

HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD

Cr. Bail. Application No.S-292 of 2026
[Abdul Raheem @ Raheem versus The State]

Applicant by: Mr. Ali Asadullah Soomro advocate
Complainant by: Nemo
State by: Mr. Nazar Muhammad Memon
Additional P.G Sindh
Date of hearing 11.06.2026
Date of Order 11.06.2026

ORDER

TASNEEM SULTANA, J: Through this CrI. Bail Application, the applicant Abdul Raheem @ Raheem seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.101 of 2025 registered at Police Station Daur District Shaheed Benazirabad under Sections 337-J, 337-A(i), 337-F(i), 337-L(ii), 342, 427, 403, 506/2, 147, 148, 149 and 504 PPC. His earlier bail application for the same relief being CrI. Bail Application No.2066 of 2025 has been declined by the trial Court vide Order dated 25.09.2025.

2. The facts of the FIR find sufficient mention in memo of bail application, therefore, in view of the case law reported in PLD 2014 SC 458, there is no need to reproduce the same for the sake of brevity and in order to avoid repetition. However, the allegation against the present applicant is that he caused iron rod and lathi blows to PW Naeem Lashari, while the remaining accused persons also resorted to cause injuries to complainant party. Consequently, the present FIR came to be registered.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants contends that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated with mala fide intent; that all the story is false and concocted one; that there is an unexplained delay of about two days in lodging the FIR; that alleged injuries attributed to present applicant are bailable; that Section 337-J PPC is not attracted according to contents of the FIR; that admittedly there is civil dispute between the parties, however, the complainant has tried to covert the same into criminal one; that co-accused have already been granted bail by this Court vide Order dated 13.01.2026 passed in Cr. Bail Applications No.S-1283 & 1297 of 2025, as such the applicant is also entitled for same relief on the rule of consistency..

4. Despite service complainant has chosen to remain absent. Whereas, learned Additional Prosecutor General halfheartedly opposed the concession of bail while conceding that injuries attributed to present applicant/accused are bailable.

5. Perusal of record reflects that alleged incident took place on 13.09.2025 at about 2130 hours; whereas the FIR was lodged on 15.09.2025 at 0200 hours, however, the complainant has not furnished any plausible explanation for such delay. A bare reading the FIR reveals that at the start of the FIR the present applicant/accused was alleged to have iron rod, whereas at the bottom he has been alleged to have caused iron rod and lathi blows to PW Naeem Lashari. Even otherwise injuries attributed to present applicant/accused have been examined by the medico-legal officer and have been declared as 337-A(i) and 337-F(i), which are bailable.

6. Furthermore, co-accused persons have been admitted on bail by this Court vide Order dated 13.01.2026 passed in Cr. Bail Applications No.S-1283 & 1297 of 2025, as such the rule of consistency is attracted in the matter.

7. In light of the principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sheikh Abdul Raheem v. The State* (2021 SCMR 822) and *Riaz Jafar Natiq v. Muhammad Nadeem Dar and others* (2011 SCMR 1708), no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances have been pointed out which would warrant denial of bail. Accordingly, the present application is allowed and the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicant vide order dated 06.03.2026 is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made herein are tentative in nature and shall not prejudice the trial Court in deciding the case on merits.

JUDGE