

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI
Criminal Bail Applications No. 2585 of 2025

Before:

Justice Zafar Ahmed Rajput, CJ

Justice Jan Ali Junejo

Applicant : Parveen w/o. Shafique Ahmed,
through M/s. Muhammad Bilal Bhatti & Jam
Shahid Iqbal, advocates.

Respondent : The State, through Mr. Dur Muhammad Shah,
DAG.

Complainant : Moazzam Ali s/o. Gul Hassan Qureshi, through
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Talreja, advocate.

Date of hearing : 02.12.2025
Date of order : 02.12.2025

ORDER

ZAFAR AHMED RAJPUT, CJ:- Having been rejected her application for grant of post-arrest bail, vide order dated 11.09.2025, passed by the Special Court (Offences in Banks) Sindh at Karachi (“**Trial Court**”) in Case No. 20 of 2025, arisen out of FIR No. 361 of 2025 registered at PS Qassimabad, Hyderabad under sections 419, 420, 468, 471, 34, PPC applicant, Parveen w/o. Shafique Ahmed, through instant Crl. Bail Application seeks the same relief from this Court.

2. Brief facts of the case, as narrated in the FIR lodged by the complainant Moazzam Ali s/o. Gul Hassan Qureshi, Operation Manager, Faysal Bank, Naseem Nagar branch, Hyderabad on 29.05.2025 are that, on the said date at about 1445 hours three women entered into the bank premises intending to deposit Rs. 15,000 in a joint account held under the name of Samreen Khan and Amna Jamaluddin; however, their biometric verification failed and their biometric data was found to be fraudulent. On inquiry with the head office it revealed that the said three women were allegedly involved in substantial frauds at other branches, including a fraud of Rs.44,775,000 committed at the Gulshan Chorangi Branch and Rs.762,681 at the Nazimabad Branch. On query, one woman disclosed her name as Samreen Khan w/o Muhammad Mateen Khan, another woman who produced a

CNIC of Amna w/o Jamaluddin² disclosed her real name as Parveen w/o Shafiq Ahmed (applicant), while the third one identified herself as Noshin w/o Khalil Rehman Siddiqui . All three women in connivance with each other by using CNIC of Amna w/o Jamaluddin committed fraud; hence, the instant FIR was lodged. Subsequently, the investigation was transferred to FIA CBC, Karachi.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case; that no direct or indirect evidence is available with the prosecution to connect the applicant with the commission of alleged offence; that the first IO submitted interim challan on 26.08.2025, subsequently on 11.09.2025 investigation was transferred to FIA CBC, Karachi; however, till date final challan has not been submitted before the Trial Court; that the alleged offence does not fall within the prohibitory clause of section 497, Cr.P.C.; that the applicant is aged about 69 years, who is confined in judicial custody since day of her arrest i.e. 29.05.2025; that co-accused Noshin has already been granted bail by the Trial Court; as such, on the rule of consistency applicant is also entitled to the same concession.

4. Conversely, learned DAG as well as learned counsel for the complainant have opposed the grant of bail to the applicant by maintaining that she is involved in an offence of financial deception and forgery by impersonating herself as the actual account holder; that the applicant is involved in other cases of like nature; that the Apex Courts of the country have discouraged the concession of bail in such like case; as such, the applicant is not entitled to the concession bail. In support of his contentions, the learned counsel has placed reliance on the cases of *Shameel Ahmed v. The State (2009 SCMR 174)*, *Bashir Ahmed v. The State (PLD 1994 Karachi 462)*, *Malik Muhammad Tahir v. The State and another (2022 SCMR 2040)*, *Syed Hasnain Haider v. The State and another (2021 SCMR 1466)*, *Haji Muhammad Nazir and others v. The State (2008 SCMR 807)*,

Muhammad Imran v. The State and³ others (PLD 2021 Supreme Court 903)
and *Muhammad Siddique v. Imtiaz Begum and others (2002 SCMR 442)*.

5. Heard, record perused.

6.

7. Accordingly, the instant application is allowed and in result thereof the applicant is admitted to post-arrest bail in aforesaid crime/offence subject to furnishing by her solvent surety in the sum of Rs.300,000/- (*Rupees Three Hundred Thousand Only*) and P.R. Bond for like amount to the satisfaction of Trial Court.

8. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the Trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits and if the applicant in any manner tries to misuse the concession of bail, it would be open for the Trial Court to cancel her bail after issuing her the requisite notice.

CHIEF JUSTICE

JUDGE

Athar Zai