

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI
Cr. B.A. No.158 of 2026
(Syed Azeemuddin Afaque Ahmed vs. The State)

For hearing of bail application

Date of hearing

& order **23.02.2026**

Mr. Javed Ahmed Chattari, advocate for applicant

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Talerja, advocate for complainant/bank

Ms. Shazia Hanjra, DAG a/w Umair, IO, FIA CBC, Karachi

ORDER

Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro, J:- Applicant, is seeking post arrest bail in a case bearing Crime No.10/2025, u/s 409, 419, 420, 468, 471,477-A, 109, 34 PPC, registered at Police Station FIA Commercial Bank Circle, Karachi, by means of this application.

2. Applicant was Head of Robotics and Cognitive Sciences Department in Habib Bank, when as per FIR a scam causing loss to the tune of Rs.1.275 billion to HBL was unearthed. Allegations against the applicant are that he along with other main accused created a dummy company under the name and style as M/s. R.T. Solutions (Private) Ltd. purportedly being maintained by Shell Company but actually operated by them. This company was issued tenders for providing internet based BOTs, software programs to the bank for running computer programs.

3. In the investigation, applicant was found to be one of beneficiaries as allegedly Rs.13.8 million was transferred to the account of his brother-in-law, while Rs.3.76 million were found transferred to his wife's account, which he could not justify. Furthermore, he was found to have purchased three plots, he was also found to have traveled abroad with his family and to have made a payment of Rs.1.25 crore to a Travel Agent in this regard. Hence, he was arrested and is currently in judicial custody. The challan has been meanwhile submitted against him.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant has pleaded that CEO of the said fake company has been granted bail; there is no evidence showing applicant is beneficiary of the alleged scam; applicant has nothing to do with the scam as he was Head of Robotic and Cognitive Department, and not the one who awarded tenders to the company, rule of consistency is applicable; that there is no evidence that he has purchased properties; that one of the plots was purchased by him on bank loan.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Bank has submitted that from the investigation conducted so far, applicant has been found to be the main accused and beneficiary of alleged scam, who along with other main accused had created a dummy company in the name of an employ (Naib Qasid) of another company, who was being paid a salary of Rs.37000/- per month and was not even aware of creation of any company in his name. This fact was confirmed in the investigation and therefore, on the basis thereof, that peon was granted bail.

6. Learned Deputy Attorney General has opposed bail and has briefly explained the manner in which the alleged scam was executed, including how the company was created by applicant and other main accused and the Bank was allegedly cheated. The Investigating Officer has also confirmed the allegations against the applicant.

7. We have gone through the available material on record and heard the parties. We are of the view that there are reasonable grounds to believe that applicant is involved in the commission of alleged offence. There are bank statements on record *prima facie* showing a money trail in his wife's and brother-in-law's bank accounts, which have not been *prima facie* explained by him. More so, during the course of further investigation, the other evidence has surfaced connecting the applicant. He has been found, for example, to travel abroad with his entire family and making huge payments to travel agent; purchasing properties, etc. Learned defence counsel's claim that there is no evidence against the applicant is not spot on, the documentary evidence is available on record *prima facie* showing his involvement in the alleged offence. The role of co-accused, who has been granted bail, is on different footing, hence, the rule of consistency is not applicable.

8. Therefore, we do not find the applicant entitled to concession of post-arrest bail. Consequently, this bail application is dismissed. However, applicant would be at liberty to move afresh bail application before the trial Court after examination of material witnesses.

Bail application stands disposed of in the above terms. The observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not prejudice case of either party at trial.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Rafiq/PA.