

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

Cr. Bail Appln. No. D-154 of 2025

Before:

*Mr. Justice Amjad Ali Bohio, J.
Mr. Justice Jawad Akbar Sarwana, J.*

Applicant : Khalid Hussain son of Iqbal Shar and Pervaiz son
Of Mohsin Shar,
Through Mr. Muhammad Kaleemullah Memon,
Advocate

The State : *Through* Altaf Hussain Khokhar, Deputy P.G

Date of Hearing : 31.12.2025
Date of Order : 31.12.2025

ORDER

AMJAD ALI BOHIO, J: The applicants/accused, Khalid Hussain and Pervaiz, seek post-arrest bail in Crime No. 30 of 2025, registered at Police Station Looni Kot, District Jamshoro, for offences punishable under Sections 9(i), 9(iii)(c) of the Control of Narcotic Substances Act, 2024. Earlier, their bail application was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Kotri, vide order dated 02.09.2025.

2. According to the prosecution, the applicants were apprehended by a police party headed by ASI Imtiaz Ali Soomro on 30.05.2025, at about 2200 hours, near Iron Bridge, Looni Kot, on Motorway M-9. During the arrest, 1015 grams of charas, in the form of two large and small pieces, were allegedly recovered from applicant Khalid Hussain, whereas 1020 grams of charas, also in the form of two large and small pieces, were allegedly recovered from applicant Mohsin, in the presence of mashirs HC Rahim Bux



Panhwar and PC Ghulam Hussain Samoon. Thereafter, the above-mentioned FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants contended that the alleged narcotic substance was falsely foisted upon the applicants with mala fide intention and ulterior motives. He argued that the recovery proceedings are defective due to the non-association of independent private witnesses from the general public, and that the mashirs cited in the arrest and recovery proceedings are police officials and subordinates of the complainant. The deliberate omission to associate independent witnesses creates serious doubt regarding the genuineness, credibility, and truthfulness of the prosecution's version. Learned counsel further submitted that the case against the applicants requires further inquiry, entitling them to the concession of bail. He argued that the applicants have remained in custody since their arrest and cannot be detained for an indefinite period, particularly when there is no likelihood of the trial commencing in the near future. Since the applicants have already been remanded to judicial custody, they are no longer required for the purpose of further investigation. It was further contended that there is no reasonable apprehension that the applicants would abscond, tamper with the evidence, or intimidate the prosecution witnesses. In support of his arguments, learned counsel placed reliance upon the order passed by the Honourable Supreme Court of Pakistan in Criminal Petition No. 150-K of 2024.

4. Conversely, learned Deputy Prosecutor General, Mr. Altaf Hussain Khokhar, advanced forceful and comprehensive arguments in opposition to the bail application on behalf of the State. He submitted that the quantity of charas allegedly recovered from the applicants is massive and staggering, placing the case within the most serious category of narcotics offences. He emphasized that the

applicants have failed to substantiate any credible claim of mala fide or enmity on the part of the police officials. Learned DPG further argued that the applicants have not raised any plausible allegation of false implication or vendetta-motivated prosecution. He contended that the applicability of Section 17(2) of the CNS Act is to be determined at the time of recording evidence during trial. He further submitted that Section 20 of the CNS Act excludes the application of Section 103 Cr.P.C. Lastly, he prayed that the bail application be dismissed. We have heard learned counsel for both parties and perused the material available on record.

5. One of the most significant lacunae in the present case is the complete absence of video recording of the alleged recovery proceedings. In the modern age of technology where mobile phones equipped with video recording facilities are ubiquitously available and are routinely carried by police officials during their duties, the failure to make video recording of recovery of such a substantial quantity of contraband substance is not only inexplicable but raises serious doubts about the veracity of the prosecution story. The importance of video recording in narcotic cases has been repeatedly emphasized by the superior courts of this country. The ratio decidendi in various judgments has established that video recording serves multiple purposes: (i) it ensures transparency in the recovery proceedings; (ii) it provides independent and irrefutable evidence of the circumstances of recovery; (iii) it protects innocent persons from being falsely implicated; (iv) it safeguards the police officials from false allegations of planting evidence; and (v) it preserves the chain of custody of the recovered material.

6. In the instant case, no explanation whatsoever has been offered by the investigating agency for their failure to conduct video recording despite the fact that the alleged incident occurred at

at 2100 hours, providing ample time and opportunity for such recording. The prosecution has remained silent on this critical aspect. This omission, in the considered opinion of this Court, is a serious procedural irregularity that materially affects the credibility of the prosecution case.

7. The second cardinal infirmity in the prosecution case pertains to the unexplained delay of three days in sending the sample parcels for chemical examination. Although the parcels were dispatched through HC Murad vide memorandum No. 30/25 dated 02.06.2025, the same were delivered to the Chemical Examiner on 03.06.2025. Thus, the parcels did not remain in proven safe custody during the intervening period from 02.06.2025 to 03.06.2025. The learned Deputy Prosecutor General failed to offer any explanation regarding the safe custody and safe transmission of the sealed parcels during the said period, which creates serious doubt about the authenticity and reliability of the chemical report.

8. It is further observed that 1015 grams of charas allegedly recovered from applicant Khalid Hussain was reduced to 1009 grams, while 1020 grams of charas allegedly recovered from applicant Mohsin was reduced to 1014 grams at the time of delivery of the parcels to the Chemical Examiner. The learned DPG failed to explain these discrepancies in weight. Consequently, the contention raised by learned counsel for the applicants regarding possible tampering with the parcels of contraband charas during the intervening period from 02.06.2025 to 03.06.2025 cannot be ruled out. Accordingly, the applicants have made out a case for further inquiry, entitling them to the concession of bail.

9. The object and rationale behind this mandatory time limit is to ensure: (i) preservation of the integrity of the sample; (ii) maintenance of unbroken chain of custody; (iii) prevention of

tampering or substitution; and (iv) expeditious scientific verification of the nature of the recovered substance.

10. Moreover, when the total quantity is not so huge or unmanageable that its complete transmission to the laboratory was impossible, and yet only an insignificant fraction was sent, an adverse inference must necessarily be drawn against the prosecution. This selective and partial transmission, without any reasonable justification, gives rise to a strong suspicion of manipulation and exaggeration of the quantity.

11. Another serious infirmity in the prosecution case is the complete absence of independent witnesses from the locality. The admitted position is that:

- (i) *The alleged incident occurred at 2200 hours*
- (ii) *The place of incident is at beside Iron Bridge M-9 Motorway, which is a public road*
- (iii) *The area is not described as desolate or uninhabited*
- (iv) *Recovery of 1015 and 1020 respectivelygrams of contraband is claimed to have been made*

12. Despite these circumstances, no independent witness from the locality has been associated with the recovery proceedings. All the witnesses cited by the prosecution are the subordinate staff of the complainant ASI Imtiaz Ali Soomro, namely HC Rahim Bux Panhwar, PC Ghulam Hussain Samoon, and DHC Muhammad Juman. These witnesses are highly interested witnesses being the subordinates of the complainant and working under his command and supervision. Section 103 Cr.P.C. mandates that searches shall be made in the presence of two or more respectable inhabitants of the locality in which the place to be searched is situated. The object of this provision is to ensure transparency and to provide independent corroboration to the prosecution story. The

learned APG has contended that Section 25 of the CNS Act, 1997 excludes the requirement of associating witnesses from the public in cases relating to narcotics. While it is true that Section 25 provides certain exclusions, the same cannot be invoked arbitrarily and mechanically in every case to justify complete non-compliance with Section 103 Cr.P.C. The prosecution must demonstrate circumstances which made it difficult or impossible to associate independent witnesses. In the instant case, when the recovery was allegedly made at 2100 hours on a public road, there is no justification for non-association of independent witnesses. The absence of independent witnesses, when considered along with the other irregularities discussed above, further weakens the prosecution case.

13. Moving ahead, the legislative intent embedded within the SCNS Act, 2024 (as amended in 2025), particularly sections 16, 17, 17(2), 35(1) and 35(2) holds proprietary. This is not a mere procedural formality but a substantive obligation designed to ensure, transparency in police conduct; accountability to law; evidentiary integrity and reliability; prevention of false implications and police abuse and advancement of the rule of law. A watershed amendment to the SCNS Act, introduced in 2025, has fundamentally altered the legal landscape governing bail in narcotics cases. Section 35(1), in its original form, provided an absolute interdiction on bail, stipulating that: "*Notwithstanding anything contained in sections 496 and 497 of the Code, the bail shall not be granted to an accused person charged with an offence under this Act*". However, Section 35(2) (as amended in 2025) now provides a critical exception, thereby restoring judicial discretion and constitutional safeguards. Section 35(2) provides that "*If it appears to the Special Court or competent court at any stage of the investigation, inquiry or trial, as the case may be, that the accused is arrested under this Act, but*

there are sufficient grounds for further inquiry into his being guilty, the accused shall, pending such inquiry, be released on bail with sureties...". The phrase "sufficient grounds for further inquiry" does not require the Court to reach a conclusion that guilt is improbable or that acquittal is likely. Rather, it directs the Court to examine whether the prosecution case, as presently constituted and investigated, exhibits deficiencies or lacunae that necessitate deeper investigation, cross-examination, and trial court scrutiny. Non-compliance with mandatory statutory provisions, such as the video recording requirement under Section 17(2), constitutes a material ground for "further inquiry" because such non-compliance, which undermines the reliability and credibility of the prosecution version; prevents verification of the police account through objective means; raises questions about whether the statutory safeguards were deliberately circumvented and creates a foundation for reasonable doubt regarding the veracity of the alleged recovery.

14. The Honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan in the landmarks judgments of *Zahid Sarfaraz Gill v. The State* [2024 SCMR 934] and *Muhammad Abid Hussain v. The State* [2025 SCMR 721] have collectively establish that procedural fairness, technological evidence collection, and constitutional protections form the foundational pillars upon which narcotics prosecutions must rest, ensuring that neither the innocent are wrongfully convicted nor the guilty escape accountability through shoddy investigation.

15. For the foregoing reasons, we are/were of the considered opinion that the applicants are/were entitled to bail. Accordingly, the bail applications in hand are/were allowed and the applicants were admitted to bail, subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/= (Rupees one hundred thousand only) each and

P.R. bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court
vide short order dated 31.12.2025.

16. Needless to mention that the above assessments are
tentative nature and shall not affect the merits of the case during
trial.

17. Above are the reasons of short order dated 31.12.2025.



JUDGE

Ahmed/Pa,