

# HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

Cr. Bail Application No.S-30 of 2025.

**Nazeer Ahmed v. The State**

**Applicant** : Nazeer Ahmed through Mr. Ali Nawaz Rajput,  
Advocate.

**Respondent** : The State through Mr. Shahid Ahmed Shaikh,  
Addl: P.G for the State a/w ASI Muhammad  
Saleh & I.O Baber Saleh Rahpoto ACE Dadu.

**Date of hearing** : 15.05.2025.

**Date of Decision** : 15.05.2025.

## **ORDER**

Miran Muhammad Shah, J:- Through instant Bail Application, the applicant/accused namely, Nazeer Ahmed s/o Jan Muhammad seeks post arrest bail in Crime No.146/2023, registered at Police Station B-Section Dadu for the offence U/s 201, 217, 218, 120-B, 506-PPC 155-A Police Order 2002. Earlier bail plea of the applicant/accused was declined by the learned Special Judge Anti-Corruption (Provincial), Hyderabad vide order dated 30.11.2024.

2. The facts of the case are mentioned in the Bail Application and the copy of F.I.R. is also attached with the Bail Application, hence, needs not to reproduce the same here.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant/accused as well as the learned A.P.G for the State as assisted by the I.O of the case. The case of the present applicant/accused is that he had tempered with the evidence during investigation of a murder case being a police official.

4. Counsel for the applicant/accused, however, denies all such allegations and states that due to personal grudge and enmity he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further contends that he was only serving

his duties honestly and diligently and was investigating the case in a fair manner. The complainant/applicant has falsely implicated him in this case.

5. Learned A.P.G for the State argued that the present applicant/accused was found to be tempering with the evidence and the case was lodged against him on the application of complainant of FIR No.21 of 2018. He further denies that other than causing tempering of the investigation papers no other offence was committed by him. He further presses that the bail may be rejected.

6. The case against the present applicant/accused is only of tempering of evidence, which is yet to be proved. The FIR has been lodged after delay of about five years and no other allegations are against him. The case has already been challaned and evidence is being led as stated by the I.O of the case and it is yet to be determined as to how the case was manipulated by the applicant/accused and how the ingredients of Section 201 PPC are attracted in this case. The co-accused has already been granted bail in this case, therefore, making this case falling under the principle of consistency, whereas, his trial has commenced and the only evidence could prove their guilt or otherwise. The present applicant/accused, hence making a case of further inquiry, therefore, I am of the opinion that the case for bail of the applicant/accused is made out, and he is **granted** bail and admitted to bail subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) and P.R Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

7. 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

*Ali.*