

Order Sheet  
**HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,  
HYDERABAD**

CP No. D- 262 of 2012  
[Muhammad Juman v. Province of Sindh & others]

**BEFORE :**

Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon

Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar

Date of hearing  
& decision:

27.11.2025

Petitioner:

Through Mr. Dilip J. Mullani, Advocate

**ORDER**

**ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON, J:-** The constitutional petition was disposed of vide order dated 02.11.2021. This Court noted that the petitioner sought a direction to Respondents No. 1 & 2 to stop illegal construction of a drainage system on the petitioner's land and restore it. However, as Revision Application No. 116 of 2002 between the parties was still pending, this Court dismissed the petition without prejudice, directing that the Revision Application be fixed according to roster.

2. Through MA No. 9093 of 2021, the petitioner seeks review of the above order, arguing that the Court failed to appreciate, the issue involves illegal construction admitted by Respondents No. 3, 4, and 5; that the petitioner's title has been declared by two lower Courts; that the dispute in R.A. No. 116 of 2002 is only between the petitioner and Respondents No. 3 & 4; that there is apparent collusion and malafide conduct by Respondents No. 3 & 4 with government officials (Respondents No. 1 & 2); whereas Respondents No. 1 & 2 are not parties to R.A. No. 116 of 2002 and have no claim over the land; that the earlier orders of this Court regarding the tagging of R.A. No. 116 of 2002 were ignored; that contempt notices were issued against the respondents, but illegal acts continued.

3. The petitioner counsel contends that this Court committed an error of law and prays for the review of the order as discussed supra.

4. The review application has been carefully examined. The petitioner seeks review on the grounds that illegal construction was admitted by certain respondents, that the petitioner's title has been declared by lower courts, that there is alleged collusion, and that earlier orders of this Court were not considered. It is observed that

the impugned order of 02.11.2021 already provided proper safeguards to the petitioner.

5. The order explicitly preserved the rights of the petitioner pending adjudication of Revision Application No. 116 of 2002 and directed that the matter be fixed according to roster. The petitioner remains free to pursue the matter in accordance with law. Since no apparent error is visible on the face of the record that would warrant interference under Section 114 of the CPC, the review application is dismissed accordingly.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Karar\_hussain/PS\*