

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA
Criminal Bail Application No. S-343 of 2026

Applicant : Shahid Hussain son of Fida Hussain Meerani,
through Mr. Muhammad Qasim Kanasiro,
Advocate

Complainant : Peer Bux son of Mehar Ali Abro, present in
person.

Respondent : The State
Through Aitbar Ali Bullo, Deputy Prosecutor
General, Sindh.

Date of Hearing : 17.08.2026

Date of Order : 17.08.2026

ORDER

ZULFIQAR ALI SANGI, J-- Through this Bail Application, the applicant/accused Shahid Hussain seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.69 of 2026 registered at Police Station Hyderi, for the offence under Section 489-F PPC, after his bail plea was declined by the learned 1st Addl. Sessions Judge/MCTC, Larkana, vide order dated 11.07.2026.

2. The facts of the case are already mentioned in the FIR as well as impugned order, therefore, there is no need to reproduce the same.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant has been involved malafidely by the complainant and that the complainant and the applicant were business partners, from where the cheques were stolen and are being used by the complainant against present applicant. It is further contended that earlier FIR bearing Crime No.45/2025 was registered for the same offence with some other story on 22.03.2025, showing the incident on 22.11.2024, and by concealing all these facts, a fresh FIR has been registered with some other story; therefore, the case against the applicant requires further inquiry and entitles the applicant for confirmation of the bail.

4. On the other hand, learned Deputy P.G, Sindh, assisted by the complainant, opposes the bail application on the ground that the applicant is nominated in the FIR with a specific role and that he issued a cheque for a huge amount which was dishonoured by the Bank; therefore, he is not entitled for the bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

6. Perusal of the record reflects that earlier FIR bearing Crime No.45/2025 was registered, wherein the incident dated 22.11.2024 was shown. It is observed that when the earlier FIR was pending, it is not possible that a person who had already registered an FIR would give a vehicle for Rs.13,300,000/-, when the complainant already knew that his earlier cheque was dishonoured. Further, the offence for which the applicant is allegedly charged does not fall within the prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C., whereas, grant of pre-arrest bail is right and refusal is exceptional in those cases involving offence which does not fall within the prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C.

7. In view of the above, learned counsel for the applicant/ has made out a case for grant of bail in terms of subsection 2 of Section 497 Cr.P.C. Resultantly, the instant bail application is **allowed** and the interim pre-arrest bail granted by this Court to the applicant/accused vide order dated 15.07.2026 is hereby **confirmed** on same terms and conditions.

8. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the learned trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits.

JUDGE

Zulfiqar