

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S- 472 of 2026

Applicants:	Riaz Ali son of Mukhtiar Ali Khaskheli through Mr. Amjad Ali Almani, Advocate.
The State	Through Mr. Muhammad Raza Katohar, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.
Date of hearing:	01.09.2026.
Dated of order	01.09.2026.

ORDER.

Suresh Kumar, J.--- Applicant named above seeks confirmation of the ad-interim pre-arrest bail granted to him by this Court vide order dated 20.05.2026, in a case bearing crime No. 25/2026, offence u/s 364, 511, 354-A PPC registered at Police Station 'B' Section Khairpur.

2. The brief facts of the case are as follows: On 15 January 2026, an FIR was registered stating that the complainant's son had been murdered, implicating Raiz Ali and others. The FIR, numbered 269/2025, was lodged at P.S. Tando Masti Khan, where it was reported that the accused were issuing threats. On 16 June 2025, at 4:00 p.m., the complainant went to Luqman for some work. During this time, a white car approached, from which the accused Riaz Ali, Shaman Ali, and Sadaquat Ali emerged. Accused Riaz Ali attempted to kidnap her, while Shaman Ali and Sadaquat Ali restrained her by the legs and disgraced her. Upon her cries for help, Gul Hassan Azam came running. Subsequently, the accused fled, leaving the complainant behind, after which she lodged the FIR.

3. The applicant initially sought pre-arrest bail from the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-IV/GBV, Khaipur, which was dismissed vide order dated 31.03-2026. Aggrieved by this dismissal, the applicant has approached this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant/accused and learned DPG for the State.

5. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the respective parties and having perused the relevant material, it reveals that the applicant/accused has allegedly attempted to

commit the offense of abduction and has outraged the modesty of the complainant; however, upon seeing neighbors, the applicant fled the scene. The FIR indicates that the incident took place on 16 June 2025, while the FIR was registered on 15 January 2026. The record further reveals that the complainant approached the Justice of Peace for the registration of the FIR three months after the incident. Previous enmity between the parties is acknowledged in the FIR, and a prior FIR bearing crime No. 269/2025 is also mentioned. Additionally, the counsel for the applicant disclosed that another FIR bearing crime No. 87/2026 was registered malafidely due to dispute over a plot. There is a delay of more than six months in the registration of the present FIR; therefore, the possibility of false implication of the present applicant due to previous enmity cannot be ruled out. Moreover, the present case involves only an attempt, which can easily be managed due to the prior enmity. Hence, the case against the applicant falls within the ambit of further inquiry. It is also pointed out by learned counsel that the applicant/accused has been regularly attending the trial court following the grant of interim pre-arrest bail by this court.

6. For the foregoing reasons above, I am of considered view that the applicant/accused has successfully made out a case for the grant of pre-arrest bail, therefore, the interim pre arrest bail already granted to the applicant, is hereby confirmed on same terms and conditions with direction to appear before trial Court.

7. Needless to say that above observations are tentative in nature and will not prejudice the case of either party during trial.

J U D G E

Irfan