

ORDER SHEET  
**HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI**

C.P No.D-1280 of 2015

---

Date Order with signature of Judge

---

For hearing of CMA No.17736/2015 (Contempt)

---

02.10.2015.

Mr. Akhlaque Mehdi, advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ahmed Pirzada, Advocate a/w Faisal Qureshi, Mukhtiarkar,  
Jamshed Town.

Syed Sultan Ahmed, Advocate for KMC.

Mr. Anwar Ali Shah, advocate for SBCA.

Mr. Kazi Bashir Ahmed, A.A.G a/w ASI Abdul Qayoom, P.S. Soldier  
Bazar.

>><<

At the very outset learned counsel for the petitioner wants to withdraw this contempt application so far as the alleged contemnors No.1, 3 to 6, 8 &9. This application so far as these alleged contemnors are concerned is dismissed as withdrawn. Learned counsel states that vide order dated 21.05.2015 some specific instructions were issued to respondent No.3, 6 & 8 who are mentioned as alleged contemnor No.2, 7 and 10 in the instant application. Counsel states that since the order passed on 21.05.2015 has not been complied with by these alleged contemnors and they have rendered themselves that an appropriate action may be taken against these delinquent officers. Syed Sultan Ahmed advocate has appeared on behalf of alleged contemnor No.7 and states that order passed by this Court has been complied with. Mr. Ahmed Pirzada, advocate has appeared on behalf of the alleged contemnors No.2 and also states that the order passed by this Court has been complied with.

Learned counsel have invited out attention to the letter dated 28.7.2015 addressed by respondent No.6 to the Deputy Controller of Buildings SBCA for removal encroachment of available on the plot No.291/2, Al-Fareed Street Garden West, Nishter Road, Karachi with regard to compliance of order dated 21.05.2015 which has been complied

with by him and rest of the removal of the encroachment is to be made by the Deputy Controller of Building. Counsel states that purpose of filing of this contempt application has been served. Learned counsel for the petitioner has conceded that the order for removal of encroachment relating to the respondent No.6 has been complied with.

We, therefore, are of the view that since categorical statement given by the counsel for respondent No.6 who is alleged contemnor No.7 in the application the purpose of filing of this contempt application has been served, this application is therefore, disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE

JUDGE