

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

Cr. Revision Applications No. 222, 136 to 139,
148, 223 to 225, 232, 34 to 37 and 83 of 2023

Date	Order with Signature(s) of Judge(s)
------	-------------------------------------

16.10.2024

Mr. Aitzaz Manzoor Advocate holding brief for Mr. Arshad M. Tayebaly, Advocate for applicant.

Mr. Ali Zuberi Advocate holding brief for Mr. Abid S. Zuberi, Advocate for applicant.

Mr. Yahya Iqbal Advocate holding brief for Mr. Jaffar Raza, Advocate for applicant in Cr. Revision Applications No. 225, 139 and 37 of 2023.

Mr. Moiz Ali Khan Advocate holding brief for Mr. Basil Nabi Malik, Advocate for applicant in Cr. Revision Application No. 223, 138 and 36 of 2023.

Mr. Mehmood A. Qureshi, Advocate for respondent.

Mr. Abdul Majeed Khoso, Advocate for respondent.

Mr. Asad Rizvi, Advocate for respondent.

Mr. Mehmood Channa, Advocate for respondent.

M/s. Muhammad Iqbal Awan, Addl. P. G. and Mumtaz Ali Shah, A.P.G.

None of the main counsel for the applicants are present and perhaps this is because they have a stay operating in their favour. In all these Cr. Revision Applications the applicants have challenged orders, which have been passed by the concerned trial Court after taking cognizance of the offence. The appropriate forum for redressal of their grievance is before the concerned trial Court, as such, this is the place where applicants should go for redressal of their grievance rather than directly approaching this Court. In this respect reliance is placed on the case of **Muhammad Farooq v. Ahmed Nawaz Jagirani** (PLD 2016 SC 55) where it was held as under:-

“Another rule of propriety, that has evolved by precedent law must not lose sight is that where two Courts have coextensive or concurrent jurisdiction, then the propriety demands that jurisdiction of Court of the lower grade is to be invoked in the first instance.”

Reliance is also placed on **DG Anti-Corruption Establishment Lahore v. Muhammad Akram Khan** (PLD 2013 SC 401); hence, all these Cr. Revision Applications are dismissed and the applicants are free to approach the concerned trial Court if so advised for redressal of their grievance.

All these Cr. Revision Applications stand disposed of in the above terms and the stay orders are vacated.

Office is directed to place a copy of this order in all the connected matters mentioned above.

JUDGE