

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR.
Crl. Bail Application No.S-1237 of 2025.

DATE OF HEARING	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
Applicant:	Sajjan S/O Abdul Kareem Bhanbhan, through Mr. Shabbir Ali Bozdar Advocate.
Complainant:	Mst. Lal Khatoon @Sharifan W/O Sabir Khan Bhabhan, through Mr.ZulfiqarAli Panhwar Advocate
The State:	Through Mr. Mansoor Ahmed Shaikh D.PG.
<u>Date of hearing & order: 08.09.2026.</u>	

Suresh Kumar J:- Through this criminal Bail application the applicant namely Sajjan S/O Abdul Kareem Bhanbhan seeks post arrest bail in Crime No.72 of 2025 registered at PS Halani, District Naushahro Feroze for offences punishable U/Ss 302,324, 147,148 & 504 PPC.

2. The facts of the prosecution as depicted in the FIR are that the complainant, Mst. Lal Khatoon @ Sharifan, lodged the FIR on 04.05.2025 at 0600 hours at the common street/house of the complainant situated in Deh Pir Watio, Taluka Mehrabpur. The present applicant/accused, armed with a lathi, along with other co-accused wielding iron rods, caused blows to the deceased, Muhammad Yaseen, on his head, resulting in the death of Muhammad Yaseen.

3. The applicant initially filed bail application before the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge Kandiaro, which was dismissed vide order dated 13.12.2025. Being aggrieved by this dismissal order, the applicant has approached this Court.

4. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the respective parties and having perused the relevant material, it

is revealed from the FIR that the applicant/accused, allegedly along with other co-accused, was armed with a lathi and has been assigned the general role of causing lathi injuries to the witnesses, namely Naseem Ali and Zaheer Ali, while co-accused Mst. Irshad Khatoon and Bashir caused iron rod blows to the deceased, Muhammad Yaseen, who is said to have expired after sustaining these blows. The learned counsel for the applicant has mainly contended that co-accused Momin Bhabhan, having been assigned the same role, has been granted bail by the learned trial court via order dated 27.08.2025; therefore, the applicant is also entitled to bail after arrest in view of the rule of consistency. The learned DPG for the State has conceded that the present applicant, having been assigned the same role as co-accused Momin, who has been granted bail by the learned trial court, is similarly entitled to bail. Admittedly, the applicant has been assigned an identical role to that of co-accused Momin, who has been granted post-arrest bail. Therefore, the applicant is also entitled to the grant of bail in view of the rule of consistency, with reliance placed upon the case law reported in Muhammad Nadim v. The State (2023 SCMR 184).

5. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that applicant/accused has successfully made out his case for grant of post arrest bail on the rule of consistency. Consequently he is admitted to bail subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/- (One lac only) and PR 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

Hizbullah

