

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

C.P. No. D-790 of 2025

[Ghulam Muhammad Jamali vs. Province of Sindh and Others]

BEFORE:

**JUSTICE ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON
JUSTICE RIAZAT ALI SAHAR**

For hearing of M.A No.8208/2025

Mr. Noor-ul-Amin Sipio, advocate for petitioner

Mr. Bhagwan Das Bheel, advocate for alleged contemnor

Mr. Rafique Ahmed Dahri, Assistant A.G Sindh

Date of hearing and Order: 18.12.2025

O R D E R

ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON, J. - This petition was dismissed as "not pressed" by order dated 02.09.2025; however, with consent of petitioner's counsel and respondent-university directions were issued to Vice Chancellor of LUMHS, Jamshoro, to decide the petitioner's representation within two months from the date of the order. Learned counsel for the petitioner alleged non-compliance with these directions and sought initiation of contempt proceedings against the alleged contemnor.

Learned counsel for the alleged contemnor submitted that, in compliance with the aforementioned directions, Vice Chancellor of LUMHS constituted a Committee on 22.01.2025, under the chairmanship of Director of Finance. He further stated that the matter was duly inquired into and decided on its merits. He referred to the decision of the Committee, which was annexed along with the objections of alleged contemnor, wherein it was held that, in accordance with Rule 6 of the Recruitment, Appointment, and Promotion Rules of the LUMHS Code, the date of birth recorded at the time of initial appointment shall be deemed final and no subsequent alteration or modification is permissible.

In view of the above, it is evident that the Vice Chancellor of LUMHS complied with the directions of this Court by constituting a Committee, which inquired into the matter and decided it on its merits in accordance with the applicable Rules. Since the Committee's decision was taken following the provisions of Rule 6 of the Recruitment, Appointment, and Promotion Rules of

the LUMHS Code, and the date of birth of the petitioner has been correctly treated as final, no contempt can be said to have occurred.

Accordingly, the plea for initiation of contempt proceedings against the alleged contemnor is not maintainable and is therefore dismissed.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Karar_Hussain/PS*