

Enhancing the Enforcement of Nuisance Laws in Pakistan: Bridging Legal Gaps, Overcoming Implementation Challenges, and Advancing Reforms for Public Welfare

Mehak Roy¹

¹Student, Hamdard University, Madinat al-Hikmah, Karachi, Pakistan

Abstract

This paper explores the ineffective enforcement of nuisance laws in Pakistan, focusing on historical, legal, and procedural challenges. Although the Pakistan Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Code provide a legal framework, their implementation remains weak due to ambiguous legal definitions, broad discretionary powers, inadequate penalties, and limited public awareness. Nuisance, classified into private, public, and statutory forms, demands tailored legal responses. The study highlights systemic flaws such as minimal fines and short-term imprisonment, which fail to deter violations and reflect a lack of serious commitment to addressing public disturbances. To improve enforcement, the paper recommends reforms like clearer legal definitions, stricter penalties, stronger procedural safeguards, and greater public involvement. Strengthening judicial oversight and addressing these gaps would enhance the protection of individual rights and foster social harmony in Pakistan.

Keywords: Nuisance; Legal Enforcement; Public Awareness; Judicial Oversight; Legal Reforms

Introduction

Nuisance is an essential aspect of tort law, and is fundamentally understood to be a civil violation that legal systems around the world offer recourse for. Each of us has the right to “exist without interference for his senses, his welfare, and his enjoyment of life”. In all legal systems, these rights are viewed as fundamental to the individual’s freedom and to social harmony. A nuisance is thus defined as the “interference with the public or private enjoyment of property or rights of any kind” (Menski, 2006).

Nuisance originated in English common law and has developed into a tort of established legitimacy in various jurisdictions. Generally, it comes in three forms: private nuisance, public nuisance, and statutory nuisance. Each one targets a specific type of interference and necessitates an appropriate legal response based on the type and scope of the injury produced.

Private nuisance is the significant and unreasonable interference with an individual’s use and enjoyment of land by another party (Sebok, 2021). This category of nuisance is most commonly encountered in the form of cases between adjacent property owners where one individual is engaging in some sort of activity that generates excessive noise, pollution, or obstructs light resulting in the other owner being unable to reasonably enjoy his land. Among other things, courts will consider the nature of the locality and the duration, frequency, and intensity of the interference in determining whether an interference is substantial and unreasonable (Murphy, 2010). The traditional legal system also requires some proof that the victim’s injury is actual and

substantial, not trivial or speculative.

Public nuisance, on the other hand, pertains to “acts or omissions that injure, annoy, or endanger the public or the public’s health, safety, morals, or comfort” (Kendrick, 2023). This form is generally an activity relating to an invasion of communal rights, such as blocking public highways, contaminating water, or making dangerous public space. Due to its broader societal impact, public

nuisance is treated as a criminal offense in many jurisdictions. Legal systems typically require public authorities or a substantial group of affected individuals to initiate claims, reflecting the collective nature of the harm (Kendrick, 2023).

Statutory nuisance represents a modern, codified approach to addressing activities that adversely affect individual well-being and property use. This category encompasses actions that impact health, cause disturbances, or unreasonably interfere with a person’s enjoyment of their home or property (Murphy, 2010). Statutory nuisance laws, enacted by legislative bodies, provide clearer standards and more efficient enforcement mechanisms for addressing specific issues such as industrial pollution, noise complaints, and environmental hazards. Unlike common law nuisances, statutory nuisances rely on predefined legal provisions and regulatory frameworks to define unacceptable behavior and outline enforcement procedures.

The application and interpretation of nuisance laws vary considerably across jurisdictions, shaped by cultural, legal, and institutional factors. In the United States, for instance, nuisance law is a blend of common law traditions and specific statutes, with courts striving to strike a balance between individual property rights and community interests (Kendrick, 2023). In many European countries, there is a strong focus on protecting the environment and public health. More strict nuisance laws do often result, and even more active regulatory efforts can address issues before those issues become serious problems (Krämer & Badger, 2023).

Developing countries, in contrast, face significant hurdles in effectively enforcing nuisance laws, owing to limited public awareness, inadequate legal infrastructure, and weak implementation mechanisms. Pakistan, for one instance shows that nuisance laws do exist, yet their application is inconsistent. Since this is inconsistent, it goes on to challenge us by way of pollution, noise, as well as unlawful occupation of public spaces (Ahmed, 2021). Even with comprehensive legal frameworks in the Pakistan Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code, enforcement tends to be hit or miss due to vague legal definitions and excessive discretionary power, which really hampers the effectiveness of legal remedies.

To address these challenges, we need a holistic approach that includes legal reforms, improved judicial oversight, and greater public participation. Establishing clearer legal definitions for nuisance, stricter penalties should be imposed proportionate to the offense's severity, and procedural safeguards must be rigorously enforced for improving legal implementation (Siddiqui, 2022a). Additionally, public awareness of campaigns can be for encouraging greater civic participation now. Also, more simplified legal procedures can help promote more timely reporting

of nuisance activities.

Protecting individual rights along with promoting social harmony rely upon the effective implementation of nuisance laws. If legal systems globally close existing gaps plus build stronger systems, they can protect people from nuisance effects and help make societies more just. This article aims to provide a holistic review of current Pakistani nuisance laws, specifically Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) in order to provide suggestions for reform in order to make them more effective. This exploration will be primarily focused around the question of what kind of reform is needed in Pakistan's legal system to deal more robustly with issues of public nuisance, enforcement, judicial accountability and public access? In addressing this question, this article will point to how necessary legislative reform, judicial empowerment and forms of popular engagement are with respect to ensuring that nuisance laws are enforced in ways that positively impact public welfare and social harmony.

Methodology

The present research is doctrinal in nature, focusing mainly on the provisions of law, case law and secondary literature on the subject to explore the effectiveness of nuisance laws in Pakistan. The Pakistan Penal Code PPC and Code of Criminal Procedure CrPC are the main legal codes examined. The study examined important Pakistani court cases, like Muhammad Akram v. The State, to evaluate how judicial oversight is applied to discretionary powers. We also drew comparisons with similar legal frameworks in the UK and India, referencing key legislative acts such as the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 from the UK and Section 133 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 from India.

To comprehensively understand the challenges and propose meaningful reforms, a range of secondary sources was examined, including scholarly articles, legal commentaries, and policy reports. Our approach was qualitative, focusing on a detailed analysis of the existing legal norms, procedural mechanisms, and enforcement practices. This research underscores the significance of normative legal analysis, with the goal of suggesting changes that would align Pakistan's nuisance laws with principles of good governance, judicial accountability, and international best practices.

Existing Nuisance Laws in Pakistan

Pakistan's legal system for dealing with public nuisances is thorough and established. Two main laws govern this area: Section 15 of the Pakistan Penal Code (PPC) and Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC). These laws aim to maintain public peace and tranquility, which the government views as a basic responsibility to ensure the well-being of its citizens (Ali, 2023).

The Pakistan Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code offer important legal protections against disturbances created by public nuisances. These disturbances are not limited to harm caused to individuals but extend to animals, privately-owned properties, and state-owned assets. Section 144 of the CrPC, in particular, serves as an essential provision for issuing temporary orders in urgent situations where public safety and peace are threatened. This section empowers magistrates to take immediate and decisive action when the general public is at risk, preventing

potential hazards to health, safety, life, and overall public order (Usman, 2022).

The term "nuisance" itself originates from the French word "nuire" or "nuis," meaning to annoy, harm, or disturb. In the Pakistani legal context, public nuisance is defined as any act that adversely affects the general public, particularly regarding their health, safety, comfort, and collective rights (Akram, 2022). Public nuisance laws in Pakistan are structured around three core principles. The first involves unlawful interference by an individual in matters affecting the broader community. The second principle addresses the infringement of public rights and the disruption of societal harmony. The third principal concerns damages or losses incurred by publicly or state-owned properties due to acts of public nuisance (Akram, 2022; Siddiqui, 2022b).

Under the Pakistani legal framework, magistrates are entrusted with significant authority to combat public nuisance. Section 144 of the CrPC grants district magistrates, sub-divisional magistrates, and specially empowered executive magistrates the power to issue orders against parties involved in acts of public nuisance. However, this authority is restricted to emergency situations where immediate intervention is necessary. Any order issued outside the context of an emergency lacks legal jurisdiction and is considered null and void (Pakistan CrPC, latest amendment 2023).

While Section 15 of the PPC provides a general framework for addressing public nuisance, Section 144 of the CrPC serves as a more targeted and responsive measure in urgent cases. This dual approach ensures that Pakistan's legal system can address current and urgent threats to public safety and peace. However, the effectiveness of these rules relies on consistent enforcement and responsible use of power by the authorities (Ahmed, 2023).

Challenges in Implementing Nuisance Laws in Pakistan

Although Pakistan's legal system contains several clauses to tackle public nuisance, the main challenge is effective law enforcement. This problem is not only faced by the Pakistan; this disease is also spread in other developing countries like Bangladesh. Despite the government's efforts to strengthen legal measures, inconsistencies and weaknesses can commonly be seen in the implementation of public nuisance laws. A 2021 study by the Pakistan Institute of Law and Society (PILS) found that more than a third of those surveyed said that red tape and bureaucratic hurdles caused delays in enforcement. For example, in the 2020 case of *State v. Habib Traders* in Karachi, police used Section 144 to manage public unrest caused by a construction site. However, the order was not enforced for over two weeks due to unclear enforcement procedures, causing significant frustration for local residents (Pakistan Institute of Law and Society, 2021).

One of the primary aspects of enforcing nuisance laws in Pakistan is the issuance of restraining orders by magistrates. According to the legal framework, when a magistrate issues such an order in response to an emergency, it must be directed specifically to the individual involved and served through a legally defined process. In cases where the order applies to the general public, it must be publicly announced through an appropriate proclamation to ensure widespread awareness. Failure to adhere to these communication protocols can compromise the legal standing of the order (Pakistan CrPC, latest amendment 2023).

A major issue arises from the discretionary powers granted to magistrates. Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code gives magistrates extensive and extraordinary authority to take immediate action against public nuisances during emergencies. However, this discretion must be exercised with caution and prudence. The law clearly prohibits the delegation of this power to any other individual or body. This creates a significant loophole if the magistrate's judgment is questioned, higher courts can nullify the order on the grounds that the situation did not qualify as an emergency. This makes it crucial for the legal system to define "emergency situation" more clearly to avoid misuse and subsequent legal challenges (Pakistan CrPC, latest amendment 2023). Section 144(2) introduces further complexities by requiring prior notice to the affected parties before issuing an order. However, in exceptional cases, such as emergencies or when the party fails to acknowledge the notice in time, the magistrate can issue ex-parte orders without prior notification. Even in these situations, the magistrate must document the reasons and the evidence that justified the immediate action. This requirement is meant to balance the need for swift intervention with the rights of the affected parties, but it also leaves room for legal challenges if the proper procedure is not strictly followed. For instance, in the 2021 case of "State v. Imran Traders", the lack of proper procedural records led to concerns about the misuse of such powers. To address this, introducing a digital system for tracking and documenting these orders could help make the process more transparent and accountable. Additionally, setting up an independent review board to monitor the use of ex-parte orders would help ensure these emergency powers are applied fairly and do not violate individual rights (Pakistan Criminal Procedure Code, Section 144(2)).

Despite these procedural safeguards, the government of Pakistan has made some efforts to curb public nuisance more effectively. The current penalty for causing public nuisance is a fine of PKR 200. A proposed amendment to the Pakistan Penal Code suggests increasing this fine to PKR 600. However, legal experts criticize this revised penalty as still being too lenient and unlikely to serve as a meaningful deterrent (Pakistan Penal Code, latest amendment 2023).

The Pakistani judiciary has long struggled with applying Section 144 of the CrPC consistently. According to a 2022 study by the Supreme Court of Pakistan, nearly half of magistrates about 47% said they had not received enough training on how to use emergency powers (Supreme Court of Pakistan, 2022). This lack of training often results in the law being applied unevenly, sometimes to the detriment of marginalized groups. In cities like Karachi, for example, residents of informal settlements frequently report being harassed by private developers and even local authorities, all under the pretense of controlling public nuisances. Meanwhile, in rural areas, local power structures and economic gaps heavily influence how these laws are applied often to the advantage of wealthier individuals because of abuse of power and a lack of accountability. One of the issues is that investigators and prosecutors often do not work together effectively. Because of this disconnection and lack of training, people who are accused of crimes can sometimes escape justice. When that happens, it does not hurt the victims only but it also erodes public trust in the entire system (Soomro & Soomro, 2023).

Comparative Analysis with UK and India

In different jurisdictions and under different legal systems, there are strong and efficacious tools to address what could be termed public nuisance that surpass what Pakistan has available to it. The United Kingdom, for example, through the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 enacted Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) to permit authorities to respond to ongoing/public signs of nuisance behaviour. The ASBOs are a hybrid remedy that encompasses both civil and criminal law, that is, ASBOs are made in civil proceedings, but the act of breach of the ASBO is subject to a criminal penalty and sanction. The hybrid nature of the ASBO allows the appropriate authorities to respond more immediately and more flexibly to the type of disruptive behaviour without the waiting from criminal prosecution. Though ASBOs have eventually been supplanted with slightly newer remedies, including Civil Injunctions and Criminal Behaviour Orders, the idea is still preserved. An accessible and adequately enforceable remedy can be provided against behaviour that undermines public order; it does not have to be in the form of a criminal sanction. In nearby India, Section 133 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 allows magistrates to act similar to Pakistan's Section 144, albeit with additional protections in place. Section 133 provides the magistrate authority to issue conditional orders as to the removal of nuisances affecting public health, safety, or comfort, and requires a more open process, including notice to the alleged violator, and an opportunity for a hearing and defence to oppose the order. This safeguards the use of emergency powers as it is an open process, is reviewable by the judiciary, limits the harm from any individual, makes it more probable that the order reflects an actual necessity, and instills public confidence in the legal system. The need for improvement in Pakistan is evidenced by case law. In *Muhammad Akram v. The State* (2009 SCMR 230), the Supreme Court emphasized that the powers under Section 144 must meet legal requirements and their use should not infringe upon the fundamental rights of citizens unless acting to avert an immediate use of lawful force against public order. Similarly, Pakistani courts have held that Section 144 should not be applied at random indefinitely where the orders as issued should be based with at least some reasonable evidence of necessity on the part of officials.

These cases reveal a consistent concern of judges: while discretionary powers to contain nuisances are important for public safety, they need to be limited with defined tests to avoid misuse. Applying the conclusions from international and domestic case law, it seems Pakistan's laws on nuisance would benefit significantly from the application of more specific statutory guidelines, enhanced protections in procedure, and a purposive approach that relies on proportionality in the exercise of its emergency powers.

The Need for Comprehensive Reform in Nuisance Law in Pakistan

Legislative Reforms

Pakistan's framework for nuisance law currently needs fundamental reforms to enhance its effectiveness and transparency. Rather than formulating entirely new legislation, Pakistan should focus on refining its existing legislative provisions to fill in gaps and respond to new challenges.

Clarification of Emergency Situation

The lack of clear articulation in terms of what constitutes an "emergency situation" under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code will among the areas of improvement. The absence of a clear universally defined standard allows for considerable discretion for the magistrates to determining when these powers can be exercised, which can result in arguably arbitrary powers of emergency which could infringe on people's rights. Therefore, Pakistan should devise a clear and explicit definition that delineate the standards and establishes the circumstances around an emergency, to promote that magistrates' discretion can be exercised within proper legal rationale and concrete evidence.

Making Processes for issuing prohibitory orders easier

It is true and evident that issuing prohibitory orders is generally laid out in terms of procedures, and while clear, the fact is that the procedure in itself can often be bureaucratic and ineffectively slow. This slow process we'll see in the next chapter will have ramifications on the speed at which nuisance laws can be enforced. Making the prohibitive procedures clearer and easier - especially in terms service of the act of 'issuing and serving the order' will help to ensure that the appropriate action can take place in a timely and effective manner to mitigate nuisance. There needs to be greater clarity on the procedure and use of technology to support the larger due process needs and better communication and action can be supported: we need to have a clearer process and easier mechanism to communicate the orders and ensure all parties are informed in a timely manner.

Revised Penalties for Public Nuisance

One reform that could provide a substantial deterrent on offenders is realigning the penalty structure for public nuisance offences. The current level of fines and custodial sentences are not effective to deter individuals and corporations from committing public order offences. I would recommend increasing the fine range to PKR 10,000 to PKR 50,000, depending on the seriousness of the public nuisance, which would be more effective deterrent. As for an extraordinarily serious case of public nuisance that threatens the health and safety of the public or the environment, the penalty framework should add custodial sentences in order to create more proportionality between punishment and crime. With increased fines, the law could indicate how serious an offence it was, rather than simply outlining a lesser penalty, thus interested parties would exist within a more effective deterrent.

Judicial Oversight and Training

Improving Judicial Oversight

To ensure fairness and consistency in the manner in which nuisance law is applied, an important reform is to strengthen judicial contestability over magistrate discretionary powers. A functional system of checks and balances is necessary to prevent the abuse of these powers. It is important that judicial officers are empowered, and encouraged, to reconsider the orders of magistrates and the law's application, to ensure that orders are not made in the arbitrary or excessive manner envisaged by the introduction of the system.

Training for Judicial and Law Enforcement Personnel

Central to any reform process is the professional development of those enforcing the laws that restrain nuisances. The introduction of compulsory training programmes for magistrates and judges as well as law enforcement regarding nuisance issues and legal considerations should establish a better understanding of the potential implications of a nuisance charge. Establishing a program of ongoing professional development, with formal training in public nuisance laws, may assist magistrates in enforcing these laws transparently, while being mindful of rights and judicial standards. Ongoing practical training opportunities will help to ensure that magistrates charge practices become a fair process, not clouded by their own prejudices, or by excessive application of the law, with a comprehensive understanding of breaches against constitutional demands. Further, these programs will help begin to establish consistency in judgment and legislative interpretation.

Public Engagement Raising Public Awareness

Public participation is an essential pillar of every legal regime. Through educational programs and the provision of outreach services to the community, Pakistan could create a culture whereby citizens are engaged and empowered to report nuisance-related incidents of their concern. Community-based programs, such as community workshops on nuisance laws delivered in conjunction with local law enforcement or civil society organizations, might seem to be an appropriate way to increase public awareness. One good example is the Punjab Bar Council's (2023) campaign in Lahore to deliver a series of "Know Your Rights" seminars to inform people about public nuisance laws and to advise them about reporting nuisance issues in their communities. Teaching people about their rights and available remedies and reporting nuisance behavior will contribute to the early identification and solutions of problems. A more informed and engaged public will place greater pressure on duty bearers to address public nuisances - and to do so quickly and effectively.

Accessible Legal Compensatory Measures for Marginalized Groups

In many communities located throughout the various provinces of Pakistan, the manner in which nuisance laws are enforced often reflect extreme social and economic disenfranchisement. In order for public nuisance laws to have effect, citizens particularly those from marginal or vulnerable communities, must be afforded facilitative and affordable access to legal remedies. From this perspective, it is important to recognize that the route to accessible justice can be limited, especially as it relates to nuisance-related issues. One way to alleviate this problem is through the introduction of mobile legal clinics in the kind of areas where legal services are severely lacking. Mobile legal clinics can offer free basic legal advice and support services, increasing people's access to legal consultation or assistance particularly in less accessible rural and remote regions, and in some cases may improve people's understanding of their rights to the point they will be able to access the informal system. Governments should remove barriers to accessing legal resources, and encourage dispossessed communities' access to legal redress when their rights are infringed.

Need for Effective Implementation

Reform is never solely about changing laws, but reform involves bolstering structures and altering the attitude towards enforcement. Reforming nuisance laws will require negotiation through existing interests within the legal and bureaucratic systems. In particular, if local law enforcement does not want to take on more responsibilities or to implement procedures that are new to them, they will resist reforms. To alleviate this potential obstacle, a phased implementation should take place with pilot programs in a handful of districts to determine if some form of the proposed change would be practical and effective. Then any changes could be modified before extension to the larger system. Involving civil society and local members in this process could ensure more sustainable support, as well as ensure that reforms are not only practical but are also responsive to local needs.

Capacity Building by providing Training to Magistrates, Judges, and Police Officials

Getting judicial officers and law enforcement to effectively apply nuisance laws is paramount. It is not their fault; they just support roles, and there needs to accurate training aimed at ensuring magistrates, judges, and police officers understand nuisance law and its application, and applications within the law they are obligated to enforce: After training officers, they will need to practice, and learn to apply nuisance laws consistently and fairly: how to apply law, and engage more critically with speech and specifics, and balance a trade-off between individual rights and multiple issues public order presents. All of the above interests punitive preventive steps, learning how to not overly compromise, and police use of discretion in these situations. . By creating professionally trained personnel, Pakistan will have the potential to effectuate fairness and accessibility within its legal system overall.

Simplification of Legal Processes by Introducing Streamlined Complaint Mechanisms and Case Disposal

A fundamental impediment to effective implementation lies in the convoluted nature and profusion of legal procedures. In order to enhance effectiveness, the legal system should consolidate complaint processes so that it is ultimately easier for individuals to report it as a nuisance and monitor the progress of their cases. Time-limited processes to resolve cases will help curtail delays in action and ensure that nuisance cases are processed in a timely manner. Further, the plausibility and accessibility of processes for especially vulnerable citizens will be enhanced with simpler methods for navigating a legal system, including simple guidance on how to navigate a legal process.

Accountability Mechanisms by Establishing Transparent Review Boards

A more transparent review board of accountability mechanisms would prevent the misuse of authority granted through the Section 144. The review board would allow oversight on the evidence to support claims and ensure that orders conform to the law. An independent authority to consider these actions will not only instill public confidence in the legal system, but ensure that any application of the law is neither capricious nor unjust. Review boards serve in consideration

of the consistency and fairness of magistrates' decisions related to public nuisance, deterring situations when laws employed are really in the best public's interest.

Active Community Participation

Ultimately, activating community engagement is vital for the sustained effectiveness of public nuisance reforms. A system responsive to the demands of social change, in conjunction with active public participation can dramatically minimize nuisance and enhance public well-being. When individuals are supported and encouraged to interface with the legal system, report nuisances, and request remedies from public authorities, communities are much better positioned to confront public nuisance problems before they reach a disruption crisis. Further, community engagement serves to create a collective consciousness and responsibility which is essential in the maintenance of social order.

By developing institutional capacity alongside cultural change such as proactive engagement, Pakistan could increase its enforcement of nuisance laws and utilize more meaningful reform as an outcome. In the end, these steps will lead to a better regulated and more harmonious society in which the public can exist without fear of disruptive or harmful social behavior.

Conclusion

Although useful in theory, Pakistan's nuisance legislation fails to work in practice. To eliminate the barriers preventing nuisance laws from working effectively, Pakistan will need to move in two directions: firstly, revise our nuisance laws; and secondly, regulate the enforcement of them. First the procedural reforms, then secondly, adding on to the regulations, includes; easier definitions, expanded civil and criminal penalties, proffers streamlined processes, and better accountability from the courts. The comparative analysis indicates effective nuisance control depends equally on effective legislation and functional community involvement.

Pakistan's nuisance statutes can better protect the health and safety of humans, as well as social cohesion, by implementing certain reform and increasing community involvement. Increasing community involvement would bring Pakistan's nuisance statutes in line with internationally accepted principles and assist in supporting a rule of law to their citizens.

References

- Akram, M. (2022). Public nuisance laws in Pakistan: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Pakistani Law*, 15(3), 112–128.
- Ahmed, R. (2021). Environmental challenges and legal responses in Pakistan. *Pakistan Law Review*, 15(2), 89–105.
- Ahmed, R. (2023). The legal framework for addressing public nuisance in Pakistan. *South Asian Law Journal*, 22(2), 90–105.
- Ali, A. (2023). Nuisance law enforcement and its impact on public welfare in Pakistan. *Pakistan Law Review*, 28(1), 45–62.
- Kendrick, L. (2023). The perils and promise of public nuisance. *Yale Law Journal*, 132(3), 702–791.
- Krämer, L., & Badger, C. (2023). *Krämer's EU environmental law* (9th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.

- Menski, W. (2006). *Comparative law in a global context: The legal systems of Asia and Africa* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, J. (2010). *The law of nuisance*. Oxford University Press.
- Pakistan Institute of Law and Society. (2021). *Misuse and enforcement challenges of Section 144 in Pakistan*. <https://www.pils.org.pk/reports/section144>
- Pakistan Penal Code, §15. (2023). *Pakistan Penal Code (Latest Amendment 2023)*. <http://www.pakistan.gov.pk>
- Pakistan Criminal Procedure Code, §144. (2023). *Pakistan CrPC (Latest Amendment 2023)*. <http://www.pakistan.gov.pk>
- Punjab Bar Council. (2023). *Know Your Rights seminar series*.
- Sebok, A. J. (2021). The public right and wrongs: Tort theory and the problem of public nuisance. *Journal of Tort Law*, 14(2), 531–549. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jtl-2021-0032>
- Siddiqui, L. (2022a). Legal reforms in Pakistan: The need for clarity and enforcement. *Pakistan Journal of Legal Studies*, 20(4), 56–72.
- Siddiqui, L. (2022b). Public nuisance and legal reform in Pakistan. *Journal of Criminal Law and Society*, 12(4), 200–215.
- Soomro, S. I. A., & Soomro, M. M. (2023). Criminal justice system and reforms in Pakistan. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 12(3), 480–496. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2023.12.3.35>
- Supreme Court of Pakistan. (2022). *Judicial perspectives on the use of emergency powers under Section 144 CrPC*. <https://www.supremecourt.gov.pk/reports/emergency-powers-2022>
- Usman, M. (2022). Section 144 CrPC: Powers and limitations in Pakistan's public nuisance law. *Pakistan Judicial Review*, 35(2), 178–193.