

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S-276 of 2026

Applicant: Ali Muhammad son of Dur Muhammad bycaste Mirbahar, **through** Miss Fareeda Advocate.

The State **Through** Mr. Shafi Muhammad Mahar, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Date of hearing: 18-08-2026.

Dated of order 18-08-2026.

ORDER.

Suresh Kumar, J.--- Through, instant bail application, applicant Ali Muhammad Mirbahar seeks post arrest bail in a case bearing crime No. 19/2025, offence u/s 302, 201 PPC registered at Police Station Dadloi, District Sukkur.

2. Concisely the facts of the prosecution case as depicted in the FIR are that complainant Hidayatullah lodged the FIR with police station Dadloi alleging therein that on 20-03-2025 he along with co-villagers went to Railway crossing at village Wali Dino Khunharo, where they found the dead body of his son, whose head was severed from his body. Ultimately complainant lodged the FIR.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant/accused and learned Deputy P.G for the State.

4. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by learned counsels appearing on behalf of respective parties, perused the relevant record. From the perusal of FIR, it reveals that applicant/accused Ali Muhammad is not nominated in the FIR, but he has been implicated by the complainant and PWs Muhammad Eisa and Bashir Ahmed in their further statements which were recorded after 08 days of registration of the FIR as well as previous statements u/s 161 Cr.P.C. It further reveals from the statement of complainant as well as PWs that they have simply stated that they had come to know about the involvement of the applicant/accused Ali Muhammad in the commission of offence of murder of deceased; however, they have neither disclosed the source

of information nor any other evidence is available on record to show that how applicant/accused had committed the murder of deceased. In the present case no one had seen the applicant/accused while committing the murder of the deceased and it is unseen incident; therefore case against the applicant/accused falls within the ambit of further inquiry. Moreover, recovery of crime weapons had also not been affected from the applicant/accused and no other any incriminating material is available on record which connects the applicant/accused with the commission of offence.

5. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that applicant/accused has made out the case for grant of bail; therefore, he is admitted to bail subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs. 200,000 (two lacs) and P.R bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

6. Needless to say that the above observations are tentative in nature and will not prejudice the case of either party at the time of trial.

J U D G E