

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

Criminal Bail Appln. No. S-701 of 2025

Applicant	Jeeand @ Mohammad Jeeand son of Sarwar @ Ghulam Sarwar
	Mr. Habibullah G. Ghouri, advocate
Complainant	Ahmed Khan (In person)
The State	Mr. Aitbar Ali Bullo, D.P.G for the State
Date of hearing	05-01-2026
Date of order	05-01-2026

O R D E R

MIRAN MUHAMMAD SHAH, J. - Through instant Criminal Bail application, applicant/accused Jeeand @ Mohammad Jeean seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.14/2025, for offence U/S 395, 396, 302 P.P.C registered with Police Station, Garhi Yasin, after rejection of his bail plea by the learned trial court vide order dated 26.11.2025.

2. The facts of the prosecution case are that on 15.02.2025 at about 06:00 p.m., at Mungar Wah Mori situated on the top of Khirthar Canal, the applicant/accused along with co-accused persons, all duly armed with deadly weapons and acting in furtherance of their common intention, committed dacoity of cash and mobile phones from the complainant party, and during the course of such dacoity caused the murder of Muhammad Younis by firing shots.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant/accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the parties have amicably settled their dispute outside the Court and that the complainant Ahmed Khan as well as P.Ws Ali Dost and Wali Muhammad have filed their affidavits expressing no objection to the grant of bail in favour of the present applicant/accused. In support of his contention, learned

counsel for the applicant has placed reliance upon the case of *Muhammad Najeeb v. The State (2009 SCMR 448)*.

4. Learned D.P.G. has opposed the grant of bail on the ground that the sections involved in the offence are non-compoundable, except the offence under Section 302 P.P.C.

5. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned D.P.G., the complainant in person, and perused the material available on record.

6. In the cited case, *Muhammad Najeeb v. The State (2009 SCMR 448)*, the bail was granted to the applicant/accused on the ground that the complainant had sworn his affidavit stating that he did not wish to pursue the matter and had no objection to the grant of bail to the accused.

7. In the present case as well, the complainant Ahmed Khan and P.Ws Ali Dost and Wali Muhammad have raised no objection to the grant of bail and have filed their affidavits accordingly. In view of the case law relied upon by the learned counsel for the applicant, wherein bail was granted even in a non-compoundable offence on the basis of subsequent affidavits of the complainant party, I am of the considered opinion that the present case calls for similar treatment. In these circumstances, bail at this stage can be granted on the basis of the affidavits placed on record.

8. Consequently, the applicant/accused is admitted to post-arrest bail, subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/- (Rupees One Hundred Thousand only) and a P.R. bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

9. Needless to mention here that observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not prejudice the case of either party at the time of conclusion of case.

JUDGE

Abdul Salam/P.A