

43

ORDER SHEET  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA  
C.P. No.D-598 of 2011.

DATE OF HEARING	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF HON'BLE JUDGE
--------------------	---------------------------------------

1. For orders on office objection as Flag 'A'.
2. For Katcha Peshi.

24.9.2014

Mr. Habibullah G. Ghouri, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Asif Hussain Chandio, advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. Mushtaque Ahmed Kourejo, Standing Counsel.

-----


It is case of the petitioner that though he has applied for L.P.R but on the next day he had moved application for its cancellation. The record reflects that in terms of annexure-G attached with the comments such request for cancellation of LPR was declined on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2004. However, Mr. Ghouri, counsel for the petitioner relied on a document which is a request for cancellation of L.P.R. It was claimed to have been forwarded by the then Minister WAPDA, whereby request of the petitioner was allowed. This document does not establish at all that such request was allowed by the sitting Minister, WAPDA nor Mr. Ghouri has pointed out that the said Minister enjoys such powers and privileges to have decided such instead of board. Be that as it may, the crucial documents whereby the petitioner was released and relieved which is annexed as annexure 'C' attached with the comments which reflects as under :

**"OFFICE ORDER**

365 (Three hundred, Sixty five only) days is sanctioned hereby accorded to grant of L.P.R with effect from 25.5.2004 to 24.5.2005 (Both days inclusive) to Mr. Dhani Bux s/o Late Muhammad Akram Sanjrani, LM-II of Operation Sub Division, HESCO: (WAPDA), Khanpur (under Operation Division, HESCO: (WAPDA), Shikarpur on full pay last he drawn.

On expiry of L.P.R the official will stand retired from HESCO:/WAPDA service with effect from 24.5.2005 (F.N)."

Along with comments it has also been shown that the retired person / employee is paid an amount of gratuity / commutation of Rs.312,558/- vide cheque No.4299280 dated 27.10.2005 and is also drawing monthly pension amounting Rs.5979/- and in these circumstances when it is not denied by the petitioner, it appears that no case





45

for such interference is made out. Even after lapse of about more than seven years this petition was filed. The counsel has also failed to establish under what powers as being authority, the Minister who could have decided the fate of the request for cancellation of L.P.R when the petitioner himself is drawing pension and other benefits in pursuance of his retirement, hence no case for interference is made out. The petition is dismissed.



Judge



Judge