

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

Present:
Mr. Justice Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro
Mr. Justice Khalid Hussain Shahani

Cr. B.A. No.2864 of 2026
(Raees Lodhi **vs.** The State)

Cr. B.A. No.2865 of 2026
(Raees Lodhi **vs.** The State)

Cr. B.A. No.2866 of 2026
(Raees Lodhi **vs.** The State)

For hearing of bail applications

Date of hearing
& order **28.09.2026**

Mr. Shafqat Gul Malik, advocate for applicant
Mr. Muhammad Ali Noonari, DPG

ORDER

Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro, J:- Applicant is seeking post arrest bails in cases bearing Crime No.136/2026, u/s 353, 324, 34 PPC, Crime No.305/2026, u/s 384, 385, 34 PPC, and Crime No.306/2026, u/s 384, 385 PPC, registered at Police Station N.K.I.A. Karachi, by means of this application.

2. FIR No.136/2026 was registered at Police Station SIU by ASI Muhammad Younus, posted at the same Police Station. It is alleged that police received spy information that two extortionists involved in Crime No.305/2026 and 306/2026 u/s 384, 385, 34 PPC, were available on Katcha Paka Rasta, Lyari Expressway, within limits of Police Station Liaquatabad, Karachi. On such information, when police reached the spot, they found two persons, who on seeing police party, started firing. In retaliatory firing, police injured one person, and arrested him. He disclosed his name as Muhammad Zahid. The other person made good his escape, whose name was disclosed by him as Raees Lodhi, the applicant.

3. From arrested accused, a 30 bore pistol was recovered.. He also admitted his involvement in the aforesaid two cases, so also involvement of the applicant. On the basis of which, applicant and the co-accused were involved in all three cases.

4. In the cases of extortion, the facts are more or less the same, that the complainant party had received a chit demanding extortion from some unknown person, which was recorded on CCTV camera, and which was produced in the investigation.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant has pleaded for bail on the ground that name of the applicant was taken by co-accused, and in extortion cases, except admission of the applicant before the police, no other evidence is available. Even the complainant party does not identify the applicant to be the same person, who had allegedly handed over the chit demanding bhatta from them.

6. On the other hand, learned DPG has opposed bail.

7. However, we have seen that the cases against the applicant are of further inquiry, as *prima facie*, there is no direct evidence against him. After his arrest, he was not put to an identification parade before the Magistrate to confirm that he is the same person, who had handed over chits to the complainant parties. Even, it is not clearly mentioned anywhere that in CCTV camera footage, the applicant has been identified by the complainant party or not. Insofar as, Crime 136/2026 is concerned, he was not even arrested from the spot and nothing was recovered from him. Further, from his alleged firing no one was injured, therefore, applicability of section 324 Cr. PC to the case of the applicant is a question, which is yet to be determined in the trial.

8. Accordingly, we allow these bail applications and grant him bail subject to his furnishing a solvent surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/- (Rupees one hundred thousand only) in each case with P.R. bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

9. 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.

Office to place a copy of this order in connected bail applications.

JUDGE

JUDGE