

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,**  
**MIRPURKHAS**

**Criminal Revision Application No.D-23 of 2024**

**Applicant:** Soomar son of Pehlwan,  
Through Mr. Mir Muhammad Nohri, Advocate.

**Respondent No3:** Umer Aijaz son of Muhammad Ramzan,  
Through Mr. Parshotam K. Khatri, Advocate.

**State:** Through Mr. Shahzad Saleem, Additional P.G Sindh.

**Date of hearing:** 18.08.2025

**Date of order:** 18.08.2025

**O R D E R**

**Amjad Ali Sahito, J:** Through this Crl. Revision Application, the applicant has impugned the order dated 27.08.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Anti-Terrorism Court, Mirpurkhas Division @ Mirpurkhas, wherein the learned trial court has dismissed the Preliminary Enquiry filed by the applicant/complainant. Being aggrieved, the applicant has filed the instant Crl. Revision Application before this Court.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that after recording the statement under section 200 Cr.P.C., the learned trial court has not recorded further statements of the witnesses under section 202 Cr.P.C., and at the preliminary stage has dismissed the application, and prayed that the impugned order be set aside.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Parshotam K. Khatri, Advocate, filed Vakalatnama on behalf of respondent No.3 which is taken on record. He supported the impugned order. Learned A.P.G has also supported the impugned order.

4. Heard and perused.

5. From perusal of the record, it reflects that a Direct Complaint was filed by the complainant Soomar for offences under sections 365, 386, 114 P.P.C r/w sections 6/7 ATA, 1997 and the allegations against the respondents are that they demanded 'Bhatta' from the complainant in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and further threatened that otherwise they would not allow the complainant to run his affairs and also alleged that they tried to kidnap the applicant/complainant. After recording the statement of the complainant under section 200 Cr.P.C, report was called from the police official and DSP Umerkot submitted his report that there is a dispute between the parties over the plot. As such, the application was filed. After submission of the report, the learned trial court passed a speaking order wherein the learned trial court also observed that there is no record about the demand of 'Bhatta' from the accused persons and noted in the background of the Direct Complaint, the Inquiry Officer stated there is a dispute between the parties over the property. We have also scanned the impugned order and material available on record. No illegality or material irregularity has been committed by the learned trial court while passing the impugned order.

6. Consequently, the instant CrI. Revision Application being devoid of merits is dismissed.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**

**"Faisal"**