

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR
C. P. No. D – 2014 of 2018

Date of hearing	Order with signature of Judge
-----------------	-------------------------------

Hearing of case
For hearing of main case

Mr. Muhammad Raza Soomro, Advocate for the Petitioner No.1.
Mr. Irfan Mehdi Soomro, associate of Mr. Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro, Advocate for respondent No.3 a/w Dr. Aijaz Ali, Demonstrator, KMC, Khairpur on behalf of respondent No.3.
Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Naich, Assistant A.G Sindh.

Date of Hearing: **02-11-2022**
Date of Order: **02-11-2022**

ORDER

Through instant petition, the petitioners seek directions to the respondents to produce entire relevant record of appointments of the Attendants and Chowkidars in Khairpur Medical College, Khairpur for verification of this Court. They also seek cancellation of Select List with directions to respondents No.1 to 3 to make fresh appointments on merits after holding tests and interviews, as per rules and regulations.

2. It is alleged that the applications for the appointment of Attendants and Chowkidars etc. were invited by the respondent No.3 (Principal, Khairpur Medical College, Khairpur) through publication made in various newspapers dated 07.12.2017. The petitioners No.1 to 3 applied for the post of Attendant (BPS-01), while the petitioner No.4 applied for the post of Chowkidar (BPS-01). It is case of the petitioners that without holding tests and interviews, the respondents No.1 to 3 selected the candidates of their own choice, illegally, arbitrarily and by misusing their authority and bypassing the relevant rules and

regulations. It is also case of the petitioners that the said respondents appointed respondents No.4 to 11, who even did not apply for any post.

3. Herd learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

4. It is a matter of record that the petitioners have not sought any relief in their favour. Nothing has been brought on record to show that the appointments made pursuant to the alleged publication by the respondent No.3 were in violation of rules and regulations. Mere for the reason that the petitioners could not be appointed against the posts they applied for, issuing of directions to the respondents to produce entire record of the appointments would not be justified. So much so, leaned counsel for the petitioner No.1 has failed to point out any relevant rules and regulations which have been violated by the respondent No.3 while making appointments of the deserving, suitable and meritorious candidates pursuant to alleged publication. Hence, this petition being devoid of any merit is hereby **dismissed**.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Ahmad