

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

C.P No.D-5169 of 2026

[Mrs. Fozia Almas V. Province of Sindh and others]

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE(S).
------	-----------------------------------

Before;
Mr. Justice Muhammad Saleem Jessar;
Mr. Justice Abdul Hamid Bhurgri.

- 1. For orders on Misc. No.19817/2026.
- 2. For order on office objection No.22 & 29.
- 3. For orders on Misc. No.19818/2026.
- 4. For orders on Misc. No.19819/2026.
- 5. For orders on Misc. No.20270/2026.
- 6. For hearing of main case.

.-.-.-.-.-

Date of hearing and Order:- 18.08.2026

Ms. Fareeda Mangrio, Advocate for the petitioner.

.-.-.-.-.-

Abdul Hamid Bhurgri, J.- Through this Constitution Petition, the petitioner claims to be the lawful owner of the subject land admeasuring 67-00 Acres and 30-00 Ghuntas, bearing Survey Nos.169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177 and 178 situated in Deh Jam Chakro, Tappo Manghopir, Karachi West, and has called in question the action/order of respondent No.6 whereby the revenue entries concerning the subject land have been cancelled vide letter/order dated 10.08.2026.

2. When learned counsel for the petitioner was confronted with the fact that the impugned action/order passed by the revenue authority is amenable to challenge before the competent forum under the applicable land revenue law by way of appeal and/or revision, as the case may be, he could not satisfy the Court as to why the petitioner should be permitted to bypass the statutory remedy and directly invoke the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court. Moreover, the controversy raised in the petition involves disputed questions of fact, including the petitioner’s claim of title and the validity of the revenue entries, which cannot appropriately be adjudicated in constitutional jurisdiction.

3. In view of the availability of an adequate statutory remedy under the land revenue hierarchy, coupled with the disputed questions of fact involved in the matter, we are not persuaded to exercise our discretionary jurisdiction under Article 199 of the Constitution. Consequently, this petition is dismissed in *limine*, along

with all listed/pending applications, if any. The petitioner shall, however, be at liberty to avail the remedy available under the relevant law, in accordance with law. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the petitioner's claim or the impugned action/order.

JUDGE

JUDGE
HEAD OF CONST. BENCHES

Ayaz Gul