

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

C.P.No.D-1663 of 2013

DATE ORDER WITH SIGNATURE(S) OF JUDGE(S)

For Directions

- 1.For hearing of CMA No.20869/2014
- 2.For hearing of CMA No.12147/2014
- 3.For hearing of CMA No.29863/2014

29-08-2017

Dr.Shah Nawaz, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr.Muzaffar Leghari, Additional Advocate General.

On 25.10.2013 this petition was disposed of in the following terms:-

“Petitioner in this petition has prayed that directions may be issued to respondent No.3 to rectify the record and publish the correct vacancy position on their website and make appointments on the basis of current vacancy position given in the letter of EDO dated 27.03.2013. Such letter is available on record as annexure-C at Page No.13. This letter was written by respondent No.4 to respondent No.3 while another letter dated 25.03.2013 is also available on record which was also written by respondent No.4 to Director, School Education Sukkur. Learned AAG suggested that this petition may be disposed of in view of letters dated 27.03.2013 and 25.03.2013. Learned counsel for petitioner is satisfied. This petition is disposed of accordingly and respondent No.3 is directed to correct the actual vacancy position in terms of aforesaid letters. Copy of this order be transmitted to respondent No.3 & 4 for compliance.”

The order reflects that on the basis of aforesaid letters the learned AAG herself proposed and consented that the petition may be disposed of in view of the aforesaid letters. On 11.11.2013 the respondent No.3 file a review application in person and it is clear that the review application is neither moved by Government of Sindh nor by the A.G. Office. Learned AAG was

representing all the respondents in this petition and after issuing notice normally the A.G. office files their counter affidavit or the comments. The internal correspondence through the above letters were read by the learned AAG and after proper reflection she conceded to dispose of the petition. No logical ground has been raised in the review application. The respondent No.3 simply stated that he did not authorize the A.G. Office to give consent. Whereas the learned AAG argued that earlier AAG had given consent on the basis of aforesaid letters rightly so he does not want to add anything more.

No reasonable ground has been made out in the review application, which is pending since long. This petition was heard by the Division Bench comprising me (Muhammad Ali Mazhar-J) and Mr. Justice Farooq Ali Channa. However, at the time of filing review application Mr. Justice Farooq Ali Channa was ceased to be the Judge of this court, therefore, under the administrative order of hon'ble Chief Justice passed on 4.12.2016 the review application has been ordered to be fixed before me for further orders in the single bench. Since I have not found any reasonable ground to review the earlier order, this review application is dismissed.

Judge

ns