

[Supreme Court of Pakistan]

Present: Umar Ata Bandial, C.J., Syed Mansoor Ali Shah, Munib Akhtar,**Jamal Khan Mandokhail and Muhammad Ali Mazhar, JJ****ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT BAR ASSOCIATION ISLAMABAD through President Muhammad****Shoaib Shaheen, Advocate Supreme Court, Islamabad and others---Petitioners****Versus****ELECTION COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN through Chief Election Commissioner, Islamabad and****others---Respondents**

Suo Motu Case No. 1 of 2023 and Constitutional Petitions Nos.1 and 2 of 2023, decided on 1st March, 2023.

(Suo Motu Regarding Holding of General Elections to the Provincial Assemblies of Punjab and Khyber
Pakhtunkhwa)Per Umar Ata Bandial, CJ, Munib Akhtar and Muhammad Ali Mazhar, JJ; Syed Mansoor Ali Shah and Jamal
Khan Mandokhail, JJ.dissenting (Majority view)**(a) Constitution of Pakistan---**

---Arts. 105(3)(a), 107, 112(1), 112(2), 224(1), 224(2) & 184(3)---Elections Act (XXXIII of 2017), S. 57(1)--
-Constitutional petitions and suo motu proceedings regarding holding of General Elections to the Provincial
Assemblies of Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa---Constitutional responsibility and authority for appointing the
date for the holding of a general election to a Provincial Assembly, upon its dissolution in the various situations
envisaged by and under the Constitution, and how and when such constitutional responsibility is to be
discharged stated.

Per Umar Ata Bandial, CJ, Munib Akhtar and Muhammad Ali Mazhar, JJ. (Majority view)

The Constitution envisages three situations for the dissolution of a Provincial Assembly. In the context of the
role of the Governor, the "first situation" is set out in clause (2) of Article 112. This envisages the dissolution
of the Assembly by an order made by the Governor at his discretion, subject to the previous approval of the
President and fulfillment of the conditions set out therein. In this situation, the Assembly cannot, and does not,
dissolve without an order being made by the Governor, and dissolves immediately on the making of the order.
The "second situation" is set out in clause (1) of Article 112, when the Chief Minister advises dissolution. This
situation can be divided into two sub-categories; the "sub-category (a) of second situation" is where the
Governor acts on the advice tendered and makes an order dissolving the Assembly. Here, the Assembly
dissolves immediately on the making of the order. The "sub-category (b) of second situation" is where the
Governor does not make an order of dissolution on the advice tendered. Here, the Assembly stands dissolved
on the expiry of forty-eight hours from the tendering of the advice by the Chief Minister (i.e., by the efflux of
time), and that does not require an order of the Governor.

The "third situation" is set out in Article 107 of the Constitution. This provides that unless an Assembly is
sooner dissolved (i.e., in terms of either of the two preceding situations), it stands dissolved after a term of five
years. Here, the Governor has no role at all; the Assembly dissolves by the efflux of time.

In situations where the Assembly is dissolved by an order of the Governor, the constitutional responsibility of
appointing a date for the general election that must follow is to be discharged by the Governor as provided in
terms of Article 105(3)(a). These are the "first situation" and "sub-category (a) of second situation" described
above.

In situations where the Assembly is not dissolved by an order of the Governor, the constitutional responsibility
of appointing a date for the general election that must follow is to be discharged by the President as provided
in terms of section 57(1) of the Elections Act, 2017 ('the 2017 Act'). These are the "sub-category (b) of second
situation" and "third situation" described above.

Since the general election on a dissolution of a Provincial Assembly has to be held within a time period
stipulated by the Constitution itself, which is a constitutional imperative, the President or, as the case may be,
the Governor must discharge the constitutional responsibility of appointing a date for the said election swiftly

and without any delay and within the shortest time possible. The Election Commission must proactively be available to the President or the Governor, and be prepared for such consultation as required for a date for the holding of general elections.

In the present case in relation to the dissolution of the Punjab Assembly, to which the "sub-category (b) of second situation" applied, the constitutional responsibility for appointing a date for the general election that must follow was to be discharged by the President. However, in relation to the dissolution of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Assembly, to which the "sub-category (a) of second situation" applied, the constitutional responsibility for appointing a date for the general election that must follow was to be discharged by the Governor.

In ordinary circumstances the general election to the Punjab Assembly ought to be held on 09.04.2023, the date announced by the President in terms of his order of 20.02.2023. However, on account of the delay in the emergence of the date for the holding of the general election, it may not be possible to meet the 90 day deadline stipulated by the Constitution. It is also the case that (possibly on account of a misunderstanding of the law) the Election Commission did not make itself available for consultation (with the President) as required under section 57(1) of the 2017 Act. Supreme Court directed that the Election Commission shall use its utmost efforts to immediately propose, keeping in mind sections 57 and 58 of the 2017 Act, a date to the President that is compliant with the 90 day deadline; that if such a course is not available, then the Election Commission shall in like manner propose a date for the holding of the poll that deviates to the barest minimum from such deadline; that after consultation with the Election Commission, the President shall announce a date for the holding of the general election to the Punjab Assembly; that the Governor of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province must after consultation with the Election Commission forthwith appoint a date for the holding of the general election to the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Assembly and the directions issued in relation to elections to the Punjab Assembly shall, *mutatis mutandis*, apply in relation thereto.

Supreme Court further directed that the Federation, and in particular the Federal Government, is obligated, on an immediate and urgent basis, to forthwith provide the Election Commission with all such facilities, personnel and security as it may require for the holding of the general elections; that in like manner, it is the duty of the Provincial Governments, acting under the Caretaker Cabinets, to proactively provide all aid and assistance as may be required by the Election Commission, and that the duty cast upon the authorities as set out in section 50 of the 2017 Act must also be discharged forthwith and proactively. Constitution petitions and suo motu proceedings, being maintainable, were disposed of accordingly.

Per Syed Mansoor Ali Shah and Jamal Khan Mandokhail, JJ. dissenting (Minority view)

(b) Constitution of Pakistan---

----Arts. 105(3)(a), 107, 112(1), 112(2), 224(1), 224(2) & 184(3)---Elections Act (XXXIII of 2017), S. 57(1)---Constitutional petitions and suo motu proceedings regarding holding of General Elections to the Provincial Assemblies of Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa---Maintainability---Detailed reasons for finding the Constitutional petitions and suo motu proceedings as not maintainable recorded.

Per Syed Mansoor Ali Shah and Jamal Khan Mandokhail, JJ. (Minority view)

The present suo motu proceedings, in the facts and circumstances of the case, are wholly unjustified in the mode and manner they were taken up under Article 184(3) of the Constitution, besides being initiated with undue haste. The suo motu case and the Constitutional petitions under Article 184(3) of the Constitution, in the light of the principles settled in cases reported as *Manzoor Elahi v. Federation of Pakistan* (PLD 1975 Supreme Court 66) and *Benazir Bhutto v. Federation of Pakistan* (PLD 1988 Supreme Court 416), do not constitute a fit case to exercise the extraordinary original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court under Article 184(3) of the Constitution and are thus not maintainable as the same constitutional and legal issues seeking the same relief are pending and being deliberated upon by the respective Provincial High Courts in Lahore and Peshawar, without there being any inordinate delay in the conduct of the proceedings before them. There is no justification to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of the Supreme Court under Article 184(3) to initiate suo motu proceedings or entertain petitions under Article 184(3) of the Constitution, as a single Bench of the Lahore High Court has already decided the matter in favour of the petitioner before the said High Court and the said judgment is still

in the field. The intra court appeals (ICAs) filed against the said judgment are pending before the Division Bench of the Lahore High Court (and none of the said petitioners has approached the Supreme Court under Article 185(3) of the Constitution).

Manzoor Ilahi's case PLD 1975 SC 66 and Benazir Bhutto's case PLD 1988 SC 416 ref.

Once a constitutional issue is pending before a Provincial High Court, keeping in view the Federal structure of the Constitution the autonomy and independence of the apex provincial constitutional court, should not be readily interfered with rather be supported to strengthen the provincial autonomy and avoid undermining the autonomy of the provincial constitutional courts.

There is no inordinate delay in the proceedings pending before the High Courts, infact the present proceedings have unnecessarily delayed the matter before the High Courts. However, considering the importance of the matter it is expected that the respective High Courts shall decide the matters pending before them within three working days from present order.

Even otherwise matters such as the present matter should best be resolved by the Parliament.

Constitutional petitions were dismissed and suo motu proceedings were dropped.

Abid S. Zuberi, Advocate Supreme Court, Shoaib Shaheen, Advocate Supreme Court assisted by Ayan Memon, Advocate, Ms. Amna Khalili, Advocate, Agha Ali Durrani, Advocate, Arif Ansari, Advocate for Petitioners (in Constitutional Petition No. 1 of 2023).

Syed Ali Zafar, Advocate Supreme Court, Sarfraz Ahmad Cheema, Advocate Supreme Court, Zahid Nawaz Cheema, Advocate Supreme Court, Ch. Faisal Fareed, Advocate Supreme Court, Safdar Shaheen Pirzada, Advocate Supreme Court, Ashfaq Ahmed Kharal, Advocate Supreme Court and Amir Saeed Rawn, Advocate Supreme Court for Petitioners (in Constitutional Petition No. 2 of 2023).

On Court's Notice

Shehzad Ata Elahi, Attorney General for Pakistan, Ch. Aamir Rehman, Additional A.G.P., Malik Javaid Iqbal Wains, Additional A.G. assisted by Ms. Mehwish Batool, Advocate, Aitzaz ul Haque, Advocate and Maryam Rasheed, Advocate for Federation of Pakistan.

Salman Akram Raja, Advocate Supreme Court, Amir Malik, Advocate-on-Record assisted by Malik Ghulam Sabir, Advocate, M. Shakeel Mughal, Advocate, Maqbool Ahmed, Advocate and Sameen Qureshi, Advocate for President of Pakistan.

Khalid Ishaq, Advocate Supreme Court for Governor of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Mustafa Ramday, Advocate Supreme Court, Jahanzeb Awan, Advocate Supreme Court, Rashid Hafeez, Advocate Supreme Court assisted by Ms. Zoe K. Khan, Advocate, Ahmed Junaid, Advocate, Akbar Khan, Advocate, Uzair Shafi, Advocate, Barrister Maria Haq, Advocate and Barrister Salman Ahmed, Advocate for Governor of Punjab.

Sajeel Shehryar Swati, Advocate Supreme Court assisted by Barrister Saman Mamoon, Advocate, Ms. Kiran Khadijah, Advocate, Zafar Iqbal, Special Secretary, Muhammad Arshad, DG Law, Khurram Shehzad, Additional D.G. Law, Ms. Saima Tariq Janjua, DD (Law), Ms. Bushra Rasheed, Law Officer and Zaighum Anees, Law Officer for Election Commission of Pakistan.

Muhammad Shan Gul, A.G., Malik Waseem Mumtaz, Additional A.G., Sana Ullah Zahid, Additional A.G. assisted by Khurram Chughtai, Advocate, Usman Ghani, Advocate, Raza Rehman, Advocate and Ahmed Raza Sarwar, Additional Chief Sec. Law (Punjab) for the Government of Punjab.

Aamir Javaid, A.G., Sardar Ali Raza, Additional A.G. and Mian Shafaqat Jan, Additional A.G. for the Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Asif Reki, A.G. and M. Ayaz Swati, Additional A.G. for the Government of Balochistan.

Hassan Akbar, A.G., Saifullah, A.A.G. (through V.L. Karachi), Fauzi Zafar, Additional A.G. and Zeeshan Edhi, Additional A.G. for the Government of Sindh.

Jehangir Khan Jadoon, A.G. for ICT.

Haroon-ur-Rasheed, Advocate Supreme Court, Vice Chairman, PBC, Hassan Raza Pasha, Advocate Supreme Court and Chairman, Executive Council for the Pakistan Bar Council.

Abid S. Zuberi, Advocate Supreme Court, President SCBA, Muqtadir Akhtar Shabbir, Advocate Supreme Court/Secretary SCBA and Malik Shakeel-ur-Rehman, Advocate Supreme Court/Additional Secretary for Supreme Court Bar Association.

Syed Ali Zafar, Advocate Supreme Court, Ch. Faisal Fareed, Advocate Supreme Court, Safdar Shaheen Pirzada, Advocate Supreme Court and Ashfaq Kharal, Advocate Supreme Court for PTI.

Farooq H. Naek, Senior Advocate Supreme Court assisted by Barrister Sheraz Shaukat Rajpar for PPP.

Mansoor Usman Awan, Advocate Supreme Court and Anees Shehzad, Advocate-on-Record for PML(N).

Kamran Murtaza, Senior Advocate Supreme Court for JUIP.

Ghulam Mohyuddin Malik, Advocate Supreme Court and Syed Rifaqat Hussain Shah, Advocate-on-Record for Jamat-e-Islami.

Azhar Siddiqui, Advocate Supreme Court for PML (Awami).

Date of hearing: 28th February, 2023.

ORDER

By a majority of 3:2 (Mr. Justice Syed Mansoor Ali Shah and Mr. Justice Jamal Khan Mandokhail dissenting) and for detailed reasons to be recorded later and subject to what is set out therein by way of amplification or otherwise, these matters are disposed of in the following terms:

1. Parliamentary democracy is one of the salient features of the Constitution. There can be no parliamentary democracy without Parliament or the Provincial Assemblies. And there can be neither Parliament nor Provincial Assemblies without the holding of general elections as envisaged, required and mandated by and under the Constitution and in accordance therewith. Elections, and the periodic holding of elections, therefore underpin the very fabric of the Constitution. They are a sine qua non for parliamentary democracy, and ensure that the sacred trust of sovereignty entrusted to the people of Pakistan is always in the hands of their chosen representatives.

2. While the holding of general elections has different aspects and requirements, one that is absolutely crucial is the timeframe or period in which such elections are to be held. The Constitution envisages two such periods, being of sixty and ninety days respectively. In relation to a Provincial Assembly, the first period applies when the Assembly dissolves on the expiration of its term under Article 107 and the second period is prescribed when it is sooner dissolved under Article 112. The time periods so set down in Article 224(1) and (2) respectively are constitutional imperatives that command complete fidelity. We are here concerned with the dissolution of two Provincial Assemblies before the expiry of their terms and therefore to the holding of general elections in relation to each within 90 days.

3. It is in the foregoing context that three questions have to be considered by the Court. The Assemblies in question are those of the Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Provinces, which dissolved on 14.01.2023 and 18.01.2023 respectively. In both cases, the then Chief Ministers tendered advice to their respective Governors under Article 112(1) of the Constitution to dissolve the Assembly. In the case of the Punjab Province the Governor chose not to act on the said advice so that the Assembly stood dissolved on the expiry of 48 hours, on the date just mentioned. In the case of the KPK Province, the Governor did act on the advice and made an order dissolving the Assembly, on 18.01.2023. The questions which have been considered with the assistance of learned counsel for the various parties and the Law Officers are as follows:

1. Who has the constitutional responsibility and authority for appointing the date for the holding of a general election to a Provincial Assembly, upon its dissolution in the various situations envisaged by and under the Constitution?
2. How and when is this constitutional responsibility to be discharged?
3. What are the constitutional responsibilities and duties of the Federation and the Province with regard to the holding of the general election?
4. The Constitution envisages three situations for the dissolution of a Provincial Assembly. These, in the context of the role of the Governor, are as follows.
5. The first situation is set out in clause (2) of Article 112. This envisages the dissolution of the Assembly by an order made by the Governor at his discretion, subject to the previous approval of the President and fulfillment

of the conditions set out therein. In this situation, the Assembly cannot, and does not, dissolve without an order being made by the Governor, and dissolves immediately on the making of the order.

6. The second situation is set out in clause (1) of Article 112, when the Chief Minister advises dissolution. This situation can be divided into two sub-categories, which are as follows:

a. The first is where the Governor acts on the advice tendered and makes an order dissolving the Assembly. Here, the Assembly dissolves immediately on the making of the order.

b. The second sub-category is where the Governor does not make an order of dissolution on the advice tendered. Here, the Assembly stands dissolved on the expiry of forty-eight hours from the tendering of the advice by the Chief Minister (i.e., by the efflux of time), and that does not require an order of the Governor.

7. The third situation is set out in Article 107. This provides that unless an Assembly is sooner dissolved (i.e., in terms of either of the two preceding situations), it stands dissolved after a term of five years. Here, the Governor has no role at all; the Assembly dissolves by the efflux of time.

8. Article 105(3)(a) provides that where the Governor dissolves the Assembly he shall appoint a date for the holding of a general election thereto, being a date not later than 90 days from the date of the dissolution.

9. The Elections Act, 2017 ("2017 Act") has been enacted by Parliament in exercise of its legislative competence under the Constitution. That includes, in addition to Entry 41 of the Fourth Schedule, a specific provision in the body of the Constitution, being Article 222, that expressly articulates a list of matters relating to elections which are within the Federal domain. The 2017 Act applies, inter alia, to both the National and the Provincial Assemblies. Section 57(1) thereof provides that the President shall "announce the date or dates of the general elections after consultation with the Commission".

10. On a conjoint reading of the foregoing provisions we conclude and hold as follows:

a. In situations where the Assembly is dissolved by an order of the Governor, the constitutional responsibility of appointing a date for the general election that must follow is to be discharged by the Governor as provided in terms of Article 105(3)(a). These are the situations described in paras 5 and 6(a) above.

b. In situations where the Assembly is not dissolved by an order of the Governor, the constitutional responsibility of appointing a date for the general election that must follow is to be discharged by the President as provided in terms of section 57(1) of the 2017 Act. These are the situations described in paras 6(b) and 7 above.

11. Since the general election on a dissolution of a Provincial Assembly has to be held within a time period stipulated by the Constitution itself, which is a constitutional imperative, the President or, as the case may be, the Governor must discharge the constitutional responsibility of appointing a date for the said election swiftly and without any delay and within the shortest time possible. The Election Commission must proactively be available to the President or the Governor, and be prepared for such consultation as required for a date for the holding of general elections.

12. It follows from the foregoing that in relation to the dissolution of the Punjab Assembly, to which the situation described in para 6(b) above applied, the constitutional responsibility for appointing a date for the general election that must follow was to be discharged by the President. However, in relation to the dissolution of the KPK Assembly, to which the situation described in para 6(a) above applied, the constitutional responsibility for appointing a date for the general election that must follow was to be discharged by the Governor.

13. It further follows that the order of the President dated 20.02.2023 is constitutionally competent and subject to what is observed below, it is hereby affirmed insofar as it applies to the Punjab Assembly; but the same is constitutionally invalid insofar as it applies to the KPK Assembly and is therefore hereby set aside. It also follows that the Governor of KPK Province, inasmuch as he has not appointed a date for the holding of the general election to the Assembly of that Province is in breach of his constitutional responsibility.

14. It is further declared and directed as follows in relation to the matters before the Court:

a. In ordinary circumstances the general election to the Punjab Assembly ought to be held on 09.04.2023, the date announced by the President in terms of his order of 20.02.2023. However, we are informed that on account of the delay in the emergence of the date for the holding of the general election, it may not be possible to meet

the 90 day deadline stipulated by the Constitution. It is also the case that (possibly on account of a misunderstanding of the law) the Election Commission did not make itself available for consultation as required under section 57(1) of the 2017 Act. The Election Commission is therefore directed to use its utmost efforts to immediately propose, keeping in mind sections 57 and 58 of the 2017 Act, a date to the President that is compliant with the aforesaid deadline. If such a course is not available, then the Election Commission shall in like manner propose a date for the holding of the poll that deviates to the barest minimum from the aforesaid deadline. After consultation with the Election Commission the President shall announce a date for the holding of the general election to the Punjab Assembly.

b. The Governor of the KPK Province must after consultation with the Election Commission forthwith appoint a date for the holding of the general election to the KPK Assembly and the preceding clause (a) shall, *mutatis mutandis*, apply in relation thereto.

15. It is the constitutional duty of the Federation, in terms of clause (3) of Article 148, "to ensure that the Government of every Province is carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution". There can be no doubt that this duty includes ensuring that a general election to the Assembly of every Province is held, and enabled to be held, in a timely manner within the period set out in the Constitution. This duty is in addition to, and applies independently of, the duty cast under Article 220 on "all executive authorities in the Federation and in the Provinces to assist the Commissioner and the Election Commission in the discharge of his or their functions". It follows that the Federation, and in particular the Federal Government, is, *inter alia*, obligated, on an immediate and urgent basis, to forthwith provide the Election Commission with all such facilities, personnel and security as it may require for the holding of the general elections. In like manner, it is the duty of the Provincial Governments, acting under the Caretaker Cabinets, to proactively provide all aid and assistance as may be required by the Election Commission. The duty cast upon the authorities as set out in section 50 of the 2017 Act must also be discharged forthwith and proactively.

16. The three matters before the Court are found maintainable and stand disposed of as above.

Sd/-

Umar Ata Bandial, C.J.

I have appended my separate order.

Sd/-

Syed Mansoor Ali Shah, J.

Sd/-

Munib Akhtar, J.

I have appended my note along with the main order.

Sd/-

Jamal Khan Mandokhail, J.

Sd/-

Muhammad Ali Mazhar, J.

Announced in Court at Islamabad on 01.03.2023.

Sd/-

Umar Ata Bandial, C.J.

SYED MANSOOR ALI SHAH AND JAMAL KHAN MANDOKHAIL, JJ.---For the reasons to be recorded later, we hold that:

i. The suo motu proceedings (SMC No. 1 of 2023), in the facts and circumstances of the case, are wholly unjustified in the mode and manner they were taken up under Article 184(3) of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan ("Constitution"), besides being initiated with undue haste.

ii. The Suo Motu Case No.1 of 2023 and the two Const. Petitions Nos. 1 and 2 of 2023 under Article 184(3) of the Constitution, in the light of the principles settled in *Manzoor Ilahi*¹ and *Benzair Bhutto*², do not constitute a fit case to exercise the extraordinary original jurisdiction of this Court under Article 184(3) of the Constitution and are thus not maintainable as the same constitutional and legal issues seeking the same relief are pending

and being deliberated upon by the respective Provincial High Courts in Lahore and Peshawar, without there being any inordinate delay in the conduct of the proceedings before them.

iii. There is no justification to invoke our extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 184(3) to initiate suo motu proceedings or entertain petitions under Article 184(3) of the Constitution, as a single Bench of the Lahore High Court has already decided the matter in favour of the petitioner before the said High Court vide judgment dated 10.02.2023 and the said judgment is still in the field. The intra court appeals (ICAs) filed against the said judgment are pending before the Division Bench of the Lahore High Court (and none of the said petitioners has approached this Court under Article 185(3) of the Constitution).

iv. Once a constitutional issue is pending before a Provincial High Court, keeping in view the Federal structure of our Constitution the autonomy and independence of the apex provincial constitutional court, should not be readily interfered with rather be supported to strengthen the provincial autonomy and avoid undermining the autonomy of the provincial constitutional courts.

v. There is no inordinate delay in the proceedings pending before the High Courts, infact the instant proceedings have unnecessarily delayed the matter before the High Courts. However, considering the importance of the matter we expect that the respective High Courts shall decide the matters pending before them within three working days from today.

vi. Even otherwise without prejudice to the above, such like matters should best be resolved by the Parliament.

2. We, therefore, agree with the orders dated 23.02.2023 passed by our learned brothers, Yahya Afridi and Athar Minallah, JJ.³, and dismiss the present constitution petitions and drop the suo motu proceedings.

Sd/-

Syed Mansoor Ali Shah, J

Sd/-

Jamal Khan Mandokhail, J

MWA/I-4/SC Order accordingly.