

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA**

Constitution Petition No.D-483 of 2025

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

**Before;**  
*Mr. Justice Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry;*  
*Mr. Justice Abdul Hamid Bhurgri.*

Petitioner : Abdul Samad s/o Khawand Bux Soomro,  
through Mr. Asif Ali Abdul Razak Soomro,  
Advocate.

Respondents : Through Mr. Munawar Ali Abbasi,  
Assistant A.G.

***Date of Hearing*** : ***19.02.2026.***  
***Date of Order*** : ***19.02.2026.***

**ORDER**

***Abdul Hamid Bhurgri, J.-*** The petitioner appeared in the recruitment process for the post of Vaccinator (Male/Female) BPS-06, advertised by the respondents. He qualified in the written test conducted through National Testing Service (NTS) on 10.06.2023 by securing 83 marks and was subsequently called for interview on 05.12.2024 by the Directorate of Expanded Programme on Immunisation (EPI), Health Department, Government of Sindh. He appeared in the interview; however, he was not selected. His grievance is that despite securing higher marks in the written examination, he was denied appointment due to alleged political interference, nepotism, and favouritism.

2. The official respondents, in their comments, have stated that the written test was not the sole criterion for selection and that final merit was determined on the basis of cumulative performance, including interview evaluation. According to them, the petitioner could not qualify in the interview on merit. The merit list of selected candidates has also been placed on record.
3. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and examined the material available on record.
4. It is settled law that mere success in a written examination or securing higher marks does not confer a vested right to appointment

unless the candidate successfully qualifies in all stages of the selection process. Reliance is placed in Waheed Gul Khan and another v. Province of Sindh and others (2024 SCMR 1701).

5. In the present case, except for general allegations of favouritism and political interference, the petitioner has failed to place any cogent or tangible material on record to establish mala fide, arbitrariness, or violation of recruitment policy. No specific allegation has been levelled against any member of the Interview Committee, nor has any convincing comparative material been produced to demonstrate illegal selection of ineligible candidates. It is well settled that mala fides must be specifically pleaded and proved through reliable evidence, and bald assertions are insufficient to invalidate a recruitment process.

6. This Court, in exercise of constitutional jurisdiction under Article 199 of the Constitution, does not sit as an appellate forum over decisions of selection committees and cannot substitute its own opinion regarding suitability of candidates in absence of patent illegality or mala fide.

7. For the foregoing reasons, the petitioner has failed to make out any case for interference. Consequently, the instant constitutional petition is dismissed, along with pending applications, if any.

*JUDGE*

*JUDGE*