

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

Criminal Appeal No.S-38 of 2023

Appellant : Mir Zaman @ Mano s/o Abdul Rehman.
Through Mr. Muhammad Hashim Laghari,
advocate

The State : Through Mr. Shahzado Saleem Nahiyoona,
Additional P.G, Sindh.

Criminal Appeal No.S-40 of 2023

Appellant : Sht. Nanjo w/o Jumon Bheel.
Through Mr. Pervez Akhter Talpur, Advocate

The State : Through Mr. Shahzado Saleem Nahiyoona,
Additional P.G, Sindh.

Date of hearing : 16-09-2025

Date of decision : 16-09-2025

JUDGMENT

Amjad Ali Sahito, J;- By this single judgment, I shall decide the fate of the captioned Criminal Appeals preferred by the appellants Mir Zaman @ Mano s/o Abdul Rehman and Sht. Nanjo w/o Jumon Bheel , whereby they have impugned the judgment dated 18-10-2023, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge-I/Model Criminal Trial Court, Umerkot, in Sessions Case No.214/ 2021 (Re. St.Vs. *Mir Zaman @ Mano and another*), vide FIR Crime No.84/2021, registered for the offences punishable under Section 302, 201, 109 PPC at Police Station, Umerkot City, whereby they, for having committed the murder of one Jumon Bheel, were sentenced to suffer imprisonment for life under Section 302(b) PPC r/w section 120-B(i) PPC, with fine of Rs.100,000/- each, and in default thereof, they shall suffer S.I for six months more. The benefit of section 382-B Cr.P.C was extended to the appellant Mir Zaman @ Mano.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 09-07-2021, complainant Smt. Najo lodged a First Information Report (FIR) at Police Station Umerkot City, alleging that she was residing with

her husband, Jumoon Bheel, and their three children at Gulab Colony, Kundi Stop, Taluka, Umerkot. She stated that one Mir Zaman alias Mano Punjabi, a resident of Toori Mori, District Sanghar, who was on visiting terms with her husband, had developed illicit intentions towards her, which she disclosed to her husband. Subsequently, on 14-03-2021, Mir Zaman alias Mano visited their house again. Her husband, Jumoon Bheel, confronted him and asked him not to visit their home anymore. Mir Zaman became annoyed and left. After that incident, her husband went to Umerkot town but did not return home. Despite efforts to trace him, including publishing a missing person notice in newspapers, no information was found. She later obtained the call data record of her husband's mobile number (0346-4805069) for the date 15-03-2021, which indicated that his last known location was in the area of Mir Zaman alias Mano Punjabi. She also received a phone call from her husband's number, but the voice was unclear. Thereafter, along with her brothers Sharif and Mouchar, she continued searching for her husband. Eventually, their relatives Sharif son of Samad and Manji son of Kewal came forward and informed them that on 15-03-2021, at around 03:00 PM, while standing at Teen Talwar Chowk, they saw Mir Zaman, Abdul Rehman, Sattar, Ishfaq, and Leemon Bheel forcibly taking away Jumoon Bheel in a white 2-D car towards Mirpurkhas. When approached, Mir Zaman and Leemon Bheel told them that Jumoon Bheel was with them and would return soon. However, despite repeated requests and efforts through community elders (Nek Mards), her husband did not return. The accused persons kept misleading them and eventually, Mir Zaman threatened her to remain silent, asserting that Jumoon Bheel was with them and challenging her to do whatever she can. Hence Sht. Najo approached the Ex-Officio Justice of Peace, obtained an order, and lodged the present FIR accordingly.

3. After registration of FIR, the police initiated investigation, visited place of incident i.e. Teen Talwar Chowk Umerkot, arrested accused Leemon @ Bheemon and Mir Zaman @ Mano, recorded their statements and on statement of accused Mir Zaman visited

Kanhar Moni Maithrau Canal District Sanghar, got recorded confessional statement of accused Mir Zaman @ Mano under section 164 CrPC, in which accused Mir Zaman @ Mano confessed that he has committed murder of deceased Jumoon Bheel by drowning him in Mithrau Canal District Sanghar at the instruction of Sht. Najo (wife of deceased Jumoon Bheel), as the deceased Jumoon Bheel obstructed their illicit relationship. Later, in light of such confessional statement, the call data record between accused Mir Zaman @ Mano, Sht. Najo and deceased Jumoon was collected. Eventually, the final report under section 173 Cr.P.C was submitted before learned Judicial Magistrate-II, Umerkat who passed an Order dated: 02-10-2021 whereby, the names of co-accused were dropped from the list of accused persons and cognizance was taken against accused Mir Zaman @ Mano for committing murder of deceased Jumoon Bheel and causing disappearance of evidence, while sht. Najo was indicated for abetment and hatching conspiracy to murder of Jumoon Bheel.

4. The necessary case papers were supplied to the accused charge was framed against the appellants, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

5. At trial, the prosecution to prove its' case, examined in all nine (09) witnesses, who had produced numerous documents and then learned Prosecutor closed the prosecution side by filing such statement. Thereafter, statement(s) of the appellant/ accused under section 342 Cr.P.C was recorded wherein they denied the allegations being false and claimed their innocence. According to accused Mir Zaman, his confessional statement was not voluntarily and was recorded due to torture of police. Further, they did not examine themselves on oath as required u/s 340(2) Cr.P.C, nor lead evidence in defence. After hearing learned counsel for both parties, learned trial Court convicted the appellants through impugned judgment, hence these Criminal Appeals.

6. Mr. Muhammad Hashim Laghari, learned counsel for the appellant Mir Zaman @ Mano has argued that impugned judgment of the trial court is challenged as being legally flawed, factually incorrect, and contrary to established principles of criminal justice; that the trial court failed to consider that there was neither direct, nor circumstantial evidence linking the accused to the alleged murder. The prosecution's case is fraught with serious legal and procedural irregularities that undermine its credibility. The FIR was lodged after an unexplained delay of over four months, raising doubts about its authenticity. He has further argued that no dead body of the alleged deceased was ever recovered, further weakening the prosecution's claim. It is further submitted that the confessional statement of the accused, Mir Zaman, is inadmissible as it was recorded without oath, without attaching his photograph to the IO's application, and under circumstances suggesting coercion and torture. He has further argued that the learned magistrate acknowledged visible signs of violence on the accused, but failed to order a medical examination. Furthermore, the accused's confession appears to have been induced by the illegal detention of his relatives, who were released only after he confessed. The accused was also kept in unlawful custody before being formally shown as arrested. Procedural safeguards required at the time of recording the confession were not followed, particularly the failure to inform the accused that he would not be returned to police custody regardless of whether he confessed. Furthermore, he argued that the call detail record (CDR) relied upon by the prosecution is inadmissible as it was not obtained through lawful means, is neither authenticated nor linked to the accused or deceased, and contradicts the prosecution's case by placing key witnesses in a different location at the time of the alleged incident. Additionally, the entire initial investigation, including arrest and registration procedures, was conducted by an officer not legally authorized to investigate a murder case, rendering the proceedings void under the law. Moreover, the original complainant herself had earlier declared her husband missing due to mental illness in a public

notice, which contradicts the later claim of murder and casts serious doubt on the occurrence of the alleged crime. The prosecution witnesses did not support the case; their statements were inconsistent and contradictory, further eroding the credibility of the prosecution's version. Furthermore it is submitted that despite serious doubts and gaps in the evidence, the trial court failed to apply the golden rule of criminal jurisprudence that the benefit of doubt must go to the accused. He further argued that the trial court misread and overlooked material evidence, acted with bias, and convicted the accused based on presumptions and conjectures rather than solid proof. During course of arguments learned counsel has produced newspaper daily Kawish Hyderabad wherein it is mentioned that wife of deceased had also given publication regarding missing of deceased Jumon/her husband. Lastly he prayed for acquittal of the appellant Mir Zaman @ Mano. In support of his contentions he has relied upon cases of Muhammad Hashim and others v. The State and others (2023 YLR 1768), Azeem Khan and another v. Muhammad Khan and others (2016 SCMR 274), Akbar alias Mohsin v. The State and another (2023 P Cr. L J 917), Mian Khalid Perviz v. The State through Special Prosecutor ANF and another (2021 SCMR 522), Muhammad Siddique and others v. The State (2021 SCMR 1409), Adnan Pervaiz and another v. The State and another (2022 YLR 2259), Jabir Ali Shah v. Babar Ali Shah and another (2021 YLR Note 44), Shamsuddin and another v. Muhammad Asif and another (2023 YLR Note 54), Akhtar Zaib v. The State (2019 PCr.LJ 1014), Saleem Iqbal and another v. Muhammad Ashiq and others (2020 MLD 2039), Tariq and others v. The State (2013 PCr.LJ 1786), Tahir Sarwar alias Shahab and others v. The State and others (2007 PCr.LJ 1682), Suleman v. The State (2006 SCMR 366), Abdul Latif v. The State (PLJ 1999 SC 264), Gul Sher and another v. The State (1998 PCr.LJ 1274), Mian Khalid Perviz v. The State through Special Prosecutor ANF and another (2021 SCMR 522), Muhammad Israr and another v. The State (2002 PCr.LJ 1072), Abdul Jabbar v. The State (1995 PCr.LJ 159), Muhammad Shafiq v. The State and another (2003

YLR 1481), Sharif v. The State (2000 PCr.LJ 562) and Qadir Bakhsh v. The State (2021 PCr.LJ 1169).

7. Mr. Mir Pervez Akhter Talpur, learned counsel for the appellant Sht. Nanjo has argued that the impugned judgment of the trial court is challenged on the grounds that it is the result of misreading and non-reading of evidence, and is not sustainable under the law. The key argument is that there is no direct or admissible evidence against the appellant, who is in fact the original complainant in the case. The body of the alleged deceased (Jumoon Bheel) has not been recovered, and thus the nature and cause of death remain unconfirmed. He further argued that the confessional statement of the co-accused Mir Zaman, which forms the sole basis of the appellant's conviction, is alleged to have been recorded under coercion and without fulfilling legal formalities. It is further argued that such a statement, under the Qanoon-e-Shahadat Order, 1979, is inadmissible against a co-accused and cannot be the basis for conviction, especially in a capital offence. The confessor allegedly had enmity with the appellant, as she had earlier filed an FIR against him for her husband's kidnapping. Learned counsel further argued that appellant Nanjo has been maliciously implicated due to political influence and that the prosecution produced no independent, corroborative, or scientific evidence, such as DNA, call recordings, or eyewitness accounts to support any allegations of her involvement or illicit relationship with the co-accused. He further argued that the flaws cited in the trial include the Easy-Paisa and call data records were unauthenticated and not lawfully obtained. These records were not presented to the appellant for explanation during her statement under Section 342 Cr.P.C, rendering them inadmissible. There was a jurisdictional error, as the alleged offence occurred in another district, making the proceedings before the Umerkot court invalid. The trial court ignored that no charge regarding illicit relations was framed, nor was any such claim supported by admissible evidence. He has further argued that the prosecution case is riddled with reasonable doubt, lacks a complete chain of evidence, and rests solely on a confession

obtained under suspicious circumstances. The conviction, therefore, is based on presumptions and conjecture, not on solid legal grounds. He further argued that the judgment shows a clear non-application of judicial mind, the trial court acted beyond its jurisdiction, and the conviction should be set aside due to lack of credible, lawful, and sufficient evidence. He lastly prayed for acquittal of the appellant Sht. Nanjo. In support of his contentions, he has relied upon the cases of Mst Asiya v. The State and another (2023 SCMR 383), Jamshaid alias Bablu and others v. The State and another (2022 YLR 1822), Muhammad Parvaiz v. The State through Additional Advocate General, K.P.K and another (2019 YLR 2213), Atta Ul Mustafa v. The State and another (2023 SCMR 1698), Asif Mahmood v. The State (2005 SCMR 515), Sheral alias Sher Muhammad v. The State (1999 SCMR 697), Muhammad Shah v. The State (2010 SCMR 1009), Mohammad Noman and 2 others v. The State (2018 P Cr. L J 1100), Muhammad Fazil v. The State (2016 P Cr. L J 844) and Azeem Khan and another v. Muhammad Khan and others (2016 SCMR 274).

8. While, refuting the above contentions, the learned Additional Prosecutor General, appearing for the State argued that there was illicit terms in between the appellants, which were admitted by the appellant Mir Zaman @ Mano in his confessional statement under section 164 Cr.P.C and deceased Jumon Bheel came into knowledge about their illicit relationship and due to save themselves the appellants with collusion of each other made conspiracy and appellant Mir Zaman @ Mano had brutally murdered the deceased Jumon Bheel by drowning him in Mithrau Canal District Sanghar at the instruction of Sht. Najo (wife of deceased Jumoon Bheel), as the deceased Jumoon Bheel obstructed their illicit relationship. Later, in light of such confessional statement, the call data record between accused Mir Zaman @ Mano, Sht. Najo and deceased Jumoon was collected, which connects the appellants with the commission of heinous offence. The appellants have committed pre-planned and intentional murder of the deceased. He has further argued that

the no material contradiction and discrepancy is pointed out by the learned defence counsel to show their false implication in this case, therefore, in such circumstances, the learned trial Court has rightly awarded the conviction and sentence to the appellants. He lastly prayed for dismissal of the instant appeal.

9. I have heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and have gone through the evidence as well as record with their able assistance.

10. Upon a careful examination of the material available on record, it transpires that the prosecution's case is primarily founded upon the confessional statement of the appellant Mir Zaman alias Mano, coupled with digital evidence in the form of Call Data Record (CDR) reflecting communication between the appellant/accused Mir Zaman alias Mano, the co-appellant/accused Mst. Nanjo, and the deceased Jumoon. This evidence is further supported by circumstantial material.

11. From a perusal of the record, it further appears that the First Information Report (FIR) was lodged by the complainant/accused Sht. Nanjo (Ex. 9-B) for missing of her husband Jumoo Bheel/deceased after an unexplained delay of approximately four months. It is also evident from the contents of the FIR that the complainant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence and merely reported the disappearance of her husband/deceased, for which she had also caused a publication to be made in the Daily Kawish newspaper.

12. Inasmuch as the judicial confession allegedly made by the appellant Mir Zaman alias Mano constitutes a material piece of evidence relied upon by the prosecution, it is appropriate to examine and determine its evidentiary value in the first instance.

13. In view of the High Court Rules prescribing a binding procedure for the observance of necessary precautions and the requirements mandated under Section 364 read with Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, it is now a well-settled principle of law that, prior to the recording of a confession,

particularly in cases involving capital punishment, the Recording Magistrate is duty-bound to strictly adhere to all such mandatory safeguards.

14. The underlying rationale of these requirements is to ensure that any fear or influence instilled in the mind of the accused by the investigating agency is completely dispelled, and that the accused is fully assured that, if he is not guilty or does not wish to make a voluntary confession, he will not be remanded back into police custody. After the initial caution is administered, the accused must be afforded adequate time for reflection. Upon the expiry of such time, the Magistrate is required to administer a second caution and provide further assurance to the accused that he is now in safe and independent custody.

15. During this process, all police officials, whether in uniform or in plain clothes, including any person attached to the Court, must remain outside the courtroom and beyond the view of the accused. Only after ensuring strict compliance with these legal prerequisites, and if the accused still expresses a willingness to confess, should the Magistrate proceed to put all the requisite questions prescribed under the High Court Rules and record the answers in the exact words spoken by the accused.

16. In the event that the accused is illiterate and the confession is recorded in a language other than his own, such as Urdu or English, the recorded statement must, upon completion, be read over and explained to the accused in a language he fully understands. Thereafter, the Magistrate must issue the certificate required under Section 364, Cr.P.C., duly signed and sealed, attesting to the compliance with these procedural safeguards. The accused shall then be remanded to judicial custody, and at no stage of these proceedings shall he be handed back to any police official, whether a person in uniform or any other member of the police force, as any such lapse would materially compromise the voluntary character of the confession.

17. In the present case, the Recording Magistrate, PW-9 Mr. Rasool Bux, failed to observe the minimum safeguards mandated by law. He neither administered a second warning to the accused nor ensured or confirmed that the accused was in safe and independent custody at the time of recording the alleged confession. The record reflects that the appellant/accused, Mir Zaman alias Mano, was arrested on 14.07.2021, and his confessional statement was recorded on 19.07.2021, after a delay of approximately seven days. However, the appellant contends that he was in fact arrested on 12.07.2021 and remained in unlawful custody for about two days prior to the officially recorded date of arrest.

18. It is particularly noteworthy that, during the recording of the confessional statement, the learned Magistrate posed the question to the appellant, "Have you been beaten, tortured, or subjected to maltreatment by the police?" to which the appellant replied in the negative. Another question was put to him as to whether any of his family members, relatives, or any female had been detained by the police to pressurize him into confessing, to which he again replied in the negative. However, while later recording his own evidence, the learned Magistrate admitted that when the appellant Mir Zaman was produced before him, he observed visible signs of maltreatment, including marks of violence on the appellant's buttocks.

19. Furthermore, the learned Magistrate also admitted that following the recording of the appellant's confessional statement, the names of the appellant's father, brother, and uncle were placed in Column No. 02 of the police report. He voluntarily stated, *"It is a fact that after the confessional statement of accused Mir Zaman, the names of his father, brother, and uncle were placed in Column No. 02. **Voluntarily say; the complainant of the same crime, Mst. Najo, was charged as an accused by me.**"*

20. Initially, the FIR was lodged by Mst. Nanjo; however, the learned Magistrate subsequently admitted that he had himself ordered her to be arrayed as an accused. Such action of

implicating Mst. Nanjo as an accused was manifestly beyond the jurisdiction of the learned Magistrate, as he was not vested with any authority to insert or delete the name of any person in the police report submitted under Section 173, Cr.P.C. It is exclusively the prerogative of the Investigating Officer/Station House Officer to add or omit the name of any person in the police report. Moreover, no court, including the High Court, is vested with the power to override the statutory command and direct the Station House Officer either to withhold the investigation report (challan) or to submit it in a particular manner, whether against specific persons as desired by the court or with respect to only such offences as the court may wish. Reliance is place in the case of ***Muhammad Nasir v. Mazhar Javaid (2007 PLD Supreme Court 31)***.

21. In light of the foregoing circumstances, it stands established that the confessional statement of the appellant/accused Mir Zaman was not recorded in conformity with the mandatory legal safeguards intended to ensure its voluntariness and authenticity. The omission of the Recording Magistrate to administer the requisite second warning, his failure to ascertain and satisfy himself that the accused was in safe and independent custody, coupled with his own admission of having observed visible marks of violence on the person of the accused at the time of his production before the Court, gravely impair the credibility of the purported confession. Furthermore, the subsequent insertion of the names of the appellant's close relatives in Column No. 02 of the police report, following the recording of the confessional statement, further reinforces doubts regarding the voluntariness and genuineness of the said statement.

22. Accordingly, the confessional statement cannot be treated as having been made free from coercion or undue influence and, as such, lacks the evidentiary worth required to safely form the basis of a conviction. Reliance is placed upon the dictum laid down in *Azeem Khan and others v. Mujahid Khan and others* (2016 SCMR 274).

23. The cell phone call data produced by the prosecution is of no evidentiary value for multiple reasons. Firstly, no voice recording or transcript of the alleged calls has been brought on record. Secondly, the data does not disclose the specific locations or areas from which the calls were made. Most significantly, the prosecution has failed to furnish conclusive proof establishing that the cell phone in question belonged to the accused or that the SIM card was registered in his name.

24. It is further observed that only a photocopy of the Call Data Record (CDR) pertaining to the relevant SIM numbers was produced as part of the prosecution's evidence. Neither any officer or employee of the concerned telecommunication company nor a CDR duly certified or attested by the said company was produced. Admittedly, no permission was obtained from the competent court to tender such photocopies as secondary evidence. The allegation that the appellant Mir Zaman transferred various amounts to the account of Mst. Nanjo is similarly unsupported, as the purported transaction statement presented by the Investigating Officer during his testimony is unauthenticated, neither signed nor stamped by the relevant company, nor verified by any authorized officer or representative.

25. It is a well-settled principle of law that a CDR, by itself, does not constitute conclusive evidence to establish the guilt of an accused. Mere production of call data, unaccompanied by a transcript or end-to-end audio recording of the conversations, cannot be treated as reliable evidence. The Investigating Officer candidly admitted that he neither produced any transcript of the CDR nor established that the relevant mobile number was registered in the name of co-accused Mst. Nanjo. He further conceded that the mobile phones of the accused Mir Zaman, co-accused Mst. Nanjo, and the deceased Jumoon Bheel were never recovered. Additionally, he failed to record the statements of any Easypaisa operators or any person who could confirm that the SIM card registered in the name of one Altaf was actually being used by Mir Zaman.

26. In view of these deficiencies, this piece of evidence is wholly inconclusive, fails to connect the accused with the alleged offence in any manner, and is of no assistance to the prosecution. Reference in this context may be made to the judgments reported as *Azeem Khan v. Mujahid Khan* (2016 SCMR 274), *Rehmatullah v. The State* (2024 SCMR 1782), *Khalid Perviz v. The State* (2021 SCMR 522), as well as the unreported judgments of the Honourable Supreme Court of Pakistan in *Sikandar Ali Lashari* (Crl. As. 343 & 344/2023) and *Muhammad Irfan Khan @ Faheem* (Crl. A. 345/2023).

27. Upon a careful perusal of the testimony of the prosecution witnesses, namely Manji and Shareef, it emerges that they merely stated that they were present at Teen Talwar Chowk, Umerkot, where they observed a white-colored car in which the accused persons—Mir Zaman Punjabi, Ishfaq Punjabi, Abdul Rehman Punjabi, Sattar Punjabi, and Leemon Bheel, were traveling along with the deceased, Jumoon Bheel, proceeding in the direction of Mirpurkhas. Beyond this observation, the said witnesses did not depose to any fact relating to the alleged incident, nor did they state that they had seen the accused Mir Zaman committing the murder of the deceased Jumoon Bheel. It is further significant to note that none of the prosecution witnesses testified to the existence of any prior relationship or visiting terms between the accused Mir Zaman and the deceased, or that the accused was accustomed to visiting the residence of the deceased.

28. In light of the foregoing, it is manifest that the testimony of prosecution witnesses Manji and Shareef does not directly implicate the accused Mir Zaman in the commission of the alleged murder. Their evidence is confined to the fact of having last seen the accused and the deceased together in a vehicle, which, at the highest, establishes a circumstance of “last seen together.” However, no direct evidence has been produced placing the accused at the scene of the crime or establishing his participation in the act of murder. The absence of any evidence of prior relations or association between the accused and the deceased

further enfeebles the prosecution's case. Consequently, the evidence adduced is insufficient to prove the guilt of the accused beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt.

29. The upshot of the above discussion is that the complainant/prosecution has miserably failed to bring home the guilt of the appellants beyond reasonable doubt and it is a settled proposition of law that for giving the benefit of the doubt to an accused there doesn't need to be many circumstances creating doubts if there is a single circumstance which creates reasonable doubt about the guilt of the accused, then the accused will be entitled to the benefit. In this respect, reliance can be placed upon the case of **MUHAMMAD MANSHA v. THE STATE reported in 2018 SCMR 772**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that:

“4. Needless to mention that while giving the benefit of doubt to an accused it is not necessary that there should be many circumstances creating doubt. If there is a circumstance which creates reasonable doubt in a prudent mind about the guilt of the accused, then the accused would be entitled to be benefit of such doubt, not as a matter of grace and concession, but as a matter of right. It is based on the maxim, “it is better than one innocent person be convicted”. Reliance in this behalf can be made upon the cases of Tarique Parvez v. The State (1995 SCMR 1345), Ghulam Qadir and 2 others v. The State (2008 SCMR 1221), Mohammad Akram v. The State (2009 SCMR 230) and Mohammad Zaman v. The State (2014 SCMR 749).”

30. In view of what has been discussed above, the above captioned criminal appeals were allowed vide short order date 16.09.2025 and the impugned judgment dated 18.10.2023 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I/Model Criminal Trial Court, Umerkot in Sessions Case No.214/2021 (The State v. Mir Zaman @ Mano and another) being outcome of crime No.84/2021 registered at PS Umerkot City under sections 302, 201, 109 PPC were set aside and the appellants namely Mir Zaman @ Mano and Sht. Nanjo were acquitted of the charge. Appellants were in jail,

they shall be released forthwith, if they are not required in any other custody case. These are the reasons of short order dated **16.09.2025.**

JUDGE

“Adnan Ashraf Nizamani”