

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI**  
**Cr. Bail Application No.627 of 2026**

Applicant : Muhammad Rashid son of Muhammad  
Shahid,  
Through Mr. Javed Ahmed Rajput,  
Advocate

Complainant : Muhammad Asghar  
Through Ms. Faiza Kanwal, Advocate

Respondent : The State  
Through Ms. Robina, DPG

Date of hearing : 08.04.2026  
Date of order : 08.04.2026

**ORDER**

**MIRAN MUHAMMAD SHAH, J:-** Through this application the applicant/accused Muhamad Rashid son of Muhammad Shahid, seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.617/2025, registered at Police Station Zama Town, for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 34 PPC. His earlier application for the same relief, bearing No.573/2026, was dismissed, vide order dated 09.02.2026, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Karachi East.

2. The facts of the case are need not to be reproduce herein, as the copy of FIR is attached with the bail application and the facts are also stated in detail therein.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned counsel for the complainant, learned DPG and peruse the record.

4. It transpires from the record that the present applicant has been specifically nominated in the FIR with a definite and active role of causing injuries to the deceased with a sharp-edged weapon. The medical evidence available on record is fully in line with the ocular account furnished by the

complainant and witnesses, which, at this stage, lends strong corroboration to the prosecution case. Furthermore, the statements of the witnesses recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. support the version of the prosecution and specifically implicate the applicant in the commission of the offence. The applicant has failed to point out any material suggesting enmity, ulterior motive, or malafide on the part of the complainant, witnesses, or the police, which could justify false implication in such a serious offence. The absence of any such motive further strengthens the prima facie case against the applicant. At this stage, there are sufficient reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant is connected with the commission of the alleged offence. The offence carries capital punishment; therefore, the case falls within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C. In such cases, the grant of bail is not a matter of course and can only be allowed if the case of the applicant falls within the ambit of further inquiry or if there exist exceptional circumstances, which is not the situation in the present case. Moreover, the nature of allegations, the manner in which the offence has been committed, and the gravity of the accusation do not call for any leniency. At this stage, no ground has been made out to bring the case of the applicant within the scope of further inquiry as contemplated under Section 497(2), Cr.P.C.

5. In view of the above facts and circumstances, and the tentative assessment of the material available on record, the applicant has failed to make out a case for grant of bail. Accordingly, the bail application is dismissed. However, the learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the case expeditiously and conclude the trial preferably within a period of three months, strictly in accordance with law. A compliance report in this regard be submitted to this Court through MIT.

6. Needless to mention here that the observations made herein above are tentative in nature and would not influence the trial court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits.

**JUDGE**

Suleman Khan/PA

