

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI**  
**CP No. D-4250 of 2023**

(Rehan Iqbal & Others v. The Province of Sindh & Others)

---

|              |                                            |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------|
| <b>DATE:</b> | <b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE(s) OF JUDGE(s)</b> |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------|

---

- 1. For Hearing of CMA No. 19579 / 2023 (Stay App)
- 2. For Hearing of Main Case

**11-4-2025**

Mr. Muhammad Daud Narejo Ahmed, Advocate for Petitioners  
Mr. Shehryar Qazi, AAG, Sindh

-----

- 1. **Sana Akram Minhas J:** The Petitioners seek the conversion of their alleged “*Ijzatnama(s)*” / leases for poultry farming and “*wahi chahi*” (agricultural) purposes from a 30-year term to a 99-year term. While copies of these “*Ijzatnama(s)*” / leases are not available on record, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Petition indicate that the purported “*Ijzatnama(s)*”, commencing in 1987–1988, 1989–1990, and 1992–1993 respectively, had already expired prior to the institution of this Petition. This clearly indicates that, at the time of filing, the Petitioners held no subsisting right, title, or interest under the alleged “*Ijzatnama(s)*”.
- 2. Even otherwise, the Supreme Court, through its order dated 28.11.2012 passed in Suo Motu Case No.16 of 2011, has explicitly restrained the Government of Sindh and the Revenue Department from carrying out any mutation, allotment, transfer, and/or conversion of state land. This directive has further been reinforced and clarified by a subsequent order dated 23.6.2014. In view of these binding directions, any attempt by the Petitioners to seek conversion of state land during the subsistence of the said restraint is not only impermissible but also constitutes a blatant disregard of the Supreme Court’s orders. The learned Counsel for Petitioners made a feeble attempt to argue that the Supreme Court’s orders are inapplicable to the present case; however, his submissions lacked cogent reasoning and he failed to identify any material divergence in the factual circumstances or legal issues that would warrant a departure from the Supreme Court’s directives.
- 3. In these circumstances, the Petition – having been filed in the absence of any subsisting, enforceable right, title, or interest of the Petitioners in the subject land, and being devoid of merit – is hereby **dismissed**.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**