

**IN HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT  
HYDERABAD**

**C.P. No.D-2265 of 2025**

[Imran Ali v. Chancellor through its Secretary & others]

**Before:**

**Mr. Justice Arbab Ali Hakro**

**Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar**

1. For order on MA No.1856/2026.
2. For order on office objection.
3. For order on MA No.9610/2025.
4. For order on MA No.9611/2025.
5. For hearing of main case.

Petitioner : Imran Ali through Mian Taj  
Muhammad Keerio, Advocate.

Respondents : Nil.

Date of Hearing : 05.03.2026

Date of Decision : 05.03.2026

**ORDER**

**RIAZAT ALI SAHAR. J.** - Through this petition, the petitioner is seeking following reliefs:-

- A. Direct the respondents to adopt fair and transparent process and appoint the deserving candidates purely on merit.*
- B. Declare the entire appointment process to be illegal, unlawful and void ab-initio as the same has been carried out to give appointment letters to their chummy, favourite and blue-eyed candidates through huge underhand deal.*
- C. Interim orders solicited whereby suspending the process of appointment till the final decision of the petition.*
- D. Costs of the petition may be saddled upon the respondents.*
- E. Any other relief(s) which this Honourable Court deems fit, just and proper in favour of the petitioner.*

2. In the instant Constitution Petition filed under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, the petitioner has stated that Respondent No.1 through an advertisement dated 14.01.2025 invited applications for various vacant posts at DHQ Hospital, functioning under the administrative control of Liaquat University of Medical & Health Sciences. According to the petitioner, the advertisement did not clearly disclose the number of vacancies nor the nature of certain posts mentioned therein. The petitioner stated that being eligible for lower grade posts, he submitted applications for the posts of Senior Store Keeper (BPS-6) and Computer Operator after depositing the requisite fee and thereafter awaited intimation regarding test or interview. The petitioner has further stated that no call letter for test or interview was ever issued to the petitioner. Later, upon inquiry, the petitioner allegedly came to know that interviews for certain lower posts were conducted at DHQ Hospital, Dadu from 17.03.2025 to 25.03.2025 and that the posts for which he had applied were not included therein. The petitioner further stated that when he approached the university authorities, certain officials of respondents demanded illegal gratification from candidates and according to information gathered from social media, appointment letters were subsequently issued to favored candidates through collusive and corrupt practices without conducting a transparent recruitment process or preparing a final merit list. The petitioner claims that despite submitting a complaint before the competent authority, no action was taken, compelling him to approach this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the impugned recruitment process suffers from patent illegality, arbitrariness and lack of transparency, thereby violating the principles of merit and fair competition guaranteed under the Constitution. He contended that the respondents deliberately failed to issue interview call letters to genuine candidates including the petitioner while secretly issuing appointment letters

to their favored individuals. When queried by the Court as to whether the petitioner possessed any documentary material demonstrating that interviews were not conducted or that appointments had actually been issued in violation of the prescribed procedure, learned counsel conceded that the allegations were primarily based on information obtained through social media and informal sources and no official record or specific details of appointed candidates could presently be produced before the Court.

4. Heard and perused the record.

5. At the outset, it may be observed that the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution is discretionary in nature and is ordinarily invoked only where a clear violation of law or infringement of a fundamental right is demonstrated through cogent and reliable material. The jurisdiction cannot be exercised on the basis of conjectures, presumptions, or unsubstantiated allegations. A petitioner approaching the constitutional court must lay a factual foundation supported by some tangible material enabling the Court to examine the alleged illegality.

6. In the present case, the entire structure of the petitioner's claim rests upon general assertions that the advertisement did not specify the number of vacancies, that the petitioner did not receive a call letter for interview and that certain officials allegedly demanded illegal gratification while issuing appointment letters to favored candidates. However, apart from these bald allegations, no documentary evidence has been placed on record to substantiate the claim that the recruitment process was actually conducted in a secret or unlawful manner. The petitioner has neither produced any copy of appointment letters allegedly issued to favored candidates nor furnished details of any particular individual who was appointed in violation of merit. Even during the course of hearing, learned counsel candidly

conceded that the allegations were largely based upon information circulating on social media.

7. It is a settled principle of law that allegations of corruption, favoritism or *mala fide* must be supported by specific particulars and credible evidence. Such allegations cannot be entertained merely on the basis of hearsay or unverified information. Constitutional jurisdiction cannot be converted into a forum for conducting fishing or roving inquiries into administrative affairs on the strength of theoretical claims. Courts are required to act on the basis of concrete facts rather than assumptions. Furthermore, the petitioner has also failed to demonstrate that he had acquired any vested or accrued right to appointment merely by submitting an application in response to an advertisement. At best, an applicant only has a right to be considered in accordance with law, but such a claim must be substantiated by showing that the process actually proceeded in a manner that unlawfully excluded him. In the present case, no material has been produced to establish that the petitioner was shortlisted or that his candidature was rejected arbitrarily in violation of any prescribed rules.

8. The record further reflects that the petitioner claims to have approached the authorities prior to invoking the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court. In this regard, reliance has been placed upon an application addressed to the Secretary, Universities & Boards, Government of Sindh (available at page-41 of the petition), wherein certain grievances were articulated regarding the alleged irregularities in the recruitment process at DHQ Hospital Dadu. A perusal of the said application reveals that it essentially contains allegations similar to those pleaded in the present petition and seeks initiation of an inquiry by the competent government authority. However, even if the submission of such an application is taken into consideration, the same does not advance the case of the petitioner in the absence of any material showing that the competent authority was seized of the

matter and had declined to exercise its jurisdiction or had acted in violation of law. The mere submission of a complaint or representation does not, by itself, constitute proof of illegality in the recruitment process. Likewise, no documentary record has been produced to establish that the petitioner received any response from the authority concerned or that the matter was finally adjudicated by the competent forum so as to give rise to a justiciable grievance before this Court.

9. It is also significant to note that the contents of the said application mainly consist of generalized assertions that the recruitment process lacked transparency and that appointments were allegedly made in favor of certain candidates through corrupt practices. Nevertheless, the petitioner has failed to furnish particulars of any appointed candidate, any copy of the alleged appointment letter, or any official document indicating that the recruitment process was conducted in the manner alleged. Allegations of corruption and favoritism, howsoever serious they must be supported by credible and tangible evidence. Moreover, the relief sought by the petitioner in the present proceedings is sweeping in nature, as he seeks annulment of the entire recruitment process and direction for fresh appointments on merit. Such drastic interference in administrative matters requires the Court to be satisfied that the impugned action is patently illegal, arbitrary or in violation of statutory provisions. In the absence of any supporting material on record, this Court is not in a position to undertake such an exercise. The petitioner, at best, appears to have raised grievances which may require factual inquiry by the competent administrative authorities, but such disputed questions of fact cannot appropriately be resolved within the limited scope of constitutional proceedings.

10. It is a settled principle of law that the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution is not meant to serve as a forum for conducting fact-finding inquiries or investigating allegations. In the case in hand, the petitioner has

failed to demonstrate any direct infringement of a legally enforceable right or any specific statutory violation committed by the respondents. The material placed on record is insufficient to establish that the recruitment process was conducted in breach of the applicable rules or that the petitioner was unlawfully deprived of consideration for appointment. Mere dissatisfaction with the recruitment process, unsupported by verifiable evidence, cannot form the basis for invoking constitutional jurisdiction.

11. For what has been discussed above, we are of the considered view that the present petition is based upon vague and unsubstantiated allegations and does not disclose any ground warranting interference under Article 199 of the Constitution. The petitioner has failed to lay a factual foundation supported by reliable material enabling this Court to examine the alleged illegality in the recruitment process. Consequently, the instant constitutional petition is **dismissed** in *limine* along with listed applications, with no order as to costs.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**

\*Abdullahchanna/PS\*