

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

C.P. No. D-1370 of 2026

[Mst. Neelofar Shakeel Farooqui V. Province of Sindh and others]

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

Before:
Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon
Mr. Justice Zulfiqar Ali Sangi

1. For order on office objection.
2. For hearing of main case.

Date of hearing and Order: 05.05.2026

Mr. Imtiaz Ali, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Asad Ahmed, Advocate for the Respondent/KMC.

Mr. Ali Ahmed Zaidi, Additional Advocate General Sindh.

ORDER

Adnan-ul-Karim Memon, J. – Petitioner Mst. Neelofar Shakeel Farooqui has filed this Constitution Petition under Article 199 of the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan 1973, seeking declaration to the effect that she is entitled for recovery of back benefits and gratuity from the respondents and the respondents are bound to act under the framework provided in the Constitution of Pakistan. She also seeks directions to the respondents to release / transfer her pension forthwith. She also seeks directions to restore the pension as double pension as the petitioner is aged more than 72 years.

2. Learned counsel for Respondent-KMC submits that prima facie the case of the petitioner seems to be genuine; however, he seeks three weeks' more time to release the pensionary benefits of the petitioner as per her entitlement under the law.

3. When confronted with this legal position of the case, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks disposal of this petition in terms of statement so made by the counsel for Respondent-KMC.

4. In view of the above, the statement made by learned counsel for Respondent-KMC, acknowledging the petitioner's entitlement and seeking time for compliance, constitutes an implied admission of liability. Once such entitlement is not disputed, there remains no legal justification to withhold pensionary benefits, which are recognized as vested rights accruing from past service and protected under the constitutional guarantee of due process and lawful treatment.

5. The petitioner, being an elderly person aged over 72 years, is further entitled to expeditious relief, and any delay in release of pension and gratuity would amount to undue hardship and denial of her lawful sustenance. The request for grant/restoration of double pension, if admissible under the applicable rules, also falls within her legal entitlement and must be examined and implemented strictly in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, the disposal of the petition in terms of the statement made by Respondent-KMC is legally sound, as it binds the respondents to fulfill their admitted obligation within the stipulated timeframe. Failure to do so would expose the respondents to appropriate legal consequences, including enforcement and contempt proceedings, as the petitioner cannot be deprived of her accrued rights on account of administrative delay or inaction.

JUDG

E

JUDGE

Ayaz Gul