

JUDGMENT SHEET
IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

W.P.No.3645 of 2018

M/s Amun Petroleum

Versus

National Highway Authority and others

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Dates of Hearing: | 17.08.2020, 08.09.2020, 09.09.2020, 23.09.2020, 02.10.2020, 12.10.2020 and 18.01.2021 |
| Petitioner by: | Mr. Shazib Masood and Raja Abdul Qadeer Janjua, Advocates |
| Respondents by: | M/s Rizwan Faiz Muhammad and Muhammad Afzal Khan, Advocates M/s Babbar Ali Khan, Jawad ur Rahim Malik and Salman Saeed, Advocates for respondents No.3 and 4 |

MIANGUL HASSAN AURANGZEB, J:- Through the instant writ petition, the petitioner, M/s Amun Petroleum, impugns the order dated 04.09.2018 passed by the General Manager, National Highway Authority (“N.H.A.”), whereby the provisional No Objection Certificate dated 29.03.2010 (“Provisional N.O.C.”) was cancelled.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND:-

2. This case has a long chequered history. The record shows that vide letter dated 03.08.2009 (“Offer Letter”), the N.H.A. gave an offer to Ms. Munazza Farooq (“Ms. Farooq”) for the processing of an N.O.C. for the establishment of a Filling / CNG Station at the Islamabad Link Road (South Bound) Motorway KM 356-357 (M-2) (“the Site”) on the terms and conditions set out in the said letter. In the said letter, the N.H.A. informed Ms. Farooq that the N.O.C. / registration fee shall be Rs.2 million. Letter dated 19.03.2010 from the N.H.A. shows that Ms. Farooq had deposited Rs.2 million as N.O.C. fee and Rs.9,00,000/- as cash security and rental charges.

3. One of the conditions of the Offer Letter was that the obtaining of all required N.O.C.s from other departments and utility agencies was to be the responsibility of Ms. Farooq.

4. Vide letter dated 29.03.2010, the N.H.A. informed *inter alia* Ms. Farooq as to the decision to grant an N.O.C. for the establishment of the Filling Station. In paragraph 3 of the said letter, it is explicitly mentioned

that the N.O.C. was provisional in nature and effective from 27.03.2010. The conditions which Ms. Farooq was required to fulfill were set out in the said letter. Ms. Farooq was also required to fulfill all the conditions set out in the N.H.A.'s Offer Letter. On 08.12.2009, the office of the Assistant Commissioner (Saddar), Islamabad Capital Territory ("I.C.T.") conveyed its no objection to the issuance of an N.O.C. for the establishment of a Filling Station at the Site in question. On 30.12.2009, IESCO also conveyed its no objection to the establishment of the Filling Station. On 06.01.2010, the office of the Assistant Director, Civil Defence Department informed the District Magistrate, I.C.T. that no hindrance would be caused by the installation of a Filling Station, and therefore the said Department had no objection to the operation of a Filling Station at the Site. Order dated 17.02.2010 of the Pakistan Environmental Protection Agency sets out the conditions on which the N.O.C. for the installation of a Filling Station is granted. On 12.04.2010, the Pakistan Environmental Protection Agency granted a conditional N.O.C. for the establishment of a Filling Station at the said Site. On 23.01.2012, Sui Northern Gas Pipeline Limited also conveyed its no objection to the establishment of a Filling Station. On 11.04.2012, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Islamabad informed the District Magistrate, I.C.T. that the Site proposed for the establishment of a Filling Station was suitable for the said purpose. On 14.06.2013, the Urban Planning Directorate of Capital Development Authority ("C.D.A.") approved Ms. Farooq's request for the establishment of a Filling Station subject to the conditions set out in the said letter. On 25.11.2013, the office of the District Magistrate, I.C.T. informed *inter alia* Ms. Farooq as to its no objection to the installation of a Filling Station at the said Site. However, Ms. Farooq was required to have the building plans approved by the C.D.A., and to start construction after the approval by the C.D.A.

5. In September, 2009, a memorandum of understanding was executed between the petitioner and M/s Total Parco Pakistan Limited ("M/s Total") for the establishment of a petrol pump at the Site. In September, 2009, a lease agreement was also executed between Ms. Farooq and M/s Total, whereby land measuring 04 *kana*ls in Khewat No. 326, Khatooni No. 611 and Khasra No.941/2/1 in *Mouza* Bhudana Kalan,

Islamabad was leased to M/s Total for the purpose of establishing a Filling Station.

6. The minutes of the 25th meeting of the National Highway Council (“N.H.C.”) held on 06.06.2012 show that the N.H.A.’s Executive Board had, on 11.08.2011, decided to withdraw the Provisional N.O.C.s issued to eight applicants for approaches to link roads on Motorways. The N.H.C., in the said meeting, directed the N.H.A. to implement the Executive Board’s decision regarding N.O.C.s for approaches to link roads on Motorways. N.H.A.’s letter dated 12.11.2012 shows that directions had been issued for the cancellation of N.O.C.s for permission of entry and exit points on Motorways in the light of the decisions taken by the N.H.A.’s Executive Board and the N.H.C.

7. Apprehending the cancellation of the Provisional N.O.C. issued to Ms. Farooq, writ petition No.317/2013 was filed by the petitioner before this Court. In the said writ petition, the N.H.A.’s said letter dated 12.11.2012 was challenged. Vide order dated 23.12.2014, this Court restrained the N.H.A. from cancelling the Provisional N.O.C. in pursuance of the N.H.A.’s Executive Board’s decision dated 11.08.2011. In the said order, it was observed that *“this order shall not in any manner restrain the respondents from lawful action after due process and in accordance with the terms of N.O.C. [Provisional] or the offer letter.”* By the time the said writ petition was decided, the Provisional N.O.C. had not been cancelled. N.H.A.’s stance in the said proceedings was that the Provisional N.O.C. had been issued *“in a surreptitious manner without the fulfillment of procedural requirements.”* The said order dated 23.12.2014 passed by this Court was not challenged further by either party.

8. On 19.03.2015, the petitioner filed writ petition No.865/2015 before this Court seeking a direction to the N.H.A. to *inter alia* re-adjust the fence and demarcate the entrance and exit bridge on South Bound Carriage Way, Service Road at KM 356-357 SBC Link Road, Islamabad so as to enable the petitioner to start construction work on the Filling Station. Vide order dated 20.07.2016, the writ petition was allowed with the direction to the N.H.A. to act in accordance with the law and this Court’s earlier judgment dated 23.12.2014, and to fulfill the terms and

conditions of the N.O.C. as long as the same held the field. Furthermore, the N.H.A. was directed to make the necessary demarcation and re-adjustment of the fence so as to enable the petitioner to start the construction work on the Filling Station. In the said order, it was observed that the N.H.A. had not cancelled the Provisional N.O.C. by then.

9. Aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the N.H.A., the petitioner filed a petition for contempt of Court (criminal original No.310/2016) before this Court. During the pendency of the said petition, the N.H.A., vide letter dated 17.08.2016, cancelled the Provisional N.O.C. Consequently, the said contempt petition was disposed of with the observation that the petitioner may assail the said letter dated 17.08.2016 before the appropriate forum.

10. The petitioner assailed the said letter dated 17.08.2016 before this Court in writ petition No.1738/2017 which was disposed of vide order dated 03.11.2017. Vide the said order, this Court set-aside N.H.A.'s letter dated 17.08.2016, whereby the Provisional N.O.C. was cancelled. For the purposes of clarity, the said order dated 03.11.2017 is reproduced herein below:-

"This case was heard at length. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that he is under instructions to submit that the judgments passed by this Court in writ petitions No.317/2013 and 865/2015 shall be complied with by affording an adequate opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as regards the validity of the provisional NOC dated 29.03.2010, and the question as to whether such an NOC could be granted for a site, which is on the link road of M 1/2.

2. In view of the said statement, and to ensure that an opportunity of hearing is afforded to the petitioner with an open mind, the impugned order dated 17.08.2016 is set aside. The authorized representative of the petitioner shall appear before the General Manager (ROW) in the National Highway Authority, who shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, thereafter pass a speaking order strictly in accordance with law within a fortnight.

3. This issues with the consent of the learned counsel for the contesting parties.

4. Disposed of in the above terms."

11. After the N.H.A. afforded an opportunity of a hearing to the petitioner, the former, vide letter dated 04.09.2018, cancelled the Provisional N.O.C. on the ground that it was issued unlawfully, and that Ms. Farooq had failed to fulfill all the conditions of the Offer Letter. The said letter dated 04.09.2018 has been assailed by the petitioner in the instant writ petition.

12. Learned counsel for the petitioner, after narrating the facts leading to the filing of the instant petition, submitted that after the issuance of the Offer Letter, and the Provisional N.O.C., the petitioner had taken steps for the establishment of the Filling Station by obtaining N.O.C.s from different bodies / organizations, including C.D.A., Assistant Commissioner, Senior Superintendent of Police, Islamabad, Sui Northern Gas Pipelines Limited, Islamabad Electric Supply Company, Civil Defence Department etc.; that the petitioner had spent a huge amount in furtherance of its obligations under the Offer Letter and the Provisional N.O.C. to establish the Filling Station; that the petitioner had also entered into a lease agreement with M/s Total and had purchased land for the establishment of the Filling Station; that the petitioner had complied with all the conditions in the Offer Letter; that the N.H.A.'s allegation against the petitioner that payments had been made with the delay of three months is incorrect; that even if such payments were delayed, they were accepted by the N.H.A. without any demur or reservation; that till date, the amounts deposited by the petitioner have not been returned; that the delay in the construction was occasioned due to the omission by the N.H.A. in giving the petitioner access from the link road to the land earmarked for the establishment of a Filling Station; that this omission caused the petitioner to file writ petition No.865/2015 before this Court; that vide order dated 20.07.2016, this Court directed the N.H.A. to act in accordance with this Court's earlier judgment dated 23.12.2014 and to fulfill the terms of the Provisional N.O.C. as long as it remained in the field; that since the order dated 23.12.2014 passed in writ petition No.317/2013 had attained finality, the N.H.A. could not have cancelled the N.O.C.; and that in the said order, this Court had explicitly restrained the N.H.A. from cancelling the Provisional N.O.C.

13. Furthermore, it was submitted that M/s Amun Petroleum is a partnership concern created through partnership deed dated 11.08.2009 which was registered on 20.08.2009; that initially Ms. Farooq and Yar Mustafa were the two partners; that subsequently the said partnership deed was amended and the revised partnership deed dated 12.03.2013 shows that Ms. Farooq and Yar Mustafa exited the

said partnership whereas Waqar Ahmad Qazi and Ms. Haleema Sadia Qazi became the partners in the said partnership concern; that the Provisional N.O.C. was granted to the petitioner i.e. M/s Amun Petroleum; and that the N.O.C. fee, rental charges and cash security amounting to Rs.2,900,000/- were also deposited by the petitioner with the N.H.A.

14. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that a concession agreement was executed on 23.04.2014 between the N.H.A. and Motorway Operations and Rehabilitation Engineering Company (Pvt.) Ltd. ("M.O.R.E."), which had the effect of giving control over the area, for which the N.O.C. was granted to the petitioner, to M.O.R.E. for a period of 20 years; that the N.H.A. had also granted to M.O.R.E. the rights of passage over, and of access to areas, including the area for which the N.O.C. was granted to the petitioner; that by virtue of clause 3.1 of the concession agreement, the power to grant licenses over the concession area had also been given by the N.H.A. to M.O.R.E.; that the power to grant a license for the establishment of a Filling Station on the access road to the Motorways no longer remained with the N.H.A. but with M.O.R.E.; that the N.H.A. concealed the factum as to the execution of the concession agreement from this Court during the hearing of writ petitions No.865/2015 and 1738/2017; and that the cancellation of the Provisional N.O.C. by the N.H.A. was arbitrary, contrary to the petitioner's fundamental rights and in violation of the law. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for the writ petition to be allowed in terms of the relief sought therein.

15. On the other hand, learned counsel for the N.H.A submitted that apart from an access through an interchange, no other access to the Motorways can be permitted; that stand-alone petrol Filling Stations are not permissible on the link roads to Motorways; that the Executive Board of the N.H.A., in its 166th meeting held on 19.01.2009, decided *inter alia* that commercial activity will be allowed on link roads to Motorways and its interchanges; that thereafter the Offer Letter was issued to Ms. Farooq for the establishment of a Filling Station at Islamabad Link Road (South Bound) Motorway KM 356-357 (M-2) and the Provisional N.O.C. was issued to the petitioner on 29.03.2010; that

the Executive Board of the N.H.A., in its 206th meeting held on 11.08.2011, decided to withdraw the Provisional N.O.C.s issued to all the applicants, and to impose a complete ban on processing N.O.C. cases on the link roads to Motorways in the interest of road safety; that at that time eight N.O.C.s had been issued for the establishment of Filling Stations on access roads to Motorways; that no Filling Station has been established pursuant to any of such N.O.C.s; that the N.H.C., in its 25th meeting held on 06.06.2012, directed the N.H.A. to implement the said decision taken by its Executive Board; that vide letter dated 17.08.2016, the Provisional N.O.C. issued to the petitioner was cancelled by the N.H.A.; that the said letter was challenged in criminal original petition No.310/2016 by the petitioner before this Court; that the dismissal of the said petition vide order dated 20.03.2017 implied that the cancellation of the N.O.C. was lawful and did not violate any order passed by this Court; that pursuant to the order dated 03.11.2017 passed by this Court in writ petition No.1738/2017, the Provisional N.O.C. issued to the petitioner was cancelled through a speaking order dated 04.09.2018 by the N.H.A.; that the petitioner did not fulfill the conditions on which the Provisional N.O.C. was granted; that clause (m) of the Offer Letter required the petitioner to start construction work at the site within one year of the issuance of the N.O.C. failing which its N.O.C. would stand cancelled; that the Provisional N.O.C. became effective on 27.03.2010; that the petitioner did not carry out any construction work within a period of one year of the issuance of the Provisional N.O.C.; that it was not until 11.08.2017 that the C.D.A. approved the construction design for the Filling Station; that since the Offer Letter had been issued to Ms. Farooq, the petitioner had no *locus standi* to file the instant petition; that through the instant petition, the petitioner is seeking to enforce contractual obligations, which is not permissible in the Constitutional jurisdiction of this Court; and that the respondents' decision to cancel the Provisional N.O.C. does not suffer from any legal infirmity. Learned counsel for the N.H.A. prayed for the writ petition to be dismissed.

16. I have heard the contentions of the learned counsel for the contesting parties and have perused the record with their able assistance.

17. The facts leading to the filing of the instant petition have been set out in sufficient detail in paragraphs 2 to 11 above and need not be recapitulated.

18. Although the Offer Letter had been issued by the N.H.A. to Ms. Farooq, there is no denying the fact that the Provisional N.O.C. for the establishment of the Filling Station had been issued to the petitioner i.e. M/s Amun Petroleum, this is clearly stated in caption of the Provisional N.O.C. Additionally, it is also clearly mentioned that M/s Amun Petroleum had fulfilled the conditions specified by the General Manager (Motorways) N.H.A., which resulted in the issuance of the Provisional N.O.C. The N.O.C. fee of Rs.2,900,000/- was also deposited by M/s Amun Petroleum as mentioned in N.H.A.'s letter dated 19.03.2010. Therefore, the respondents' contention that the petitioner had no *locus standi* to file the instant petition against the impugned order dated 04.09.2018 is devoid of merit.

19. The issuance of the Offer Letter and the Provisional N.O.C. pre-date the execution of the concession agreement dated 23.04.2014 executed between the N.H.A. and M.O.R.E. By the time rights were given under the said agreement to M.O.R.E., the Provisional N.O.C. issued to the petitioner had not been cancelled. It was after the execution of the said agreement that the Provisional N.O.C. issued to the petitioner was cancelled vide the N.H.A.'s letters dated 17.08.2016 and 04.09.2018. The cancellation of the Provisional N.O.C. was also not for the reasons that a concession agreement had been executed between the N.H.A. and M.O.R.E. Therefore, the provisions of the said concession agreement cannot operate to divest the petitioner of its rights, if any, under the said Provisional N.O.C.

20. "*Motorway*" is defined in the National Highway and Strategic Road (Control) Rules, 1998 (as amended in 2002) as "*a road especially designed and built for motor vehicles which does not serve the properties bordering on it except at special points and has separate carriage ways for the two directions of the traffic and does not cross at*

level with any road, railway, tramway, cycle track or footpath.” The Schedule to the National Highway Authority Act, 1991 makes it clear that the 32 kilometers of link roads to the Lahore-Islamabad Motorway are part and parcel of the said Motorway. Admittedly, the Islamabad Link Road to the Motorway (M-2) is 7 kilometers long whereas the Kala Shah Kaku is 25 kilometers long. Therefore, the Islamabad Link Road to the Motorway (M-2) is part of the said Motorway and subject to all the restrictions that apply to the said Motorway. It is not disputed that there is not a single Filling Station on any of the link roads to the Motorway (M-2), and that all the Filling Stations on the M-2 are situated in the service areas. The petitioner is, infact, seeking access to the Motorway from a property abutting the Motorway.

21. The Executive Board of the N.H.A., in its 166th meeting held on 19.01.2009, allowed commercial activities on link roads of Motorways and fixed a commercial fee of Rs.2 to 4 million, varying on traffic volume, for the said purposes. After the Offer Letter and the Provisional N.O.C. were issued, the Executive Board of the N.H.A., in its 206th meeting held on 11.08.2011, decided *inter alia* to impose a complete ban on processing of N.O.C. cases for the link roads to the Motorways *“in the interest of road safety.”* Furthermore, it was decided to cancel the Offer Letters / N.O.C.s already issued. The N.H.C., in its 25th meeting held on 06.06.2012, directed the N.H.A. to implement the said decision of the Executive Board. Vide letter dated 12.11.2012, the Operation Wing of the N.H.A. gave directions to *“proceed further for the cancellation of such N.O.C.s already issued in the light of recent N.H.A. Executive Board’s and N.H.C.’s decision.”*

22. Vide letter dated 17.08.2016, the Offer Letter issued to Ms. Farooq and the Provisional N.O.C. issued to the petitioner were cancelled. This cancellation was not due to the decision dated 11.08.2011 taken by the Executive Board of the N.H.A. Perusal of the said letter dated 17.08.2016 shows that the Provisional N.O.C. was cancelled on the ground that the petitioner had not fulfilled the conditions set out in the Offer Letter as well as the Provisional N.O.C. Furthermore, the position taken by the N.H.A. in the said Letter was that the Provisional N.O.C. had been *“wrongly issued,”* since the petitioner and/or Ms. Farooq had

not fulfilled the conditions in the Offer Letter. The said letter dated 17.08.2016 was set-aside by this Court vide order dated 03.11.2017 passed in writ petition No.1738/2017 with the direction to the N.H.A. to afford an opportunity of a hearing to the petitioner as regards the validity of the Provisional N.O.C., and the question as to whether such an N.O.C. could be granted for site, which is on the link road of M1/2 and thereafter pass a speaking order.

23. Even though the impugned letter dated 04.09.2018 makes no reference to the decision dated 11.08.2011 taken by the Executive Board of the N.H.A., in its 206th meeting, the fact remains that the said decision has not been recalled at any stage. In other words, the N.H.A.'s policy not to issue N.O.C.s for the establishment of Filling Stations or other commercial ventures on the Motorways and link roads to the Motorways still holds the field. It is an admitted position that there is presently no valid and subsisting N.O.C. issued to any party for the establishment of a Filling Station on the link roads to the Motorways. All the N.O.C.s that had been issued for the said purpose stand cancelled. A party (namely M/s Motorways Fuels) filed writ petition No.2193/2008 before this Court seeking the issuance of a writ of *mandamus* to the N.H.A. to issue an N.O.C. for the establishment of a CNG-cum-Petrol Station on the Motorway link road between the Grand Trunk Road and the Toll Plaza. Vide judgment dated 01.07.2015, the said writ petition was dismissed. Paragraph 7 of the said judgment is reproduced herein below:-

"It is further observed that the provision of interchange through which the access to and from the motorway is controlled, is to accommodate the public at large and these interchanges are not meant to be established for the convenience of a single individual or partnership and especially for providing business opportunities to them, therefore, the acceptance of offer of the petitioner by the respondent was against the provision of the statute under which the respondent has been established, as it was having no right to issue NOC to the petitioner for establishment of CNG Cum Petrol Pump Station on link road motorway. Any said offer was not only beyond the scope of NHA Act, 1991 but also against the basic purpose for which the motorway has been laid. It appears that the Ex-Officials of the respondent organization for some malafide intentions and ulterior motives promised to the petitioner to issue the NOC for the establishment of CNG Cum Petrol Pump and allured the petitioner to deposit certain amounts. It is settled law that if one acts or molds its conduct on some expressed representation of the officers of the government or the corporations established by the government that result in the accrual of some interest and rights in his

favor. The first condition is that the representation should be within the legal domain of the person making it and it should be beneficial for the government or the corporation. In the case in hand the representation made by the Ex-Officials of the respondent to assure the petitioner to issue NOC for the establishment of CNG/Petrol Pump on link road motorway was not only against the provisions of the statute but also against the interest of the corporation, as if it would have issued the NOC in favor of the petitioner, than everybody would have applied for the issuance of such types of NOCs at several points of motorways and it would have become impossible for respondent to refuse these applications as it would have dragged the respondent in lengthy and costly litigations. In these circumstances, it is observed that if the petitioner has suffered some monetary losses due to conduct of the respondent, he is at liberty to claim the damages (if so advised) however he has failed to establish that he has a vested legal right under some specific statute to set up the disputed CNG station/ Petrol Pump at the same site."

24. Learned counsel for the petitioner placed a heavy reliance on the judgment dated 31.10.2012 passed by this Court in writ petition No.2208/2012 and the judgment dated 11.10.2011 passed in writ petition No.2279/2011, whereby this Court issued directions to issue N.O.C.s to the petitioners in those cases for the establishment of Filling Stations on the link roads to the N.H.A. I have gone through the said judgments and have noticed that in the said cases, the petitioners had complied with the conditions for the issuance of the N.O.C. However, the fact remains that Filling Stations were not established by the petitioners in those cases on the Motorways or the link roads to the Motorways.

25. If this Court is to grant the petitioner's prayer and direct the N.H.A. to permit the petitioner to establish a Filling Station on the link road to the Motorway, it would amount to undoing the decisions taken in the interests of public safety by the Executive Board of the N.H.A. in its 206th meeting dated 11.08.2011 and the N.H.C. in its 25th meeting dated 06.06.2012. This Court can most certainly not issue a writ which can have a potential consequence of causing a hazard to road safety. A decision taken in the interests of road safety cannot be termed either as irrational or arbitrary. Such an order would set a dangerous precedent and would open a floodgate of applications for the establishment of Filling Stations on Motorways or link roads to Motorways. Judicial review cannot be denied even in contractual matters or matters in which the Government exercises its contractual powers but judicial

review is intended to prevent arbitrariness and must be exercised in larger public interest.

26. The Offer Letter and the Provisional N.O.C. have not been issued by the N.H.A. in exercise of a specific statutory power. However, these letters create a contractual relationship between the petitioner and the N.H.A. The petitioner, in essence, asserts that in fulfilling the conditions for the grant of the Provisional N.O.C., it has altered its position to its detriment and expended a huge amount while having a legitimate expectancy that the N.H.A. would fulfill its part of the bargain by permitting the petitioner to establish and operate a Filling Station on the link road to the Motorway. This, at best, would be categorized as a breach of a contract for which the only remedy, if any, for the petitioner would be a claim for damages. The contract created by the acceptance of the terms offered by the N.H.A. or the issuance of the Provisional N.O.C. is most certainly not enforceable by the issuance of a writ of *mandamus* to the N.H.A. under Article 199 of the Constitution. It is well settled that a writ petition for the specific performance of a contract would not lie when damages can be awarded for breach of contract. In the cases of Messrs Momin Motor Company Vs. The Regional Transport Authority, Dacca (PLD 1962 SC 108), Shamshad Ali Khan Vs. Commissioner, Lahore (1969 SCMR 122), Lahore Cantonment Cooperative Housing Society Limited Vs. Nusrat Ullah Chaudhry (PLD 2002 SC 1068) and Pakcom Limited Vs. Federation of Pakistan (PLD 2011 SC 44), it was held *inter alia* that no writ can be filed to enforce contractual liability.

27. In view of the above, I have no reason to interfere with the impugned letter dated 04.09.2018, and consequently, this writ petition is dismissed with no order as to costs.

**(MIANGUL HASSAN AURANGZEB)
JUDGE**

ANNOUNCED IN AN OPEN COURT ON 19/01/2021

*Qamar Khan**

(JUDGE)