

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI**  
Suit No.1180 of 2011

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

For Further orders

17.02.2014.

Mr. Fareed Ahmed, Advocate for the Plaintiff.  
Mr. Liaquat Zaman, Advocate for the Defendant No.8.  
Mr. Ghulam Mustafa Lakho, A.A.G.  
Mr. Ghulam Shabbir, Advocate for BOR.  
-----

This suit has been filed by the 11 Plaintiffs claiming to be owners of certain piece of land purchased by them from villagers who were sitting on the piece of land known as Chishti Nagar. These 11 Plaintiffs claim that piece of land measuring 4000 sq.yds situated in village Chishti Nagar, Na-Class No.166, Deh Safooran, Block-10, Gulistan-e-Jauhar, Gulshan-e-Iqbal Town, Karachi is to be declared as village Chishti Nagar. The very fact that these 11 Plaintiffs are not resident of village by virtue of continuous possession in village for several years to claim possession of their ancestral land to be declared as village cannot maintain a suit of the nature declaration on the basis of agreement of sale with unidentified parties. The so-called villagers from who they claim to have purchased land were not owners not even villagers as till date the land is not regularized as village. In para-6 of the plaint, the Plaintiffs admit that a suit No.1341/2004 was also filed by some other villagers of similar nature, which was dismissed. According to him on technical grounds. Be that as it may, they have not filed even copy of that suit with plaint and dismissal order of the said suit. Admittedly the agreements of sale filed by these Plaintiffs are subsequent to the dismissal of earlier suits as each

and every agreement filed by them is subsequent to 2007. None of these sale agreements give any right, title and interest in the suit premises. The Plaintiff in prayer clause-C have sought cancellation of letter dated 18.10.1986 and order dated 17.3.1987 without any justification that under what circumstances, when they have purchased and entered into a sale agreement in 2007, they can show any grievance against the orders of 1987 to seek cancellation. All the facts mentioned above shows that the Plaintiffs are not entitled to any relief from this Court. Suit is dismissed as not maintainable as Plaintiffs have no locus standi.

JUDGE

SM