

## IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

Cr. Bail Appln. No. S-917 of 2025

Applicants : Irfan Ali son of Muhammad Ismail Mangnejo  
Through Mr. Nusrat Hussain Memon, Advocate

The State : Through Mr. Mansoor Ahmed Shaikh, DPG

Date of hearing : 23.10.2025  
Date of order : 23.10.2025

### **ORDER**

**KHALID HUSSAIN SHAHANI, J.**— The applicant, Irfan Ali, seeks pre-arrest bail in a case bearing Crime No. 32 of 2025, for offences punishable under Sections 324, 114, 337-H(2), 148, and 149 PPC, registered at Police Station Faiz Muhammad Narejo, District Khairpur. His earlier plea for pre-arrest bail was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-IV (GBVC), Khairpur, vide order dated 13.09.2025.

2. The concise facts emerging from the FIR lodged by complainant Fazl-ur-Rehman on 10.08.2025 at 2230 hours disclose that due to a subsisting matrimonial dispute between the parties, the accused were allegedly extending threats of dire consequence. On the same day at about 10:30 p.m., the accused persons, armed with deadly weapons, allegedly trespassed into the complainant's house. It is alleged that on the instigation of co-accused Muhammad Ismail, the present applicant Irfan Ali fired a pistol shot at the complainant, hitting his right thumb and finger. Upon the complainant's cries, the villagers arrived at the scene, whereupon the accused persons fled, resorting to aerial firing.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that all the invoked sections are compoundable under the law and that the complainant/injured Fazl-ur-Rehman has sworn an affidavit expressing no objection to the confirmation of bail and signifying his intention to effect a lawful compromise

before the trial court. He therefore urges that the applicant, being no longer required for custodial interrogation, merits confirmation of the interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted.

4. Learned DPG for the State, while not opposing the request, has fairly conceded that in view of the complainant's affidavit of no objection, the case is one fit for confirmation of pre-arrest bail.

5. Having considered the submissions of both learned counsel and examined the record, it is manifest that all the charged offences are compoundable in nature. The complainant himself has filed a duly sworn affidavit, not only raising no objection to the grant of bail but also declaring his intention to move a formal compromise application before the trial court. In these circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by recalling the concession earlier extended to the applicant.

6. Accordingly, this bail application is allowed, and the interim pre-arrest bail granted to the applicant on 25.09.2025 is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

**J U D G E**