

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

Criminal Bail Application No.S-242 of 2025

Applicant: Ranjhan s/o Hajan.
Through Mr. Noor Muhammad Rind,
Advocate.

Respondent: The State through Mr. Neel Parkash, Deputy
Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Complainant: Ibrahim (Called absent)

Date of hearing: **30.09.2025**

Date of Order: **30.09.2025**

O R D E R.

AMJAD ALI SAHITO, J:- Through this bail application, the applicant/accused above named seeks his pre-arrest bail in Crime No.39 of 2025, under sections 302, 201, 149 PPC, registered at P.S Shahdadpur, after his bail plea was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Shahdadpur.

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

3. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused contended that the alleged occurrence is unwitnessed and unseen, thereby rendering the presence of the applicant/accused at the place of incident doubtful. It was further submitted that the First Information Report was lodged after an unexplained delay of approximately two months. Counsel added that the applicant/accused has already joined the investigation and is no longer required for further inquiry. Hence, confirmation of pre-arrest bail was prayed.

4. On 19.09.2025, interim pre-arrest bail was

granted to the applicant/accused, and notice was issued to the complainant. On the subsequent date of hearing, the complainant remained absent, whereupon notice was reissued; however, he again failed to appear. Conversely, the learned Deputy Prosecutor General vehemently opposed the confirmation of pre-arrest bail and prayed for its dismissal.

5. Arguments heard and record perused.

6. From the perusal of the record, it transpires that the incident is unwitnessed and unseen, and the FIR was lodged by the complainant after an unexplained delay of about two months. Although the name of the applicant/accused appears in the FIR, the complainant therein has specifically named Altaf @ Alu, Saifal @ Jabal, Ranjho, Manak, and three unknown persons. No specific role, however, has been attributed to the present applicant Ranjhan. The medical certificate reflects that the deceased sustained only a single firearm injury. Furthermore, it remains to be established, upon recording of evidence, whether the applicant/accused was present at the place of occurrence. Learned counsel for the applicant has also alleged mala fides on the part of the complainant.

7. In light of the foregoing, the learned counsel for the applicant has succeeded in making out a case for confirmation of bail under subsection (2) of Section 497, Cr.P.C. Consequently, the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicant/accused is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

8. 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 applicants on merits.

JUDGE