

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S-114 of 2026

Applicants:	1. Abdul Razzaque. 2. Abdul Rehman (Raheem shown in FIR) Both sons of Noor Muhammad Shar. 3. Naib Ali. 4. Muhammad Piyaro @ Piyaro. Both sons of Muhammad Achar. 5. Mumtaz Ali son of Naib Ali Ghanghro. All resident f village Peeral Ghanghro, Taluka Mirwah, District Khairpur, through Mr. Abdul Samad Shar advocate.
The Complainant	Muhammad Idrees son of Muhammad Uris Ghanghro through Mr. Shamshuddin Ghanghro advocate.
The State	Through Mr. Khalil Ahmed Maitlo, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.
Date of hearing:	25-08-2026.
Dated of order	25-08-2026.

ORDER.

Suresh Kumar, J.--- The applicants named above seek confirmation of the ad-interim pre-arrest bail already granted to them by this Court vide order dated 04-02-2026, in a case bearing crime No. 106/2025, offence u/s 397 PPC registered at Police Station Setharja, District Khairpur.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the complainant, Muhammad Idrees, lodged the FIR on 24-12-2025, alleging that on 19-12-2025, the accused Naib Ali called the complainant to pay his amount of Rs. 91,000/-. Therefore, the complainant, along with his son Jan Muhammad, went to the house of Naib Ali on a motorcycle at about 4:00 PM, where the accused Naib Ali, Muhammad Pyaral @ Pyaro, Mumtaz Ali, Razzaque, and Raheem took out pistols, pointed them at the complainant's party,

and robbed them of their motorcycle and mobile phone before fleeing the scene. Ultimately, the complainant lodged the aforementioned FIR.

3. The applicant initially sought pre-arrest bail from the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mirwah, which was dismissed via order dated 31-01-2026. Being aggrieved by this dismissal, the applicants have approached this Court.

4. Mr. Abdul Samad Shar, Advocate, files a power of attorney on behalf of the applicants, which is taken on record. He has complied with the office objections by filing a statement along with certain documents.

5. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants/accused and the learned DPG for the State, assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant. Both parties have strongly opposed the confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail.

6. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the respective parties and having perused the relevant material available on record, it is revealed from the perusal of the FIR that there is a delay of five days in lodging the FIR, which has not been plausibly explained by the complainant. The FIR further reveals that there is a previous dispute over arrears of Rs. 91,000/- in rent for a tractor that remains outstanding against the accused, Naib Ali; therefore, malafide intention on the part of the complainant cannot be ruled out. One of the applicants, namely Naib Ali, has been shown as an accused and is disabled, as evidenced by the certificate produced by him. From his physical appearance, he cannot stand without support; thus, it raises the question of how he could rob the motorcycle at the point of a weapon from the complainant. It is also pointed out by the learned counsel for the

applicants that previously, the FIR bearing Crime No. 107/2025 was registered by applicant Naib Hussain against the complainant, Muhammad Idrees, and his sons at PS Setharja, indicating the same date and time. Therefore, the veracity of the present FIR and the FIR lodged by applicant Naib Ali is to be determined at the time of trial, as there are two counterblast FIRs. Hence, the case against the applicants/accused falls within the ambit of further inquiry. The applicants/accused are appearing before the trial court after the grant of interim pre-arrest bail, and they have not misused the concession of bail.

7. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the applicants/accused have successfully made out a case for the grant of pre-arrest bail. Therefore, the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicants on 04-02-2026 is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions, with a direction to appear before the trial court.

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

J U D G E