

# HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD

Cr. Bail. Application No.S-205 of 2026  
[Shahnawaz Khan @ Shah Nawaz Pathan versus The State]

Applicant by: Mr. Ghulamullah Mari advocate  
State/complainant by: Mr. Khalid Hussain Lakho D.P.G  
Date of hearing 15.06.2026  
Date of Order 15.06.2026

## **ORDER**

**TASNEEM SULTANA, J:** Through this Crl. Bail Application, the applicant Shahnawaz Khan @ Shah Nawaz Pathan seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.339 of 2025 registered at P.S Kazi Ahmed under Sections 353, 341, 506/2, 147, 148 and 504 PPC. His earlier bail application for the same relief being Crl. Bail Application No.2864 of 2025 has been declined by the trial Court vide Order dated 14.01.2026.

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 issued murderous threats to anti-encroachment police party while pointing out iron rod, while the remaining accused persons resorted to cause lathi blows to police 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 the applicant has been accused of issuing threats to police party which being general in nature requires further inquiry.

4. Learned Deputy Prosecutor General although opposed the concession of bail, however, concedes that the allegation against the applicant is only of issuing of threats.

5. According to FIR the only allegation against the present applicant/accused is that he had issued murderous threats of police party, which being general in nature falls within the ambit of further inquiry. Furthermore, co-accused namely Majid Ali and Ameen Ali have been

admitted on post-arrest bail by the trial Court, as such the rule of consistency is attracted in the matter.

6. 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 16.02.2026 is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

7. 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