

Judgment Sheet
IN THE LAHORE HIGH COURT,
Multan Bench, Multan
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

C.R. No.1549 of 2016

Wazir Khan

VS.

Tehsil Municipal Administration, etc.

JUDGMENT

Date of hearing:	12.11.2025
Petitioner by:	Mian Mumtaz Ahmad Zahid, Advocate.
Respondents No.1 & 2 by:	Rana Imran Riasat, Advocate.

SYED AHSAN RAZA KAZMI, J. This Civil Revision was filed against the order dated 18.10.2016, whereby the learned Appellate Court set aside the order dated 16.09.2016 passed by the learned Trial Court, through which the petitioner's application for temporary injunction had been allowed. On 27.10.2016, notice was issued to respondents and an interim injunctive order was granted in favour of the petitioner.

2. During today's proceedings, learned counsel for the petitioner was specifically asked about the status of the main suit bearing number 333/2016 pending before the learned Trial Court. Counsel professed complete ignorance. After hearing both sides at length and reserving the matter for order, a report was requisitioned from the learned Trial Court. The report confirmed that the main suit had already been withdrawn by the petitioner from the Court of Raja Zahid Hussain, the then learned Civil Judge, Vehari, on 20.04.2019.

3. The petitioner's failure to disclose that the main suit, out of which this Civil Revision had arisen, stood withdrawn, is not only a suppression of a material fact but a deliberate attempt to keep this Civil Revision alive despite its having become infructuous. The concealment is not accidental; it reflects an intentional effort to perpetuate interim protection that had

legally ceased upon withdrawal of the main suit. The petitioner continued to avail the benefit of the interim order while omitting to disclose that the underlying lis no longer survived.

4. The matter does not end here. Even after this Civil Revision was dismissed for non-prosecution on 08.12.2021, the petitioner filed C.M. No.2358/2025 under Section 151 CPC seeking a fresh restraining order against recovery of adda/parking fee, thereby attempting to secure interim benefits through a proceeding that no longer survived. This conduct is demonstrably abusive, misleading, and contemptuous of the judicial process. It also reveals that the petitioner was actively using the machinery of this Court to obtain repeated notices to the respondents for a cause that had extinguished long ago, thereby misusing judicial time and resources. The petitioner's deliberate non-disclosure and continued pursuit of relief amounts to manipulation of the Court's interim jurisdiction.

5. Misrepresentation before a Court of law is not a mere lapse; it strikes at the very core of the judicial process. The administration of justice proceeds on the assumption that litigants will make truthful disclosures and will not withhold material facts essential for a fair adjudication. When a party, through commission or omission, presents an incomplete or distorted picture, the Court is misled into proceeding on a premise that does not exist, thereby jeopardizing the accuracy and legitimacy of the outcome. Such conduct does not only affect the immediate lis; it erodes public trust in the judicial system and undermines the confidence with which parties approach this forum for redress. A litigant who deliberately resorts to concealment or deceit must, therefore, bear the consequences of such misconduct, for the integrity of the judicial process is non-negotiable and demands strict adherence to candor and fairness at every stage.

6. The combined effect of (i) withdrawing the main suit, (ii) continuing to prosecute this Civil Revision without disclosure, and (iii) filing a fresh C.M. for prohibitory relief even after dismissal of instant Civil Revision for non-prosecution and during pendency of restoration

application reveals a pattern of deliberate concealment and misuse of the Court's process. A litigant who withdraws the very suit giving rise to the Civil Revision cannot be permitted to retain any advantage under interim orders. Once the main suit was withdrawn, this Civil Revision automatically / *ipso facto* became infructuous, and all interim orders stood extinguished by operation of law. Such conduct has direct consequences, as misrepresentation before the Court strikes at the heart of judicial integrity and undermines the fair administration of justice.

7. In these circumstances, the petitioner's conduct amounts to gross misconduct, warranting imposition of heavy costs to deter such attempts to mislead the Court and abuse its jurisdiction. Given the petitioner's sustained misuse of interim relief, concealment of withdrawal of the main suit, and repeated invocation of this Court's process for collateral benefits, exemplary costs are justified. Accordingly, this Civil Revision is **dismissed** as infructuous and a cost of Rs.100,000/- is imposed upon the petitioner. In case of failure to deposit it, the same shall be recovered as arrears of land revenue.

**(Syed Ahsan Raza Kazmi)
JUDGE**

Approved for reporting.

JUDGE

Ejaz*