

HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

Cr. Bail Application No.S-514 of 2026.

[Salman Nohani Vs. The State]

Applicant : Salman Nohani through Mr. Ayaz Khaskheli,
Advocate.

Respondent : The State through Mr. Altaf Hussain
Khokhar, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Complainant : Muhammad Achar present in-person.

Date of Hearing : 25.05.2026.

Date of Decision : 25.05.2026.

ORDER

Syed Fiaz ul Hassan Shah, J:- The Applicant above-named seeks post-arrest Bail in F.I.R No.88/2026, registered at Police Station Hussainabad, District Hyderabad for offence punishable under Section 397-PPC. Previously, he applied for the same relief before learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Hyderabad but the request was declined vide order dated 20.04.2026.

2. In short the facts of the case are that on 02.04.2026 at about 2030 hours at link road Giddu Chowk near Gloria Marriage Hall, the complainant was intercepted by two motorcyclists and on the show of weapon snatched original CNIC from and cash Rs.850/- from complainant. Out of them, one accused was earlier known to complainant namely Subhan s/o Ashraf Solangi. Hence this case.

3. Counsel for applicant/accused states that the name of applicant/accused was not mentioned in the FIR as well as he was not arrested from the crime scene. He further contended that there is dispute between complainant and co-accused; therefore, at the behest of the complainant, the applicant/accused has been falsely involved in this case.

4. On the other hand, complainant presents in-person shown full trust upon learned Deputy Prosecutor General, who vehemently opposed the bail application and contended that amount Rs.850/- was recovered from

the possession of the applicant/accused. However, he conceded that the present applicant/accused is first offender.

5. Heard learned counsel for parties and perused the record with their assistance.

6. It appears that neither the name of the present applicant/accused was given in the FIR nor any identification parade was held even subsequent to the arrest of the applicant/accused. Furthermore, the complainant has not assigned any specific role as to who alighted from the motorcycle and snatched or shown weapon. The applicant has made out a case for further enquiry in terms of subsection (2) of Section 497, Cr.P.C. The investigation has already been completed; therefore, the Applicant is no more required for investigation and no fruitful would be achieved by keeping incarceration the Applicant for indefinite period.

7. In view of above, the present applicant/accused is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.40,000/- (Rupees Forty Thousand only) and P.R Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

8. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant/accused on merits.

J U D G E