

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH
CIRCUIT COURT MIRPURKHAS

Criminal Bail Application No. S-304 of 2025

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
-------------	--------------------------------------

1. For order on office objection.
2. For hearing of main case.

11.02.2026

Mr. Bhooro Mal advocate for the applicant/ accused.

Mr. Ghulam Abbas, D.P.G.

=

Miran Muhammad Shah, J:- The applicant/ accused Ramesh s/o Bughro Bheel seeks post arrest bail in F.I.R No.56 of 2025 registered at P.S Kot Ghulam Muhammad for offence under sections 395, 397 PPC (subsequently section 337-(i), 337-A(iv), 337-F(i), 337-L(2), 337-D PPC after dismissal of his bail application vide Order dated 17-10-2025 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Mirpurkhas.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant contended that applicant/ accused has been falsely implicated in this case due to previous enmity; that name of the applicant/accused does not transpire in the FIR, however allegedly he was identified by the complainant during identification parade but the applicant was already shown to the complainant at police station prior to identification parade, therefore, identification parade did not constitute reasonable ground to connect the applicant/ accused with the alleged offence; no specific role has been assigned to the applicant/ accused except mere presence at the place of incident; the case of the applicant requires further inquiry; hence he prayed for the grant of bail to the applicant.

3. On the other hand, learned D.P.G opposed grant of bail to the applicant while arguing that complainant has identified him during the identification parade before learned Magistrate and alleged offence falls under the prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C.

4. Heard, perused.

5. Record shows that the applicant is not specifically nominated in the F.I.R and one of the co-accused has already been granted bail by the learned trial Court so also co-accused Qasim and Shahmir have been granted bail by this Court. The role assigned to the accused persons in the alleged offence is similar in nature; therefore, rule of consistency is very much applicable to the case of the applicant. Moreso, no recovery of alleged robbed property was made from the possession or pointation of the applicant. Therefore, in such circumstances, the case of the applicant requires further inquiry.

6. In view of above, instant bail application is allowed and applicant/ accused Ramesh s/o Bughro Bheel is admitted to post arrest bail subject to furnishing a solvent surety in the sum of Rs. 50,000/= (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) and P.R.Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned trial court. Needless to mention here that the observation made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not prejudice the case of either party at the trial.

JUDGE

