

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Criminal Bail Application No.348 of 2025

Applicant : Rafique Ahmed S/o Muhammad Juman
through Mr. Ashique Ali Mangan,
Advocate

Respondent : For State:
Mr. Muhammad Iqbal Awan, Addl. P.G.,
Sindh

For Complainant:
Mr. Shanti Devi, Advocate

Date of hearing : 24.02.2025

Date of order : 24.02.2025

ORDER

AMJAD ALI SAHITO, J -- Through this Bail Application, applicant/accused seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.187/2024 for the offence under Section 489-F/420 PPC registered at PS Makli, Thatta, after his bail plea has been declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge/MCTC, Thatta vide order dated 30.12.2024.

2. The details and particulars of the FIR are already available in the bail application and FIR, same could be gathered from the copy of FIR attached with such application, hence, needs not to reproduce the same hereunder.

3. Per learned counsel for the applicant, the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case; that the cheque was dishonoured on 29.04.2024 whereas FIR was recorded on 19.11.2024 with a delay of more than seven months for which no plausible explanation has been furnished; that the offence in which the applicant has been charge does not fall within the prohibitory clause. Lastly, he prays for confirmation of bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, Learned Addl. P.G. so also learned counsel for the complainant opposed for confirmation of bail.

5. Heard arguments and perused the record.

6. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant is running a Book store with name and title as “Al-Hamd” so also doing business of sale/purchase of houses and plots. The applicant took loan of Rs.45,00,000/- from the complainant by issuing a cheque bearing No.20479349; however, when the complainant deposited the same on 26.04.2024, the same became dishonoured. Hence, the ingredients of Section 489-F PPC are very much applicable in this case. Further, the applicant knowingly issued the said cheque that he had no sufficient amount; as such, he has also committed offence of cheating and fraud with the complainant. The applicant has also not denied issuance of his cheque as well as from his signature. At bail stage, only tentative assessment is to be made. No malafide or ill-will or enmity has been pleaded by the applicant/accused, which could be the ground for false implication in this case.

7. Further, the concession of pre-arrest bail cannot be allowed to an accused person unless the Court feels satisfied with the 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 found as no *mala fide* is made on the part of the complainant to believe that the applicant/accused has been implicated in this case falsely. In this context, the reliance is placed to the case of **‘Rana Abdul Khaliq v. The STATE and others’ [2019 SCMR 1129]**. In addition to the above, I would like to mention that grant of pre-arrest bail is an extraordinary remedy in criminal jurisdiction; it is a diversion of the usual course of law, arrest in cognizable cases; protection to the innocent being hounded on trump up charges through abuse of process of law, therefore, an applicant seeking judicial protection is required to reasonably demonstrate that intended arrest is calculated to humiliate him with taints of *mala fide*, it is not a substitute for post-arrest bail in every run of the mill criminal case as it seriously hampers the course of the investigation.

8. In view of the above, the instant bail application is **dismissed**. Resultantly, the interim pre-arrest bail granted to the applicant/accused vide order dated 07.02.2025 is hereby recalled.

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

JUDGE

Kamran/PA