

About Pakistan Law Hub

Pakistan Law Hub (pakistanlawhub.com) is Pakistan's dedicated digital platform for legal exam preparation, built to support aspirants preparing for the Civil Judge / Judiciary Examinations, LAW GAT, LAW LAT, CSS, PMS, FPSC, SPSC, NTS, STS, and other one-paper competitive law and legal-apptitude tests across Pakistan.

Our mission is simple: to make high-quality, structured, and affordable legal education accessible to every student — regardless of their city, resources, or background. We believe that with the right guidance, practice material, and community support, every serious aspirant deserves a fair shot at qualifying for Pakistan's most competitive judicial and legal examinations.

At Pakistan Law Hub, we offer:

- Extensive MCQ Banks & Practice Tests — covering constitutional law, civil and criminal procedure, Urdu, English, Islamic Studies, Pakistan Studies, general knowledge, and subject-specific content for LAW GAT, LAW LAT, CSS, and judiciary exams.
- One-Paper Competitive Test Preparation — focused practice for FPSC, SPSC, NTS, STS, and similar recruitment tests.
- Drafting Samples & Courses — practical legal drafting resources for civil, criminal, and corporate matters, curated by subject experts.
- Taxation Course & Filing Guidance — practical modules covering Pakistani tax law and return-filing procedures.
- Typing Master Practice — tools to help candidates build the typing speed and accuracy required for competitive exams.
- Personal Student Dashboard — a space for every aspirant to track their progress, performance, and preparation journey.
- Community Forum — a dedicated space where judiciary aspirants, LAW GAT candidates, CSS aspirants, and others can connect, discuss, share resources, and support one another.

All content on Pakistan Law Hub is developed and reviewed under the guidance of legal professionals and subject-matter experts, ensuring accuracy, relevance, and exam-oriented quality.

We are more than a test-prep website — we are a growing community of aspirants who believe in helping each other succeed. Whether you're just starting your preparation or in your final stretch before the exam, Pakistan Law Hub is built to be part of your journey.

Follow our whatsapp channel for future updates

<https://whatsapp.com/channel/0029VbDIbUJ9RZAdbBwfRe1g>

*Join us. Learn with us. Qualify with us.
Be a part of Pakistan Law Hub.*

Copyright Notice

© 2026 Pakistan Law Hub (pakistanlawhub.com). All Rights Reserved.

All content published on this website — including but not limited to MCQs, quizzes, question banks, drafting samples, course material, taxation guides, articles, notes, graphics, logos, and the overall design and structure of the platform — is the intellectual property of Pakistan Law Hub, unless otherwise stated.

No part of this website's content may be reproduced, copied, distributed, republished, sold, or used for commercial purposes without prior written permission from Pakistan Law Hub, except where explicitly marked as free-to-share or open-access material.

Unauthorized use, reproduction, or distribution of this content, in whole or in part, may result in legal action under applicable copyright and intellectual property laws of Pakistan.

For permissions, licensing inquiries, or reporting unauthorized use of content, please contact us at advocatesajidmir@gmail.com

Illegal Dispossession Act, 2005 (Act No. XI of 2005), as amended by the Illegal Dispossession (Amendment) Act, 2017

1. Nature, Object and Preamble of the Act The Illegal Dispossession Act, 2005 was enacted specifically to curb the activities of property grabbers, land mafias, "qabza groups," and "china cutters" who forcibly or illegally dispossess lawful owners and occupiers of immovable property. Its preamble expressly states it is intended to protect lawful owners and occupiers from illegal or forcible dispossession, providing deterrent punishment and speedy relief distinct from ordinary civil remedies.

2. Short Title, Extent and Commencement (Section 1) The Act extends to the whole of Pakistan and came into force upon its enactment in 2005. Being a federal enactment on a criminal-law-adjacent subject (property protection through penal sanction), it applies uniformly across provinces, including Sindh, alongside any provincial procedural modifications.

3. Special and Self-Contained Nature of the Act The Act is a special law that overrides the general provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 to the extent of inconsistency (Section 4), meaning its specific procedure for investigation, cognizance, and trial takes precedence over the ordinary criminal process, despite borrowing several CrPC concepts.

4. Key Definitions (Section 2) Section 2 defines essential terms including "owner" (the person who actually owns the property at the time of dispossession, otherwise than through process of law), "occupier," "property," and "property grabber," setting the factual and legal boundaries within which the Act's protective machinery operates.

5. Definition of "Owner" Under Section 2(d), "owner" means the person who actually owns the property at the time of dispossession — this is a factual, possession-linked concept of ownership at the relevant moment rather than a formally documented title, allowing the Act to protect de facto owners against sudden illegal takeover.

6. The Core Offence — Section 3(1) Section 3(1) prohibits any person from entering into or upon any property to dispossess, grab, control, or occupy it without lawful authority, with the intention to dispossess, grab, control, or occupy the property from its owner or occupier — establishing both an actus reus (entry/occupation) and mens rea (intention to dispossess/grab) requirement.

7. Punishment Under Section 3(2) Section 3(2) prescribes punishment of imprisonment which may extend to ten years and fine for contravention of Section 3(1), without prejudice to any other punishment the offender may be liable to under any other law, and mandates that the victim also be compensated under Section 544-A CrPC.

8. Mens Rea Requirement — "Intention to Dispossess" Superior courts have consistently emphasized that the specific intention to dispossess, grab, control, or occupy property is an essential ingredient of the offence under Section 3(1); mere entry or presence on disputed property, without this specific intent, does not attract the Act, distinguishing it from ordinary civil possession disputes.

9. Distinction from Ordinary Civil Dispute Over Title Courts have repeatedly held that the Act is not intended to resolve bona fide disputes of title or ownership between rival claimants

who both assert lawful entitlement; it targets clear-cut cases of forcible/illegal dispossession by persons having no lawful claim, i.e., "qabza" situations, not genuine title litigation which belongs to civil courts.

10. Complaint and Investigation Procedure (Section 5) Section 5 lays down the special procedure: the Court, upon a complaint being filed, may direct the officer-in-charge of the police station to investigate the matter and submit a report, rather than the complainant approaching police first — this report is treated analogously to a report under Section 173 CrPC.

11. Equating Complaint and Police Report to CrPC Concepts Case law (Punjab Judicial Academy compilation) clarifies that a complaint under the Act is analogous to a report under Section 154 CrPC (FIR), while the report submitted under Section 5(1) is analogous to a report under Section 173 CrPC, and the trial court takes cognizance based on such report under Section 190 CrPC principles.

12. Cognizance and Nature of Proceedings Trial under the Act cannot be equated with an ordinary private complaint case under Section 200 CrPC; instead, it follows a hybrid procedure combining features of both complaint and police-investigated cognizable cases, with the Court directing investigation before formally proceeding, as clarified by superior court rulings.

13. Non-Cognizable Nature of the Offence The offence under the Act is classified as non-cognizable, meaning police cannot ordinarily investigate or arrest without the direction/order of the Court, reinforcing that the special procedure under Section 5 (Court-directed investigation) is the operative mechanism rather than a standard police-initiated FIR process.

14. Trial by Court of Session Offences under the Act are triable by the Court of Session, reflecting the Legislature's intent to place such cases within the more experienced and senior tier of the criminal judiciary given the serious punishment (up to ten years) and the property-rights stakes involved.

15. Role of Revenue Officer in Boundary Disputes (Section 5) Where a dispute is primarily between owners of contiguous properties and concerns only demarcation of boundaries, the Court may involve a revenue officer under Section 5 to assist in determining the precise extent of encroachment, linking the Act's procedure to the Land Revenue Act framework in Sindh.

16. Local Inquiry Provision (2017 Amendment to Section 5) The Illegal Dispossession (Amendment) Act, 2017 added a further proviso to Section 5, empowering the Court, wherever a local inquiry is necessary, to direct a Magistrate or revenue officer in the district to conduct such inquiry and submit a report within a period specified by the Court, strengthening the fact-finding mechanism.

17. Attachment of Property (Section 6) Section 6 empowers the Court to attach the property in dispute during the pendency of proceedings, to preserve its status and prevent further alienation, damage, or transfer by the accused, protecting the subject matter until the case is finally decided.

18. Interim Relief to the Complainant/Victim (Section 7) Section 7 allows the Court to grant interim relief to the complainant, including restoration of possession, even before the conclusion of trial, where the Court is satisfied of a strong prima facie case of illegal

dispossession, offering urgent protection against continuing dispossession pending final adjudication.

19. Delivery of Possession on Conclusion of Trial (Section 8) Section 8(1) provides that upon conclusion of trial, if the Court finds the owner/occupier was illegally dispossessed or the property was grabbed in contravention of Section 3, it may direct the accused (or anyone claiming through him) to restore possession of the property to the rightful owner or occupier, if not already restored under Section 7.

20. Police Assistance for Restoration of Possession (Section 8(2)-(5)) The Court may direct the officer-in-charge of the police station to render assistance in restoring possession under Section 8, and failure of the police officer to render such assistance amounts to misconduct, for which the Court may direct departmental action — a strong enforcement mechanism to ensure the Act's remedies are not rendered illusory.

21. Compensation to the Victim (Section 544-A CrPC Link) Beyond restoration of possession and criminal punishment, the Act mandates that the victim of the offence be compensated in accordance with Section 544-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, integrating civil-style compensatory relief within the criminal proceeding itself, avoiding the need for a separate civil suit for damages.

22. Right of Appeal — Section 8A (Introduced by 2017 Amendment) The 2017 Amendment inserted Section 8A, providing that any order made under Section 3(2), Section 3(3), or Section 8(1) shall be appealable before the High Court within thirty days of the order — a significant procedural addition, since the original 2005 Act was largely silent on a structured right of appeal.

23. Absence of Original Appeal Mechanism — Pre-2017 Gap Prior to the 2017 Amendment, the Act did not clearly provide a right of appeal, and courts applied the general law under Section 410 CrPC to fill this gap (as held in *PLD 2007 Peshawar 123, Yasfas v. State*), illustrating the importance of the 2017 Amendment in curing this procedural lacuna.

24. Compoundability and Withdrawal Given the criminal character of proceedings, questions of compounding or withdrawal of complaints under the Act are governed by the general principles applicable to non-compoundable offences under the Pakistan Penal Code/CrPC framework, since the Act itself does not provide for compounding of the offence.

25. Relationship with Civil Suits for Possession/Title The Act does not oust the jurisdiction of civil courts to entertain suits for declaration, possession, or injunction relating to the same property; a complainant may pursue remedies under the Act and a civil suit simultaneously, since the Act provides a speedy criminal-cum-restitutionary remedy distinct from, and not a substitute for, civil adjudication of title.

26. Distinction from Section 9 of Specific Relief Act Unlike Section 9 of the Specific Relief Act (which provides summary civil relief for recovery of possession within six months of dispossession, without inquiry into title), the Illegal Dispossession Act provides a criminal remedy with penal consequences and no rigid six-month limitation tied to dispossession, though it requires proof of criminal intent to grab.

27. Distinction from PPC Provisions on Criminal Trespass While criminal trespass under Sections 441/447 PPC also penalizes unlawful entry upon property, the Illegal Dispossession Act is a more specialized, aggravated remedy targeting organized or deliberate property-grabbing with intent to dispossess/control, carrying significantly harsher punishment (up to ten years) than simple criminal trespass.

28. Burden of Proof on Complainant The complainant bears the burden of establishing, prima facie, that he was the owner or occupier of the property, that the accused entered or occupied it without lawful authority, and that the accused acted with the specific intention to dispossess, grab, control, or occupy — mere assertion of a property dispute is insufficient.

29. Not a Substitute for Title Litigation — Judicial Caution Courts have cautioned against using the Act as a shortcut to resolve genuine title disputes or as a tool for harassment in matters that are essentially civil in nature; where a bona fide question of title or entitlement exists between contesting claimants, courts tend to relegate parties to civil remedies rather than proceed under this penal statute.

30. Illustrative Case Law — Complaint Filed Beyond Entitlement As illustrated in reported case law, where a complainant alleged the accused had taken possession of land beyond what he had purchased, courts have held that the trial court must first refer the matter to the SHO for investigation under Section 5, and only after receiving the investigation report can the court take cognizance and proceed with trial — procedural compliance being essential to maintainability.

31. Territorial Jurisdiction Jurisdiction to try an offence under the Act lies with the Court of Session having territorial jurisdiction over the area where the immovable property in question is situated, consistent with the general principle that offences relating to immovable property are tried where the property is located.

32. Limitation Considerations While the Act itself does not prescribe a specific limitation period for filing a complaint (unlike Section 9 of the Specific Relief Act's six-month bar), unreasonable or unexplained delay in approaching the court may affect the credibility of the complainant's case and the availability of urgent interim relief under Section 7.

33. Applicability to "Occupiers" as Well as "Owners" The Act protects not only owners but also lawful occupiers of immovable property (such as tenants, licensees, or persons in lawful possession without formal ownership), broadening its protective scope beyond strict title-holders to those in lawful, settled possession.

34. Property Grabbers — "Qabza Groups" as Legislative Target The Act was specifically designed as a response to organized property-grabbing gangs and mafias prevalent in urban and peri-urban Pakistan, who forcibly seize vacant plots, agricultural land, or built property, often using threats, violence, or fraudulent documentation — reflecting a strong deterrent legislative policy rather than mere compensatory civil law.

35. Interaction with the Anti-Terrorism Act Where property-grabbing is accompanied by organized violence, use of firearms, or creates a broader sense of terror in a locality, questions can arise as to whether such conduct additionally attracts provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997, though ordinarily illegal dispossession alone (without the terrorism-specific ingredients) remains within this Act's exclusive framework.

36. Rights of Third-Party Purchasers/Transferees Where a property grabber transfers or sells the illegally occupied property to a third party, Section 8(1)'s reference to "any person claiming through him" allows the Court to direct restoration of possession even against such downstream transferees, preventing property grabbers from defeating the Act's purpose through quick onward transfers.

37. Role of Local Commission/Inquiry Officer Where factual disputes arise regarding the extent of encroachment, boundaries, or physical possession, the Court's power (post-2017 amendment) to direct a Magistrate or revenue officer to conduct a local inquiry provides an evidentiary mechanism akin to appointment of a Local Commissioner under Order XXVI CPC in civil proceedings.

38. Standard of Proof at Trial Since proceedings under the Act culminate in a criminal conviction with imprisonment up to ten years, the prosecution/complainant must establish the offence beyond reasonable doubt, the standard applicable to criminal trials generally, distinguishing this from the lower "balance of probabilities" standard in ordinary civil possession suits.

39. Effect of Acquittal on Civil Rights An acquittal or dismissal of a complaint under the Act does not conclusively determine civil title or ownership rights between the parties; the parties remain free to pursue a civil suit for declaration, possession, or injunction, since criminal and civil proceedings operate on different standards of proof and serve different purposes.

40. Object Behind Ten-Year Maximum Punishment The relatively severe maximum punishment of ten years' imprisonment (compared to lesser trespass offences under the PPC) reflects the Legislature's recognition of the socio-economic harm caused by organized property grabbing, particularly its impact on ordinary citizens' security of tenure and investment in immovable property.

41. "Without Prejudice to Any Other Punishment" Clause Section 3(2)'s phrase "without prejudice to any punishment to which he may be liable under any other law" clarifies that prosecution and punishment under this Act does not bar simultaneous or additional prosecution under other laws (e.g., PPC provisions for criminal trespass, forgery, or use of force), avoiding any double jeopardy-type immunity for property grabbers.

42. Interplay with Land Revenue Records Since claims of ownership or occupation often hinge on entries in the record-of-rights or mutation registers maintained under the Land Revenue Act, 1967, courts trying complaints under this Act frequently rely on revenue record extracts (fard) as evidence of the complainant's possession/ownership status at the relevant time.

43. Speedy Trial Objective Though the Act does not prescribe a rigid statutory timeline for conclusion of trial (unlike the Anti-Terrorism Act's day-to-day trial mandate), its overall scheme — Court-directed investigation, provision for interim relief, and integrated restitution — reflects a legislative intent for expeditious resolution compared to protracted ordinary civil title litigation.

44. Sindh-Specific Application and CTD/Police Coordination In Sindh, complaints under the Act are frequently linked to organized land-grabbing networks in Karachi and other urban centers; enforcement often requires coordination between the trial court, local police stations,

and revenue authorities, given the scale of encroachment on both private and government (Katchi Abadi/state) land.

45. Overlap with Katchi Abadi and Government Land Disputes Where the property in question is government land or falls within a Katchi Abadi (informal settlement) regularization scheme, questions may arise regarding the applicability of the Act, since "owner" under the Act contemplates a private person who actually owned the property at the time of dispossession — disputes involving purely government title raise distinct considerations under land administration laws.

46. Amendment Trend — Strengthening Victim Protection (2017) The 2017 Amendment Act (Act No. XXVIII of 2017) reflects a broader legislative trend of strengthening the Act's victim-protective and enforcement features — adding the right of appeal (Section 8A) and the local inquiry mechanism (amendment to Section 5) — in response to identified implementation gaps highlighted by the Law and Justice Commission of Pakistan.

47. Law and Justice Commission's Working Paper (2009) The Law and Justice Commission of Pakistan's Report 114 (December 2009) had earlier recommended consequential amendments to the Act, including the introduction of a formal right of appeal — recommendations that were substantially incorporated only years later through the 2017 Amendment, illustrating the gap between law reform proposals and actual legislative implementation.

48. High Pendency and Practical Challenges Legal commentary has noted the significant pendency of property-related cases across Pakistan (estimates running into millions), underscoring both the necessity for a speedy remedy like the Illegal Dispossession Act and the practical challenges in fully realizing its protective and deterrent objectives given systemic case backlogs.

49. Comparison with Specific Relief Act's Section 9 Remedy For interview purposes, a key comparative point: Section 9 of the Specific Relief Act gives a summary civil remedy (six-month limitation, no title inquiry, decree only for possession) while the Illegal Dispossession Act gives a criminal remedy (no fixed limitation, requires proof of criminal intent beyond reasonable doubt, results in imprisonment/fine plus restoration of possession and compensation) — the two remedies can be pursued independently and are not mutually exclusive.

50. Present Application and Significance for Sindh The Illegal Dispossession Act, 2005, as amended in 2017, remains a vital tool in Sindh — particularly Karachi — for combating organized land mafia activity, and is frequently invoked alongside civil suits, FIRs under the PPC, and revenue-record correction proceedings, making a solid grasp of its section-by-section scheme (especially Sections 3, 5, 7, 8, and 8A) essential for judicial interview readiness.