

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI
Cr. Bail Application No.764 of 2026

Applicant : Muhammad Shoaib Khan son of
Muhammad Khan
Through M/S Aamir Zaheer Mirza
and Aajid Ali Metlo, Advocates

Complainant : Zarosh Ikram
Through Mr. Shafique Ahmed Khan
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:- Through this application the applicant/accused Muhammad Shoaib Khan s/o Muhammad Khan, seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.995/2025, registered at Police Station Gulistan-e-Jauhar, Karachi, for the offence punishable under Sections 376 PPC. His earlier application for the same relief, was dismissed, vide order dated 16.02.2026, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VII, 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 an active role in the commission of the alleged offence of rape upon the complainant, Mst. Zarosh Ikram, after calling her on the pretext of a modeling shoot. In her statement u/s 164,

Cr.P.C., she has fully implicated the present applicant, stating that he forcibly committed rape upon her, recorded videos of the act, and thereafter blackmailed her by threatening to make such videos viral. As regards the contention of delay in lodging of the FIR, it is observed that in cases of this nature, delay does not adversely affect the prosecution's case. It is a well-settled principle of law that in rape cases, the solitary statement of the victim, if found credible, is sufficient to sustain the accusation. This principle has been consistently reiterated in various judgments of the superior courts. The learned trial court has assigned cogent and compelling reasons while dismissing the bail application of the applicant. From the material available on record, there are sufficient grounds to arrive at a prima facie conclusion regarding the involvement of the applicant in the commission of the offence. Furthermore, if applicant is released on bail at this stage, there exists a strong likelihood that the applicant may intimidate or influence the complainant and prosecution witnesses. The alleged offence carries capital punishment; therefore, the case falls within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C. In such circumstances, the grant of bail is not a matter of course and may only be considered if the case calls for further inquiry or if exceptional circumstances are shown to exist. No such circumstances are apparent in the present case. Accordingly, the bail application is dismissed.

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.

JUDGE

