

ORDER SHEET
HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

Cr. Misc Application No.S-579 of 2020.

<i>DATE</i>	<i>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</i>
--------------------	---

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| | 1. For orders on office objections. |
| | 2. For orders on M.A No.7533/26. |
| | 3. For hearing of main case. |

22.01.2026.

Mr. Muhammad Hassan Chang, Advocate for Applicant
 alongwith Applicant.

Mr. Altaf Hussain Khokhar, Deputy Prosecutor General for
 the State alongwith Inspector Aijaz Hussain Soomro (SHO
 PS Badin).

ALI HAIDER 'ADA', J.- Mr. Mashooque Ali Bhurgri, Advocate, files
 Vakalatnama on behalf of Respondent No.3, which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the brother of the
 respondent was previously accused in a case lodged by the applicant in the
 year 2006. Subsequently, a compromise was effected, and the accused was
 acquitted. However, despite the said compromise, the applicant has allegedly
 been subjected to continuous mental torture and stress by the respondent
 side to date. On this basis, the applicant approached the learned Justice of
 Peace by filing an application under Sections 22-A and 22-B, Cr.P.C.

During the course of arguments, when learned counsel was questioned
 regarding the illegality of the impugned order, wherein the learned Justice of
 Peace observed that grievances relating to mental stress and agony are
 required to be agitated before the competent forum, learned counsel fairly
 conceded that such observations were not illegal. The applicant, while
 arguing the case in person, submitted that he had previously received firearm
 injuries at the hands of the brother of the respondent; however, that matter
 was compromised and finally disposed of. He further contends that
 thereafter he continued to suffer mental torture at the hands of the
 respondent side, for which he again approached the learned Justice of Peace.

He maintains that the learned Justice of Peace neither passed any illegal or incorrect order nor committed any excess in the performance of his functions and duties, though the applicant expressed his grievance regarding the mental agony suffered by him.

Learned counsel for the respondent vehemently opposed the plea of the applicant, whereas the learned State Counsel argued that the application was wholly vague in nature and beyond the jurisdiction of the learned Justice of Peace.

Heard and perused.

The scope of authority of a Justice of Peace is limited and narrowed strictly within the parameters prescribed under Sections 22-A and 22-B, Cr.P.C. The grievance raised by the applicant pertains to matters beyond the jurisdiction of the said forum and is therefore inappropriate in that forum. No illegality or irregularity has been pointed out in the impugned order, warranting interference by this Court.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, the application is hereby dismissed as being misconceived.

JUDGE

Ali.