

ORDER SHEET  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI  
Crl. Revision Application No.57 of 2023  
(*Dr. Shahed Masood v.Saeed Ghani and others*)

---

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

---

1. For order on office objection (Flag A)
2. For hearing of main case
3. For hearing of MA No.3128/23

**21.05.2024**

M/s. Shaukat Hayat and Syed M. Abdul Kabir, advocates for the applicant  
Mr. Imtiaz Mahar, advocate for private respondent  
Ms. Seema Zaidi, Additional Prosecutor General for the State

=====

1. Overruled.
- 2-3. The facts, in brief, necessary for the disposal of the instant Crl. Revision Application are that a complaint was filed by the private respondent for prosecution of the applicant for allegedly committing an offence of defamation; during its proceedings, the applicant filed an application u/s 265-C Cr.PC seeking a direction against the private respondent to supply all documents based upon the complaint to him; it was dismissed by learned IIIrd-Additional Sessions Judge Karachi South vide order dated 21.2.2023, which is impugned by the applicant before this Court by making the instant Criminal Revision Application.

It is contended by learned counsel for the applicant that it was a complaint; therefore, the private respondent was under lawful obligation to supply the requisite documents to the applicant to prepare his defence before proceedings of the case. By contending so, he sought

to set aside the impugned order with a direction to the private respondent to supply copies of all the documents necessary for trial, which is opposed by learned counsel for the private respondent and learned Additional PG for the State by contending that all the requisite documents have already been supplied to the applicant and he is delaying the disposal of the case for one or other reason which is pending on file of the learned trial Court since 2018, without any progress.

Heard arguments and perused the record.

As per the impugned order, the documents requisite for trial have already been supplied to the applicant twice. In addition to those documents, the private respondent has already been directed by the learned trial Court to supply a copy of the plaint with annexures to the applicant. In that situation, the applicant could hardly claim that he had not been supplied with the requisite documents for trial. No illegality even otherwise is noticed in the impugned order which may justify this Court to interfere with the same.

Consequent to the above discussion, the instant Criminal Revision Application is dismissed accordingly.

**J U D G E**