

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI
CP D 1632 of 2025

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE(S)
------	----------------------------------

- 1. For orders on CMA No.17837/2025.
- 2. For orders on CMA No.8842/2025.
- 3. For orders on CMA No.8843/2025.
- 4. For orders on office objections No.1 to 4.
- 5. For orders on CMA No.8146/2025.
- 6. For orders on CMA No.8147/2025.
- 7. For orders on CMA No.8148/2025.
- 8. For hearing of main case.

03.09.2025

Petitioner, Dr. Zahra Gauhar, is present in person.

This petition was filed primarily seeking relief against the private respondents, being respondents 3, 4 and 5, as well as Registrar and Project Director of Access to Justice Program, High Court of Sindh. On 29.04.2025, following order was passed:

“29.04.2025.

Dr. Zahra Gauhar, Petitioner in person.

1. Granted.

2,3,34,5&6. When confronted as to joining Respondents No. 1 & 2 as well as the prayer being sought against them, which apparently cannot be granted in view of the dicta laid down by the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of ***Gul Taiz Khan v/s. Registrar Peshawar High Court (PLD 2021 SC 391)***, the Petitioner in person requests for time to amend the petition by deleting the two Respondents as above as well as the prayer clause against them. At her request time allowed. Let such application be filed in the office. Adjourned.”

The petitioner appearing in person has drawn attention to CMA 8842/2025, whereby she has sought to amend the petition. The amended draft demonstrates that the petition remains *prima facie* discrepant as even though the earlier court officers have been removed from array of respondents, pursuant to judgement in ***Gul Taiz Khan*** (Supra); however, the relief claimed remains there against. It is also noted that the petitioner has not been able to befall the private respondents within the definition of person per Article 199(5) of the

Constitution. From the record placed before us, it reflects that apparently the Petitioner is an investor with Respondent No.3, by way of NAFA Income Opportunity Fund and has been allegedly defrauded, whereas some complaint was also filed by her before Federal Investigation Agency. The matter seems to be of personal and private grievance for which writ jurisdiction is not the appropriate forum; rather a suit for recovery is the remedy. As to use of any premises by Respondent No.2 to Respondent No.3, for that the petitioner is not an aggrieved person within the ambit of Article 199. In view hereof, petition is found to be *prima facie* misconceived and not maintainable, hence, dismissed in *limine* along with all pending applications.

Chief Justice

Judge