

ORDER SHEET

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA

Ist. CrI. Bail Appln. No.S-663 of 2025

CrI. Bail Appln. No.S- 724 of 2025

DATE OF HEARING	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF HON'BLE JUDGE
--------------------	---------------------------------------

1. For orders on office objection 'A'.
2. For hearing of bail applications.

22.06.2026

Mr. Sabir Ali Sheikh, Advocate for the applicant along with applicant in Ist. CrI. Bail. Appln. No.S-663 of 2025.

Mr. Abdul Rehman Bhutto, advocate for the applicant along with applicant in CrI. Bail Appln. No.S-724 of 2025.

Mr. Rafique Ahmed K. Abro, advocate for the complainant.

Mr. Sardar Ali Solangi, Deputy Prosecutor General.

ORDER

RIAZAT ALI SAHAR, J- Through captioned bail applications, applicants Abdul Raheem son of Abdul Majeed Sangi (CrI. B.A.No.S-663 of 2025) and Javed @ Javed Ali son of Muhammad Uris Sangi, seek pre-arrest bail, in Crime No.40 of 2025 registered against them at Police Station Mahota, for offence punishable under sections 302, 364, 109, 120-B, 201, 404, 148, 149, PPC, after rejection of their bail plea by learned IV-Additional Sessions Judge, Larkana, vide orders dated 19.11.2025 & 16.12.2025, respectively.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case as enunciated in the FIR are that on the eventful day (detailed in the FIR), the present applicants/accused along with other co-accused Faraz, Imtiaz and two unidentified culprits came on two motorcycles at common street near Dargah Syed Ashraf Ali Shah and took away Rehman, the son of complainant Mst. Hameeda on motorcycles to Larkana on the pretext of work and asked for return within half hour. However, the son of the complainant did not return. Complainant searched for her son as well as

accused but did not find their clue. The complainant came to know that one dead body is lying at the Dodai Graveyard. They proceeded there where at about 8:00 p.m., the complainant party found the dead body of son of the complainant whose throat was cut off having two injuries at the ears. The motive behind the incident is shown an old enmity and FIR to that effect was lodged.

3. Learned counsels for the applicants in both the matters contend that the applicants are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in the case with mala fide intention and ulterior motive; that the old enmity between the applicants and the complainant party is admitted in the FIR, which given rise to the present FIR; that no any active role has been attributed to the present applicants and there is only last seen evidence which in the eyes of law has no sanctity; that at bail stage only tentative assessment is to be made and no deeper appreciation is required and at this stage the case of the applicants required further enquiry as envisaged under sub-section (2) of Section 497, Cr.P.C, therefore, the ad-interim pre-arrest bail granted to the applicants may be confirmed in the larger interest of justice.

4. On the other hand, learned D. P. G assisted by learned counsel for complainant has opposed the grant of bail and argued that the names of applicants/accused transpire in FIR with specific role that the applicants/accused taken away the deceased and thereafter, when the search was made for the recovery of deceased, his dead body was found from one Graveyard. Sufficient evidence is available against the applicants/accused to prove that they have connection with the incident; that a young boy of 16/17 years has been brutally murdered at the hands of applicants/accused, therefore, in any manner, they are not entitled for the concession of extra ordinary relief in shape of pre arrest bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the applicants/accused, learned D.P.G, appearing for the State, learned counsel for the complainant and perused the material available on record.

6. Admittedly the names of the applicants/accused transpire in the FIR. A young boy of 16/17 years has been murdered brutally. The applicants/accused have been named in the FIR in a manner that the applicants along with co-accused took the deceased on motorcycle on the pretext of going to Larkana in connection with work. On the next day the dead body of deceased was found in the Graveyard whose throat was cut off. As per FIR, the accused persons took the deceased with them in presence of complainant and her witnesses Abrar Ali and Saeed Ahmed. Both the P.Ws have, supported the FIR in their statements under section 161, Cr.P.C. In this way sufficient evidence is available to connect the applicants/accused with commission of the offence. The applicants/accused have failed to demonstrate mala fide on the part of the complainant for falsely implicating them in the commission of the offence.

7. In these circumstances, the applicants/accused have failed to make out a case for extraordinary relief of pre-arrest bail. Consequently, captioned bail applications were dismissed vide order dated 22.06.2026 and above are the reasons in support thereof.

Judge