

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI

Cr. Bail Application No.649 of 2026

Cr. Bail Application No.650 of 2026

Applicant : Muhammad Ali @ Akhter son of Atta
Muhammad
Through Mr. Muhammad Yousuf Narejo,
Advocate

Respondent : The State
Through Ms. Seema Zaidi, APG

Date of hearing : 20.04.2026
Date of order : 20.04.2026

ORDER

MIRAN MUHAMMAD SHAH, J:- This order disposes of captioned two criminal bail applications filed by the same applicant, Muhammad Ali @ Akhtar son of Atta Muhammad, seeking post-arrest bail. Cr. B.A.No.649/2026 arises out of Crime No.373/2025, u/s 324, 353 and 186 PPC, PS Ibrahim Hyderi, and Cr.B.A.No.650/2026 arising out of Crime No.374/2025, u/s 23(i)(A) SAA 2013, PS Ibrahim Hyderi. Since in both the applications/Crimes involved applicant is same and registered at the same police station, therefore, for the sake of convenience, consistency, and to avoid conflicting findings, both these applications are being decided through this single consolidated order. It is also pertinent to mention that earlier the bail applications filed by the applicant for the same relief, were dismissed through single order by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Malir Karachi, vide orders dated 20.10.2025.

2. The facts of the case, for the purpose of deciding the present bail applications, are that on 15.07.2025, an alleged police encounter took place between the police officials of PS Ibrahim Hyderi and the present applicant. During the said encounter, the applicant allegedly sustained a firearm injury on his left thigh and was arrested at the spot. An unlicensed pistol was also

recovered from his possession, and accordingly, the aforesaid cases were registered against him.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned DPG, and perused the available record.

4. According to the prosecution, the encounter took place between the police party and the applicant; however, it is noteworthy that none of the police officials sustained any injury, nor was any damage caused to the police vehicle or surrounding property. On the contrary, only the applicant allegedly sustained a firearm injury on his left thigh, which creates doubt in the prosecution's version. Furthermore, in the connected case under Section 23(i) of the Sindh Arms Act, the prosecution has alleged recovery of a 30-bore pistol without number. However, the FSL report contradicts this claim, stating that the number of the pistol was rubbed. This inconsistency further renders the recovery doubtful. The veracity or otherwise of the complainant's version shall be determined during trial after recording evidence. However, at this stage, the benefit of doubt must be extended to the applicant. Additionally, the offences under Sections 353 and 186 PPC are bailable, and the applicability of Section 324 PPC shall be determined at trial. Learned DPG has opposed the bail on the ground that the applicant is a habitual offender, as reflected in his CRO showing involvement in eight other similar cases. However, learned counsel for the applicant has contended that no outcome of those cases has been placed on record, which is insufficient to deny bail at this stage. The case has already been challaned, the applicant is no longer required for further investigation, and the trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, the applicant cannot be kept in custody for an indefinite period. Consequently, both bail applications are allowed, and the applicant is admitted to bail subject

furnishing surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/- (Rupees One Hundred Thousand only) in each case, to the satisfaction of the trial court.

5. 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.

Office is directed to place assigned copy of this order in the captioned connected matter.

JUDGE

Suleman Khan/PA

