

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI

C.P. Nos. D-706, 707, 803, 897,
898, 1152 & 4830 of 2016

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGES
------	--------------------------------

Before:-
Mr. Justice Muhammad Ali Mazhar
Mr. Justice Agha Faisal

C.P. No. D-706 of 2016

Habib Metropolitan Bank Ltd.....Petitioner

Versus

Foreign Exchange Operation Department & another.....Respondents

C.P. No. D-707 of 2016

National Bank of Pakistan.....Petitioner

Versus

Foreign Exchange Operation Department & another.....Respondents

C.P. No. D-803 of 2016

United Bank Limited.....Petitioner

Versus

Foreign Exchange Operation Department & another.....Respondents

C.P. No. D-897 of 2016

Allied Bank Limited.....Petitioner

Versus

SBP Banking Services Corporation and another.....Respondents

C.P. No. D-898 of 2016

MCB Bank Limited.....Petitioner

Versus

SBP Banking Services Corporation and another.....Respondents

C.P. No. D-1152 of 2016

Allied Bank Limited.....Petitioner

Versus

SBP Banking Services Corporation and another.....Respondents

C.P. No. D-4830 of 2016

United Bank Limited.....Petitioner

Versus

Foreign Exchange Operation Department & another.....Respondents

15-01-2019

Mr. Amel Khan Kasi, Advocate for the Petitioners.
(In C.P. Nos. D-4830, 706, 707 and 803 of 2016).

Mr. Fawad Baloch, Advocate holds brief for Mr. Raashid
Anwer, Advocate for the Petitioners.
(In C.P. Nos. D-897, 898, and 1152 of 2016).

Mr. Raja Adnan Khan, Advocate for the Respondent No. 1.

M/s Ali Qamber Askari and Ms. Tehmina Ashraf, Advocates
for the Interveners.

Mr. Ishrat Zahid Alvi, Assistant Attorney General.

Muhammad Ali Mazhar, J: All these petitions have been preferred against the individual order passed by the Adjudicating Officer, Director of Adjudication, Foreign Exchange Adjudication Court, where some individual complaints were lodged by the State Bank of Pakistan against the petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioners at the very outset argued that at the time of filing of these petitions, the Foreign Exchange Regulation Appellate Board was not functional, but the petitioners had already filed their appeals alongwith stay applications. At this juncture, learned counsel for the respondent No. 1 argued that during pendency of

these petitions, the Appellate Board has been made functional, where the petitioners may pursue their appeals. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that since alongwith main appeal, stay applications have already been moved and in the interest of justice, they request that some directions may be issued to the respondent No.1 that till decision on the stay applications, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioners, to which learned counsel for the respondent No.1 has agreed and he added that the petitioners may pursue their appeals alongwith stay applications and till the decision on the stay applications, the respondent No.1 will not take any coercive action. The aforesaid petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

JUDGE

JUDGE

*SHUIBAN/PA**