

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI
C.P No. D-1015 of 2026

AQ Printer and Publisher Vs. Federation of Pakistan & others

Present:
Mr. Justice Yousuf Ali Sayeed,
Mr. Justice Muhammad Osman Ali Hadi

Date of hearing: 19.02.2026.

Date of decision: 19.02.2026.

Petitioner: Through Mr. Salman Nanji, Advocate.

ORDER

Muhammad Osman Ali Hadi, J: The Petitioner is a sole Proprietorship, who has filed the instant Petition, primarily against Respondent No. 3, which is a Shipping Line company. It transpires that the Petitioner had paid certain freight and handling charges, and the shipment of a Printing Machine (“**Cargo**”) was ordered by the Petitioner to be delivered to Pakistan from Saudi Arabia. The Cargo was booked by Respondent No. 3 (Shipping Line) and arranged / purchased through Respondent No.4 (i.e. Shipper), which is also a company.

2. As per pleadings and arguments of the Petitioner, it appears that the Respondent No. 4 / Shipper allegedly bypassed Official Banking Channels and diverted funds in contravention thereof, whilst concluding the transaction relating to the Petitioner’s Cargo. This allegedly resulted in certain title documents of the Cargo, sent by the Shipper to the Bank (which were required by the Petitioner for release of the Cargo), being rejected, as the concerned Bank refused to accept the same title documents since the Shipper and Respondent No. 3 had not followed proper banking protocols. Therefore, the Cargo documents provided by the said Respondents No. 3 & 4 were not accepted by the Bank, resulting in delayed detention and demurrage charges on the Cargo, which remained unreleased (due to lack of proper documentation).

3. Eventually, when this process was sorted out by the Respondents No. 3 & 4, the Respondent No. 3 issued the Petitioner an invoice of Rs. 1,652,000/- labelled as demurrage / detention charges for the Cargo. It

is against this claim the Petitioner holds a grievance against the Respondents No. 3 & 4.

4. A perusal of the instant Petition blatantly shows lack of any *locus standi* by the Petitioner to invoke the Constitutional Jurisdiction of this Court. At best, the Petitioner may have some private claim for recovery or damages against the Respondents Nos. 3 & 4, which cannot be raised through the instant Constitutional Petition, as the same is a civil commercial matter which must be taken and adjudicated before a competent civil court. It is pertinent to reiterate the Respondents No. 3 & 4 are neither state functionaries nor are they in any manner said to have government ownership. Furthermore, the Petitioner has sought prayers against the Respondent No. 3 regarding their demand of Rs. 1,652,000/- from the Petitioner, but a writ cannot lie in the instant matter against the said Respondent No. 3 (as they are a private Shipping Line). The Petitioner's approach to this Court is entirely misplaced. Accordingly, this Petition being devoid of any merit is dismissed *in limine*.

The above are the reasons for our short order dated 19.02.2026.

Judge

Judge