

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

Suit No.214 of 2012

Suit No.1539 of 2012

Suit No.1545 of 2012

Date

Order with signature of Judge

Present:

Mr. Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar

1. **Suit No.214 of 2012**

M/s. Master Management Private Limited.....Plaintiff

Vs.

Islamic Republic of Pakistan & others.....Defendants

2. **Suit No.1539 of 2012**

M/s. Sarhad Handicraft & others.....Plaintiffs

Vs.

Federation of Pakistan & others.....Defendants

3. **Suit No.1545 of 2012**

M/s. Punjab Handicraft & others.....Plaintiffs

Vs.

Federation of Pakistan & others.....Defendants

17.04.2017

Mirza Adil Mustafa Beg, Advocate for the Plaintiff
in Suit No.214 of 2012.

Mr. M. Khalil Dogar, Advocate for the Plaintiffs
in Suit No.1539 & 1545 of 2012.

Mr. Abdul Qadir Laghari, Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. Farooq Rashid, Advocate for the Defendant No.3.

Muhammad Ali Mazhar, J: In all aforesaid suits the plaintiffs have challenged the imposition of "Airport Entry Passes Fee" without payment of which the employees and staff of the plaintiffs were denied access. The learned counsel for the plaintiffs placed on record the copy of judgment passed by the learned division bench in C.P.No. D-641/2012 in which the Royal Airport Services (Pvt.) Ltd.

(petitioner) raised the same ground and the learned division bench vide its judgment dated 20.11.2013 allowed the petition and the Airport Security Force and Civil Aviation Authority were restrained from charging or demanding the fee from the said petitioners. All the learned counsel for the plaintiffs jointly argued that since the controversy has already set at rest and resolved in view of the judgment passed in C.P.No.D-641/2012, therefore, they request that their suits may also be disposed of in the same terms. The learned Assistant Attorney General submits that order passed by the learned division bench in C.P.No.D-641/2012 was challenged by the Airport Security Force in the hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Petition Nos.14-K to 19-K of 2014 in which leave has been granted, however, he further confirms that the impugned order has not been suspended. At this juncture the counsel for the plaintiffs submit that let their suits be disposed of in the same terms and if the judgment of the learned division bench is set aside by the Supreme Court at any later stage, they will also be treated alike on which the learned Assistant Attorney General and counsel for Civil Aviation Authority both have no objection. The above suits are disposed of accordingly. However, if the judgment of this court passed in C.P.No.D-641/2012 and the other constitution petitions mentioned in paragraph 14 of the division bench judgment are set aside, the plaintiffs shall also be treated alike. Listed applications are also disposed of in the above terms.

Judge

Asif