

**Order Sheet**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR  
Civil Revision No. S – 53 of 2004**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>Order with Signature of Hon'ble Judge</b>
-------------	--

---

**Hearing of case**

For hearing of main case

**29-11-2021**

Mr. Muhammad Nawaz Qazi, Advocate for Respondent No.1(A)

<><><>..<><><>

On the last date of hearing, the following order was passed;-

“Applicant Gul Muhammad present in person submits that he would now engage a new Counsel. On the last date of hearing, Mr. Faiz Muhammad Brohi Advocate had filed vakalatnama on his behalf, and now once again he intends to engage another Counsel. Earlier he was appearing in person and due to his inability to assist the Court he was directed to engage a Counsel. The matter pertains to year 2004 however, only the reason is the inability of the Applicant to pursue the matter, therefore, the matter is reluctantly adjourned to **29-11-2021**, on which date Counsel engaged by the Applicant, if any, shall proceed without fail, failing which the instant Civil Revision Application would be dismissed for non-prosecution.”

Today Mr. Niaz Muhammad Korai Advocate has though affected appearance but he is not ready to proceed; on the ground that he is not in possession of all documents including the impugned order which is not legible. It may be observed that matter was only adjourned for today as a last and final chance with directions, that Counsel, if any, engaged by the Applicant shall positively proceed today, failing which Revision Application would be dismissed for non-prosecution. The Counsel who has entered appearance is not ready. Even otherwise, the Applicant has, time and again taken recourse to this modus operandi, by either coming in persons or seeking time to engage counsel who on the next date either do not appear; or after filing Vakalatnama never proceed. Earlier, in similar fashion, another Counsel who was engaged by the Applicant filed Vakalatnama and sought time to fully prepare his brief and matter was adjourned and on the next date the Counsel did not turn-up and Applicant came in person and again sought adjournment. The conduct of the Applicant reflects that he is only seeking adjournments on these frivolous grounds and is not interested in proceeding with this matter, which is pending since 2004. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Application is dismissed for non-prosecution.

**Judge**