

# HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

**CP No. D- 1019 of 2023**

[ Mazhar Hussain v. Federation of Pakistan & Others]

**BEFORE:**

**MR. JUSTICE ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON**

**MR. JUSTICE RIAZAT ALI SAHAR**

Petitioner:

In person

Mr. Ghulam Abbas Sangi, Asst. Attorney General,  
along with Deedar Ali and Habeel Solangi, for Post  
Master General

Date of hearing:

& Decision:

25.11.2025

## **ORDER**

**ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON, J. -** Through instant Constitutional Petition, the Petitioner has prayed for directions to respondents 1 to 5 to:-

- i. Interview the Petitioner, display the list of candidates, qualified candidates, and marks obtained by each candidate.
  - ii. to disclose the requirement policy for whatever they have applied for filling of desired vacancies.
2. The case of the Petitioner is that Respondents 1 to 5 advertised job vacancies across Pakistan. On 12.08.2022, he applied and paid fees challans for three posts: Sorter BPS-9, Post Clerk BPS-9, and Postman BPS-7. He was issued a written slip and qualified for the Post Clerk BPS-9 interview. On 10.06.2023, he appeared for interview, where only his signature was recorded, and he was told that the interview was complete. Subsequently, he and others were not considered, and offer letters were issued to unknown persons who did not appear for the test. Despite approaching the authorities, no action was taken, leading him to file this Constitutional Petition. He prayed to allow the petition.
3. Respondents 1, 2, 4 & 5 submitted through learned D.A.G. that the petitioner qualified for the written test but failed the interview before the District Selection Committee (DSC). The recruitment was conducted lawfully, on merit, and following all codal formalities, with successful candidates issued offer letters. Learned DAG prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Upon perusal of the record and the arguments of both parties, it is an established principle that recruitment in public service must be transparent, merit-based, and in accordance with the rules. The petitioner alleges irregularities in the interview process, including that his interview was not properly conducted. Such allegations, if proved, could undermine the credibility of the recruitment process. The respondents, however, contend that the petitioner failed in the interview and that the recruitment was conducted in accordance with the law. No documentary evidence has been provided to show the marks obtained by the petitioner or to confirm that he was actually assessed during the interview. However, considering that the recruitment exercise has already been concluded, and the successful candidates have not been made parties to these proceedings, interference at this stage under Article 199 of the Constitution is not warranted. In such circumstances, no case for interference is made out as such this petition fails and is dismissed accordingly.

JUDGE

JUDGE