

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

C.P. No.D-327 of 2026

[Muhammad Muneeb v. Federation of Pakistan and others]

Before:

Mr. Justice Arbab Ali Hakro

Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar

1. For order on MA No.1415/2026.
2. For order on MA No.1416/2026.
3. For order on office objection.
4. For order on MA No.1417/2026.
5. For order on MA No.1418/2025.
6. For hearing of main case.

Petitioner : Muhammad Muneeb through
Mr.Noman Ahmed Leghari, Advocate.

Respondents : Nil.

Date of Hearing : 19.02.2026

Date of Decision : 19.02.2026

ORDER

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

- A. To direct the respondents No.2 to 4 to provide the entire particulars of the complaint lodged against the petitioner so that the petitioner could reply the same and prove his innocence.*
- B. To direct the respondents No.2 to 4 to conduct free, fair and impartial into the matter at FIA Cybercrime Circle Hyderabad Sindh and during the course of Inquiry the petitioner shall not be harassed in any form or manifestation or arrested or if the same is not possible record the statement of the petitioner through WhatsApp or Video Link.*
- C. To direct the respondents to atonce unblock the freezed accounts of the petitioner maintained at UBL Civic Centre Branch Hyderabad and Easy Paisa Account as no allegation against the petitioner has been proved through the court of law.*
- D. Interim orders solicited whereby restraining and prohibiting the FIA from taking any coercive action against the petitioner till final decision of the petition.*

E. Costs of the petition may be saddled upon the respondents.

F. Any other relief(s) which this Honourable court deems fit, just and proper in favour of petitioner.

2. In his petition, the petitioner has stated that he is a low-paid employee working in an online call center and claims to have no criminal antecedents. He received “NOTICE FOR ATTENDANCE U/S 160 Cr.P.C.” in enquiry No.1287/2024 dated 09.07.2024 from the FIA wherein the gist of allegation was mentioned merely as “financial fraud” without any further particulars or supporting material. Subsequently, another notice dated 18.07.2024 required his appearance before the Inquiry Officer on 25.07.2024. The petitioner stated that being resident of Hyderabad, Sindh and having limited financial means, he sought details of the allegations and requested that either the inquiry be transferred to Hyderabad or his statement be recorded through video link/WhatsApp. According to him, his replies were returned on the ground that the concerned officer had been transferred and later for not mentioning the name of the new Inquiry Officer. He further stated that despite his attempts to contact the officer concerned, no facilitation was extended and in the meantime his UBL and Easy Paisa accounts were blocked, thereby causing financial hardship. The petitioner alleging infringement of his fundamental rights, particularly the right to due process and fair treatment, has approached this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the impugned notices are vague and do not disclose specific allegations, thereby depriving the petitioner of an effective opportunity to defend himself. He contended that the failure of the FIA to furnish particulars of the complaint violates the principles of natural justice and fair trial as guaranteed under Article 10-A of the Constitution. He further contended that the petitioner, being a low-income individual residing in Hyderabad, was justified in requesting transfer of inquiry or recording of statement through

electronic means. The blocking of his bank accounts, without any adjudication or lawful order communicated to him, has been termed arbitrary and without lawful authority. Learned counsel contended that such actions are *mala fide* and amount to harassment, warranting interference by this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution. He lastly prayed for restraining the respondents from taking any coercive action and for immediate unfreezing of the petitioner's accounts.

4. Heard and perused the record.

5. From perusal of the record, it is evident that the impugned attendance notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C. in Enquiry No.1287/2024 (available at page-19 of the Court file) has been issued by the Investigating Officer of Federal Investigation Agency, Cybercrime Reporting Center, Circle Lahore. The subject matter of the petition thus arises out of a criminal inquiry being conducted within the territorial limits of the Province of Punjab. The issuance of notice, the conduct of inquiry and all consequential proceedings originate from Lahore, which admittedly falls beyond the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.

6. Moreover, the matter pertains to **criminal proceedings** at the inquiry stage. The competent Investigating Agency, acting within its statutory mandate, has initiated **proceedings in Lahore** and any grievance relating to such proceedings, including issuance of notice or alleged freezing of accounts in consequence thereof, is essentially connected to the said inquiry. The proper forum for redress, if any, is therefore the High Court exercising jurisdiction over the Province of Punjab. Entertaining this petition would amount to transgressing territorial limitations and interfering in proceedings lawfully initiated in another province, which is neither permissible in law nor consistent with the constitutional scheme of distribution of jurisdiction among High Courts.

7. For what has been discussed above, we are of the considered view that the instant petition is not maintainable for want of territorial jurisdiction and is misconceived. Accordingly, the petition is **dismissed in *limine*** along with pending application(s).

JUDGE

JUDGE

Abdullahchanna/PS