

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI**  
**Cr. Bail Application No.3239 of 2025**

Applicant : Syed Amir Raza Taqvi son of Syed Yassar Hussain Taqvi  
Through Mr. Zakir Laghari, Advocate

Complainant : Zubair Shah s/o Muhammad Dawood  
Through Mr. Tahir Mehmood, Advocate

Respondent : The State  
Through Ms. Robina, DPG

Date of hearing : 16.04.2026  
Date of order : 16.04.2026

**ORDER**

**MIRAN MUHAMMAD SHAH, J:-** Through captioned criminal bail application, applicant Syed Amir Raza Taqvi son of Syed Yassar Hussain Taqvi, seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.1604 of 2025, registered under section 406, 420 and 34 PPC, at Police Station Sachal, Karachi East. Prior to this he has approached to the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-VIII, Malir, Karachi, for the same relief but it was declined vide order dated 20.11.2025. He was admitted to interim pre-arrest bail by this court, vide order dated 24.11.2025, and the matter is now fixed for confirmation of the same or otherwise.

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 and record perused.

4. It is an admitted position that there is a delay of more than three years in lodging of the FIR, which has not been satisfactorily explained by the complainant. Such inordinate and unexplained delay creates serious doubt about the veracity of the prosecution story. A perusal of the contents of the FIR further reveals that no specific or active role has been assigned

to the present applicant; rather, only his presence is alleged at the time of handing over the subject amount to the principal accused, namely Zeeshan. Thus, the alleged involvement of the applicant is a matter which requires deeper appreciation of evidence and is to be determined by the learned trial Court. It is also evident that the dispute between the parties arises out of business transactions concerning alleged entrustment and subsequent misappropriation of property. The offences under Sections 406 and 420 P.P.C. do not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497 Cr.P.C., wherein the grant of bail is a rule and its refusal is an exception. Moreover, the determination of questions relating to entrustment, breach of trust, and dishonest intention involves detailed examination of evidence, which cannot be undertaken at this stage. Such issues require strict scrutiny and are to be resolved after recording of evidence during trial. It is further noted that there is nothing on record to suggest that the applicant has misused the concession of interim pre-arrest bail or that he is likely to abscond or tamper with the prosecution evidence. In view of the above circumstances, the applicant has succeeded in making out a case for confirmation of pre-arrest bail. Consequently, the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicant is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

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. 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**

