

ORDER SHEET  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI  
**Cr. B.A. No.2409 of 2026**  
(Abdullah vs. The State)

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

For hearing of bail application

**Date of hearing**  
**& order**      **14.10.2026**

Mr. Hyder Farooq Jatoi, advocate for applicant  
Mr. Mudassir Iqbal, advocate for complainant  
Mr. Muhammad Ali Noonari, DPG

**ORDER**

-----

**Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro, J:-** Applicant is seeking post arrest bail in a case bearing Crime No.387/2025, registered at Police Station Garden, u/s 365-A, 34 PPC, r/w section 7 ATA, by means of this application.

2. Abductees, Aamir and Shahziab, were kidnapped by unknown accused on 23.09.2025 from Nishtar Road, Garden Chowk, Karachi. This was reported to the police by their friend, complainant Asif Khan, on 26.09.2025. They were released on 05.11.2025 on payment of ransom. Applicant was arrested on 08.11.2025 on the basis of some CDR record showing his contact with the main accused, Javed Zehari, who had demanded and received ransom from families of the abductees. Hence, he has been booked in the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has pleaded for bail on the grounds that there is a delay of three days in lodging the FIR; the name of the applicant is not mentioned in it; there is no identification parade of the applicant; the CDR does not show location of the applicant at the place of incident on the relevant day; and there are various discrepancies in the case. Hence, the applicant is entitled to bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant and learned DPG have opposed bail, citing identification of the applicant by the abductees in their 164 Cr. PC statements before the Magistrate and the CDR record connecting the applicant with the main accused.

5. We have considered submissions of the parties and are of a view that applicant is not entitled to bail at this stage. As there is *prima facie* evidence against him in the shape of statements of the abductees u/s 164 Cr.PC. before the Magistrate. At the time of such statements, the applicant, who was already arrested in the case, was present before the Magistrate.

There the victims identified him to be the person present in the vehicle in which they were abducted, and that he was called by his accomplices by his name as Abdullah. The implication of this piece of evidence is *prima facie* corroborated by the CDR record indicating contact of the applicant with the main accused at the relevant time. In presence of such evidence, the argument of the defence counsel that no identification parade has been held is irrelevant. Because after the applicant was identified before the Magistrate in the course of 164 Cr.PC statements by the abductees, the requirement of holding identification parade of the applicant had materially been dispensed with.

6. Therefore, in presence of above evidence, we do not find the applicant entitled to bail. Accordingly, this bail application is dismissed. However, the trial Court is directed to hold expeditious trial against the applicant and decide it sooner rather than later.

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**