

ORDER SHEET  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI  
**Cr. B.A. No.2710 of 2026**  
(Syed Atif Abbas Naqvi vs. The State)

**Present:**  
**Mr. Justice Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro**  
**Mr. Justice Khalid Hussain Shahni**

For hearing of bail application

**Date of hearing**  
**& order**      **22.09.2026**

Mr. Moula Bux Bhutto, advocate for applicant  
Mr. Irshad Ahmed, Assistant Attorney General

**ORDER**

-----

**Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro, J:-** Applicant is seeking post arrest bail in a case bearing Crime No.32/2026, u/s 409, 420, 468, 471, 109, 34 PPC, registered at Police Station FIA CBC, Karachi, by means of this application.

2. As per brief facts, consequent upon an inquiry conducted by FIA on the complaint made by UBL Bank officials, applicant and other bank officials were identified to have obtained a fake cheque book belonging to the account of some customer, from which an amount of Rs.330 million was withdrawn and deposited into the account of the applicant. Applicant is further said to have issued several cheques and deposit slips for transfer of the said amount to multiple accounts. But, since some amount was sought to be transferred to account of one Shah Kamran, who had opened the account in the bank just ten days before such transaction, and was under the supervision, an alarm was caused and a complaint was made, which finally resulted into registration of the present FIR.

3. Applicant's counsel has pleaded for bail on the ground of rule of consistency stating that all the bank officials have been granted bail by the trial Court; the amount is safe and has been deposited back into the original account; the applicant is in jail for last five months.

4. On the other hand, learned Assistant Attorney General, has opposed bail stating that applicant is the sole beneficiary; the cheque for withdrawal of amount was presented by him, and then he issued multiple cheques to create different layers to conceal his identity in the crime.

5. We have considered submissions of the parties and are of the view that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant is involved in the alleged offence. As per *prima facie* evidence collected during the investigation, the applicant had presented a cheque bearing a forged signature of the customer for encashment. After getting the amount deposited in his bank

account, in order to conceal his role, he had issued several cheques for withdrawal of said amount and deposit slips, in an attempt to create multiple layers to hide the money. We, therefore, in view of *prima facie* evidence, do not find him entitled to concession of bail. As to the rule of consistency, we have serious reservations over the order granting bail to the bank officials by the trial Court, but we refrain from issuing notice to them and leave it to the office of Addl: Attorney General to consider challenging the orders granting bail to the bank officials, whose role *prima facie* appears significant in the offence.

6. Accordingly, this bail application is dismissed. Yet the trial Court is directed to expedite the matter and examine the material witnesses within a period of three months, after which, in any case, the applicant would be at liberty to repeat application for the same relief, which, if filed, shall be decided on its own merits.

7. Bail application stands disposed of in the above terms. The observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not prejudice case of either party at trial.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Rafiq/PA.