

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, MIRPURKHAS

CrI. Bail Application No.S-28 of 2026

Applicants: 1. Abdul Ghaffar s/o Gul Muhammad
2. Asad s/o Khamiso Khan
Through Mr. Shoukat Ali Rahimoon

Respondent: The State.
Through Mr. Neel Parkash Deputy P.G

Date of Hearing: 10.02.2026

Date of Order: 10.02.2026

ORDER

Miran Muhammad Shah, J: Through this Bail Application, the applicants/accused Abdul Ghaffar and Asad seek post-arrest bail in Crime No.02/2026 for offence under sections 324, 353, 224, 225, 504, 337-A(i), 337-F(i), 337-H(ii), 114, 147, 148, 149 PPC of P.S Dilbar Khan Mahar, after dismissal of their bail plea by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Mirpurkhas vide order dated 22.01.2026.

2. Learned counsel for the applicants contends that applicants/accused are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case with malafide intention due to personal grudge of PC Aijaz; that alleged recovery from present applicants/accused at the time of their arrest is totally falsified and concocted as no such alleged item was recovered from the applicants/accused; that applicants/accused fired shots but surprisingly no one had sustained fire shot injury, hence, section 324 is mis-applied and requires further inquiry; that all prosecution's witnesses are police officials and there is no independent witness of alleged incident. He prayed for grant of bail to applicants/accused.

3. Learned Deputy P.G for State has submitted that as per medical record, there is no injury on the person of injured.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for applicants/accused as well as learned Deputy P.G for State and have perused the record. As per contention of learned counsel for present applicants/accused no role has been attributed to present applicant/accused in the commission of the offence as per the contents of FIR. All the sections areailable while ingredient of section 324 PPC are not attracted. Even as per contention of learned D.P.G no one has been injured as per medical record, which clearly transpires that onlyailable offence is committed. Only due to

enmity of PC Aijaz Ali they were falsely implicated in this case and said PC Aijaz Ali is also one of mashir in this case. Moreover, in another case, the applicant/accused Abdul Ghaffar is already granted bail by the learned Civil Judge and Judicial Magistrate-II, Mirprukhas vide order dated 22.01.2026.

5. In such circumstances, applicants/accused are granted post-arrest bail, subject to furnishing a solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousand only) each and PR Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of Trial Court.

The CrI. Bail Application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Chander Kumar

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

Crl. Bail Application No.D-18 of 2025
Crl. Bail Application No.D-33 of 2025

DATE ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE

10.02.2026

Mr. Afzal Karim, advocate for applicant/accused Amir Qureshi in Crl. B.A No.D-18/2025

Mr. Rao Faisal Ali, advocate for applicants/accused Ashfaque and Muhammad Asif in Crl. B.A No.D-33/2025

Mr. Ghulam Abbas Dalwani, Deputy Prosector General Sindh

≡

We have heard learned counsels for both the parties as well as learned D.P.G. The reasons to be recorded later on, both bail applications are dismissed with directions to the learned trial Court to conclude trial within a period of thirty (30) days. Copy of this order be kept in connected bail application.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Chander Kumar

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, MIRPURKHAS**Crl. Bail Application No.S-407 of 2025**

Applicants: Ali Sher & Abdul Latif both sons of Jamal
Through Mr. Shoukat Ali Rahimoon, Advocate.

Respondent: The State.
Through Mr. Dhani Bux Mari, A.P.G.

Date of Hearing: 03.02.2026

Date of Order: 03.02.2026

ORDER

Miran Muhammad Shah, J: Through this Bail Application, the applicants/accused Ali Sher and Abdul Latif seek pre-arrest bail in Crime No.273/2025 for offence under sections 337-F(i), 337-F(vi), L-ii, 114, 506(2), 504, 147, 148, 149 PPC of P.S Khipro, after dismissal of their bail plea by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-, Khipro, vide order dated 19.12.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the applicants contends that admittedly there is dispute between the parties over landed property, due to which applicants/accused have been booked in this FIR with malafide intention; that the FIR is delayed for about 02 days without any plausible explanation; that all the sections are bailable except 506(ii) PPC and do not fall within prohibitory clause of section 497(i) Cr.P.C; that co-accused Mehrab has been granted bail by learned trial Court as such applicants/accused are also entitled for same leniency. Lastly, he prayed for confirmation of pre-arrest bail. He relied upon case laws reported in 2023 SCMR 1243, 2021 SCMR 130, 2021 SCMR 2086, 2017 PLD 73 SC, 2025 MLD 1196, 2025 YLR 1954 and 2018 YLR 204.

3. Learned A.P.G for the State, assisted by learned counsel for complainant have opposed for the grant of bail on the ground that applicants are nominated in the F.I.R and they have actively participated in the alleged offence.

4. Heard learned counsels for both the parties as well as learned A.P.G for the State and perused the record.

5. The injuries caused by both the applicants/accused were on non-vital part of body and as per medical report injuries caused through hard

blunt substance. Enmity is admitted by the prosecution, hence, malafide cannot be ruled out. All the sections applied do not fall within prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C and such like situation it is to be determined at the time of trial as to who caused injury to the applicants/accused. One of the co-accused Mehrab with similar role has been granted bail by learned trial Court vide order dated 19.12.2025. The matter has already been challaned and case is fixed for trial before learned trial Court.

6. In such circumstances, I am inclined to confirm the bail of present applicants/accused, and ad-interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicants vide order dated 23.12.2025 is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

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

Chander Kumar