

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT HYDERABAD

Crl. Bail Application No. S-681 of 2026

Applicant: Arbash Ahmed s/o Muhammad Saeed @ Saeed Ahmed
Through Mr.Anwer Ali Rajput, Advocate

Complainant: Shadman s/o Rabnawaz
Through Mr.Muhammad Ali Rajput, Advocate

The State: Through Mr.Altaf Hussain Khokhar, D.P.G

Date of Hearing: 21-09-2026

Date of Order: 21-09-2026

ORDER

ABDUL MOBEEN LAKHO-J, Through this Bail Application, applicant Arbash Ahmed seeks confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail in Crime No.142 of 2026, registered at Police Station Market, Hyderabad for an offence under Section 489-F PPC. Earlier, learned II-Additional Sessions Judge, Hyderabad, vide order dated 22.05.2026, declined to confirm his pre-arrest bail.

2. Briefly, the prosecution case is that the complainant Shadman allegedly paid an amount of Rs.50,00,000/- to the applicant for purchase of rice. Upon failure of the transaction, the applicant allegedly issued cheque No.00190762 dated 20.04.2026 for repayment of the amount, which on presentation was dishonoured due to insufficient funds, thereafter the present FIR was lodged under Section 489-F PPC.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that during pendency of the bail application, the parties have amicably resolved their dispute and the applicant has handed over post-dated cheques to the complainant towards settlement of the disputed amount.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant affirmed the compromise and acknowledged receipt of post-dated cheques, while extending no

objection to confirmation of bail in favour of the applicant. The copy of post-dated cheques is placed on record.

5. Learned D.P.G formally opposed the bail application.

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

7. Tentative assessment of the record reflects that the offence alleged against the applicant is under Section 489-F PPC, the maximum punishment whereof does not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C. It further appears that during pendency of the matter the parties have resolved their dispute and the complainant, through his learned counsel, has categorically expressed no objection to confirmation of bail. The disputed amount has been secured through post-dated cheques and no useful purpose would be served by recalling the concession of interim pre-arrest bail already extended to the applicant.

8. Keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the statement of learned counsel for the complainant, the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties and the nature of the offence involved, I am of the tentative view that the applicant has made out a case for confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail.

9. Consequently, this Bail Application is **allowed** and the interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to applicant Arbash Ahmed vide order dated 02.06.2026, is hereby confirmed on the same terms.

JUDGE