

**HIGH COURT OF SINDH CIRCUIT COURT
MIRPURKHAS**

Criminal Bail Application No.S-48 of 2026

Applicant: Amolakh Das s/o Sotiyo Meghwar.
Through Mr. Ali Sher Baloch, Advocate.

Respondent: The State
Through Mr. Ghulam Abbas Dalwani,
Deputy Prosecutor General Sindh.

Complainant: Shahnawaz (called absent).

Date of Hearing: 16.03.2026

Date of Order: 16.03.2026

<><><><>

ORDER

Miran Muhammad Shah, J-: Through instant bail application, the applicant/accused namely Amolakh Das seeks post arrest bail in crime No.75 of 2023 for the offences under sections 489-F, 420, 506(i), 34 PPC registered at PS Town Mirpurkhas, after dismissal of his bail plea by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Mirpurkhas, vide order dated 28.01.2026.

2. The details and particulars of the F.I.R are already available in bail application and the F.I.R, as such, need not to reproduce the same hereunder.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused submits that the applicant/accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case; that there is a delay of more than one month in the registration of the F.I.R.; that the co-accused has already been granted bail, therefore, the rule of consistency fully attracts; and that the alleged offences do not fall within the prohibitory clause. Lastly, he prayed for

the grant of bail. In support of his contentions, he has placed reliance on the case of *Aqeel Ahmed Khan v. The State through Federal Prosecutor General and another* reported in 2025 SCMR 1955.

4. Learned D.P.G has vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the applicant/accused and prayed for its dismissal.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant/accused as well as learned D.P.G for the State and perused the record.

6. From the perusal of the record, it transpires from the F.I.R. that a dispute had taken place over the sale and purchase of a tractor, and the parties had entered into an agreement, and the applicant/accused arranged the tractor for the complainant, which was provided to the complainant through a co-accused, who has already been granted bail. However, the learned counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted an agreement wherein it is stated that the complainant has received the amount for which a cheque was issued to him, which he allegedly dishonoured and thereby resulted in the present case. It is further contended that the compromise between the parties appears to have been effected, as reflected from the complainant's continuous absence in the case, which suggests that settlement has already been made between the parties. However, at present the applicant/accused is behind the bar and the case has already been challaned before the learned Court. Reliance is placed on the case of *Aqeel Ahmed Khan v. The State through Federal Prosecutor General and another* reported in 2025 SCMR 1955, wherein the Honourable Supreme Court of Pakistan granted bail. In such circumstances, I grant post-arrest bail to the applicant subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) and a P.R. bond in the like amount to the

satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

7. The observations made here-in-above are tentative in nature and would not prejudice the case of either party at the trial.

The application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Adnan Ashraf Nizamani