

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI

Present:

Mr. Justice Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry
Mr. Justice Muhammad Jaffer Raza

C.P. No. D – 1514 of 2021: Muhammad Qasim Bhutto versus Federation of Pakistan and others.

C.P. No. D – 1738 of 2021: Bahadur Khan Bhutto versus Federation of Pakistan and others.

C.P. No. D – 1739 of 2021: Hidayatullah Bhutto versus Federation of Pakistan and others.

C.P. No. D – 1740 of 2021: Ali Asghar Bhutto versus Federation of Pakistan and others.

C.P. No. D – 2820 of 2021: Zohaib Ali Khoro versus Federation of Pakistan and others.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Nadir Khan Burdi, Advocate

Federation of Pakistan : Barrister Mohsin Kadir Shahwani, Additional Attorney General for Pakistan *assisted by* Ms. Mehreen Ibrahim, Deputy Attorney General for Pakistan, Muhammad Ahmed, Assistant Attorney General for Pakistan.

Mr. Owais Nauman Kundi, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Law & Justice Division, Islamabad and Mr. Wajid Aziz Qureshi, Assistant Solicitor, Ministry of Law & Justice Division, Islamabad.

Registrar High Court : Mr. K.A. Vasani, Assistant Advocate General Sindh.

OGRA : M/s. Asim Iqbal, Farmanullah Khan and Syeda Maryam, Advocates for the **OGRA** in all petitions.

Date of hearing : 18-11-2025

Date of decision : 18-11-2025

ORDER

Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry J. – These petitions were coming up along with C.P. No. D-5497/2022, which has been disposed of by us today by a separate order. However, the issue in these petitions is completely different.

2. The Petitioners had received notices from the SSGC alleging gas theft and demanding payment of the gas so consumed. FIRs were eventually lodged by the SSGC against the Petitioners for gas theft. The Petitioners made complaints to the Oil and Gas Regulatory Authority [OGRA] under its Complaint Resolution Procedure Regulations, 2003, contending that the amount claimed for alleged gas theft was excessive. The SSGC replied that the issue was *subjudice*. Therefore, the OGRA disposed of the complaints citing Regulation 4(d) which prevented it from entertaining matters seized by a court of law. It is this refusal by the OGRA that is impugned in these petitions.

3. The case set-up by the Petitioners is that while criminal proceedings against them were seized by a court of law, their grievance was with regards to civil liability *viz.* the amount demanded from them by the SSGC for the gas consumed in the alleged gas theft. Even assuming that such stance does not amount to an admission of gas theft, we do not see how such fact could be determined by OGRA within the scope of Regulation 3 of the Complaint Resolution Procedure Regulations, 2003, which confines the nature of complaints that the OGRA can look into. In some cases, the Petitioners were not even registered consumers of the SSGC. It is not the Petitioners' case that they had filed any civil suit to determine civil liability emanating from the alleged gas theft. Therefore, we do not see any reason to interfere with letters issued by OGRA to dispose of the Petitioners' complaints. Petitions are dismissed.

Office shall place a copy of this order in all the listed petitions.

JUDGE

JUDGE

*PS/SADAM