

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

Constitutional Petition No. S-59 of 2026
(*Mst. Zubaida versus Inspector General of Police & others*)

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

Date of hearing and order: 04.05.2026

Mr. Raj Ali Wahid advocate for the petitioner
Syed Ali Ahmed Zaidi, Additional AG
Mr. Faheem Hussain APG along with Waqar Azeem, SHO,
PI Rizwan Patel and SI Shafiq-ur-Rehman of PS Soldier Bazar

ORDER

Adnan-ul-Karim Memon, J. Petitioner has filed this Constitutional Petition under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, seeking directions to the official respondents to refrain from harassing, threatening or causing any mental agony to him and his family members.

2. The Petitioner, is alleging that the local police, particularly the SHO and his subordinates, are harassing and threatening her and her family members without lawful justification. It is further alleged that such conduct amounts to violation of Articles 4 and 9 of the Constitution, causing fear, mental agony, and infringement of fundamental rights to life and liberty. The Petitioner submits that despite earlier proceedings in Petition No. 255/2025, wherein directions were issued for fair investigation, the police officials have continued their unlawful conduct, including threats of false implication in criminal cases and coercive actions against her family members and associates. It is also asserted that the police are acting in violation of law and the principles of natural justice. On these premises, the Petitioner seeks protection from harassment, restraint against unlawful police actions, production of any FIRs allegedly registered against her family before the Court, and initiation of departmental proceedings against the concerned SHO and officials for misuse of authority.

3. In response, the present and former SHO and an ASI, have categorically denied all allegations. It is stated that during the relevant period, no raid was conducted at the residence of the Petitioner, nor was she or her family members arrested or subjected to unlawful interference. It is further explained that one ASI was directed merely to make a discreet inquiry in civil dress regarding the Petitioner's grievances, during which he visited the premises once and returned after meeting the Petitioner's son, who informed that she was unwell. The respondents maintain that routine snap checking was being conducted as per departmental instructions and deny any form of harassment or illegal action. It is also stated that the allegations of contempt of court or disobedience of orders of this court are baseless. The respondents have, however, expressed willingness to abide by the law.

4. In view of the foregoing, it is observed that the police authorities are legally empowered to take action in accordance with law where a cognizable offence is disclosed, and no restraint can be placed upon them from performing their statutory duties. However, such powers must be exercised strictly within the four corners of law, without resorting to intimidation, coercion, or harassment of any individual, including the Petitioner or her family members.

5. The allegations and counter-allegations raised by the parties primarily relate to disputed questions of fact, which do not warrant interference in constitutional jurisdiction in the absence of any mala fide or patent illegality being established on record. The respondents have also undertaken to act in accordance with law and to avoid any unlawful interference.

6. Accordingly, while reiterating that the police shall remain at liberty to proceed in accordance with law in respect of any cognizable offence, it is directed that no harassment, unlawful pressure, or coercive action shall be taken against the Petitioner or her family members beyond the scope of law.

7. With these observations, the instant Constitutional Petition along with pending application(s) stands disposed of. However with no order as to costs.

JUDGE