

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI
Cr. Bail Application No.912 of 2026

Applicant : Ms. Nadia d/o Ubaidullah@ Abdullah
Through Mr. Imran Baloch, Advocate

Respondent : The State
Through Mr. Ali Raza Abbasi
Assistant Prosecutor General Sindh

Date of hearing : 05.05.2026
Date of order : 05.05.2026

ORDER

MIRAN MUHAMMAD SHAH, J:- Through this application the applicant/accused Ms. Nadia d/o Ubaidullah @ Abdullah, seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.674/2025, registered at Police Station Gizri, Karachi, under Sections 381 and 34 PPC. Her earlier application for the same relief was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-XI, Karachi South, vide order dated 05.03.2026.

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 I have heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.P.G., and perused the record. A plain reading of the F.I.R. reveals that the present applicant/accused was implicated merely on suspicion, on the allegation that two female employed at the house of the complainant might be involved in the commission of the offence, without any concrete or direct evidence. It further transpires from the record that soon after registration of the F.I.R., the house of the present applicant was raided, whereupon two nominated ladies were arrested, and allegedly one jhumka was recovered from the possession of the present applicant. However, the contents of the F.I.R. reflect that several valuables, including three gold ornaments, bangles, one mala set, one

ring, ten gold ornaments, and diamond jewellery were allegedly missing, whereas only a single jhumka is stated to have been recovered from the applicant. It appears that the applicant, being a poor working lady, has been implicated in the present case merely on suspicion. At this stage, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the alleged recovery of the jhumka may have been foisted upon the applicant in order to strengthen the prosecution case. The applicant has remained behind bars for the last six months in a case carrying punishment up to seven years, which admittedly does not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C. No concrete, confidence-inspiring, or independent evidence is available on record to connect the applicant with the commission of the alleged offence. Thus, the case of the applicant squarely falls within the ambit of further enquiry” as contemplated under Section 497(2), Cr.P.C. It has also been informed that the investigation has been completed and challan has been submitted before the learned trial Court; therefore, the further custody of the applicant is no longer required for the purposes of investigation. In the above circumstances, the applicant is admitted to post-arrest bail subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) and a P.R. bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

4. Needless to mention here that the observation made herein above are tentative in nature and would not influence the trial court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits. However, in case the applicant misuses the concession of bail in any manner, the trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the same after giving him notice, in accordance with the law.

Criminal bail application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

