ORDER SHEET IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

CR. BAIL APPLICATION NO.782/2021

Date

Order with signature of Judge

30.06.2021

Mr. Jahangir Rahujo advocate for applicant.

Mr. Kashif Hancef advocate for complainant.

Mr. Talib Ali Memon, APG.

On 29.06.2021 applicant was called absent and attendance was dispensed with on the plea that he is unable to attend this court due to high blood pressure and matter was adjourned for today. However today Mr. Jahangir Rahujo files Vakalatnama alongwith statement that applicant is having high blood pressure and that applicant is under treatment as OPD patient and has been advised rest.

- 2. It is a matter of record that Mr. Aftab Ahmed Channa filed this bail application and sought ad-interim bail on 04.05.2021, applicant was absent on 20.05.2021. Thereafter Mr. Ghazi Salahuddin filed Vakalatnama on behalf of applicant and matter was adjourned for 25.06.2021, on that date Mr. Ghazi Salahuddin was present and sought time. Today Mr. Rahujo files Vakalatnama who is third counsel and seeks time.
- 3. The above floating position has compelled me to emphasis that 'interim pre-arrest bail' is not a 'bail' in stricto sensu but it is order, without touching merits of the case, which is passed only in recognition of begged pleading of immediate apprehension of arrest. Thus, during such period the responsibilities of the accused (provided such protection) in cooperating with the police; Court (s), including entertaining bail plea becomes the double and any deviation may reflect upon merits of the bail plea. To this, I



find strength from the legal position that pre-arrest bail, normally, is granted on the ground of mala fide on part of the complainant or the police. To substantiate such claim, it is always the conduct and attitude of the accused which matters. Reference is made to the case of Mukhtar Ahmed v.State & others (2016 SCMR 2064) wherein it is held as:-

"2.....The said respondents had been admitted to pre-arrest bail by the High Court primarily upon the consideration that the offences allegedly committed by them did not attract the prohibitory clause contained in subsection (1) of section 497, Cr.PC. The High Court had failed to appreciate that the said consideration is hardly relevant to a case wherein what is sought is pre-arrest bail which is an extraordinary concession. This Court has repeatedly declared that the concession of pre-arrest bail cannot be allowed to an accused person unless the court feels satisfied about seriousness of the accused person's assertion regarding his intended arrest being actuated by mala fide on the part of the complainant party or the local Police but not a word about this crucial aspect of the matter is to be found in the impugned orders passed by the High Court in the present case. ..."

Prima facie, the applicant / accused, having obtained interim prearrest bail has been avoiding his appearance before this Court into though under very order (interim bail grant order) he is not only keeping the police away but has been enjoying his life which includes treatment as 'Out-door patient/OPD". Such conduct of the applicant/ accused, I shall have to insist, is not worth appreciating rather cuts his claimed plea of malafide which, otherwise, is backbone for claiming pre-arrest bail.

4. Without prejudice to above, the record reflects that this is bail before arrest and it has surfaced on record that applicant was neighbor and broker of real estate and there was sale of a flat. Accordingly, he received sale consideration, however failed to hand over the possession of flat and original file which is also available



with him. On last hearing he was categorically offered by counsel for applicant that either applicant may return the original file or return the amount; whereas counsel for applicant was present on last hearing. Admittedly there is an outstanding of Rs.30,00,000/- and therefore this matter was adjourned with said two options/offers by the complainant (a house-wife) who, prima facie, has been deprived of her valuable money by taking advantage of neighborhood. The applicant / accused, even, not bothering to contest his bail plea on merits and even avoiding response to offer. Today again applicant's counsel is seeking time having knowledge that this bench will seize the day after tomorrow and there are only two days left to end present roster and counsel is seeking for one week. Such attitude, I am to add, appears to play with the Court even where (during proceedings) the offer (s) were made so as to ease the grievance of a house hold woman. I would also add here that defrauding innocents is not an ordinary offence but was / is required to be examined differently. Though in the instant case the victim is single soul but a woman who, finding no hope, even agreed for her amount too while parting with her claim from property; this couple with referred attitude of the applicant / accused, prima facie, disentitles him for claiming such extra-ordinary relief. I find strength for holding so from the case of Muhammad Ashfaque v. State (2015 SCMR 1716) wherein it is held as:-

[&]quot;9. In ordinary course and in crimes of ordinary nature, such discretion is to be exercised in favour of the accused however, when ingenious contrived and designed methodology is pressed into service for defrauding a bulk of poor peoples through fraudulent means, would take out the case of such accused person from the ordinary principle where the discretion in granting bail by the court shall ordinary not to be exercised in a routine manner taking the matter leniently otherwise, the entire society would be corrupted through such acts of detestable nature."

Accordingly, whatever has been discussed above, renders the bail plea to dismissal which is accordingly dismissed. Interim bail is recalled. I/O of the case shall ensure arrest of applicant in view of Nasarullah's case.

Dismissed.

JUDGE

IK

Daposed of Malter

y for orders on MANUS 7576/2021 21 For orders on MANO 7576/2021 (let. Surely)

Mr. Ubedullah Malik, Advocali for Swity.
Mr. Seema Zaidi, Add. P.G.

Ungent application stands dismused as learned Counsel for the surely is unable to show availability of nelesse of surely without accused surrendering himself.

Julge