

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S-31 of 2026

Applicants:	Muhammad Yousif son of Aijaz @ Abdul Razzaq bycaste Mahar through Mr. Rukhsar Ahmed Junejo, advocate.
The Complainant	Muhammad Nawaz son of Shahnawaz Shaikh through Mr. Shafique Ahmed Laghari advocate.
The State	Through Mr. Shafi Muhammad Mahar, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.
Date of hearing:	24-08-2026.
Dated of order	24-08-2026.

ORDER.

Suresh Kumar, J.---Applicant named above seeks confirmation of the ad-interim pre-arrest bail granted to him by this Court vide order dated 13-01-2026, in a case bearing crime No. 35/2025, offence u/s 377-B, 506/2, 34 PPC registered at Police Station Sangi, District Sukkur.

2. The brief facts of the case are as follows: Complainant Muhammad Nawaz Shaikh lodged the FIR on 11-05-2025, alleging that approximately 7 months prior, the accused Faheem Sewero, Muhammad Younis Sangi, and Muhammad Yousif Mahar, by means of force and weapons, committed carnal intercourse against Yasir Nawaz, the son of the complainant, and issued threats of dire consequences. Consequently, the complainant lodged the FIR.

3. The applicant initially sought pre-arrest bail from the Court of the learned II Additional Sessions Judge/Special Court GBV Sukkur, which was dismissed via order dated 29-05-2025. Being aggrieved by this dismissal, the applicant has approached this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant/accused and the learned DPG for the State, assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant; both have strongly opposed the confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail.

5. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the respective parties, I have perused the relevant material. From the perusal of the FIR, it reveals that the applicant and co-accused Faheem and Muhammad Younis have allegedly committed Zina with the victim Yasir Nawaz. The FIR further reveals that it was registered seven months after the incident. The medical evidence is negative. Furthermore, the co-accused Faheem and Muhammad Younis, who were assigned the same role, have already been granted bail by this Court via order dated 11-08-2025, and the case of the present applicant/accused is on par with theirs; therefore, he is also entitled to the concession of bail in view of the rule of consistency. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has stated that the order passed by this Court on the bail application of the co-accused has not been challenged before the Supreme Court. The applicant has surrendered before the trial Court, cooperated with the police, and has not misused the concession of interim bail to date.

6. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the applicant/accused has successfully made out a case for the grant of pre-arrest bail. Therefore, the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicant on 13-01-2026 is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions, with a direction to appear before the trial Court.

7. Needless to say, the above observations are tentative in nature and will not prejudice the case of either party during the trial.

J U D G E

Nasim/P.A