

ORDER SHEET
THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, MIRPURKHAS

Criminal Revision Application No. S-26 of 2026

Applicant : Muhammad Munir through Mr. Farhan Ahmed Bozdar, Advocate.

Respondent No.1 : Ghulam Sarwar through Mr. Kamran Bhatti, Advocate.

Respondent No.2 : Through Mr. Neel Parkash, Deputy Prosecutor General Sindh.

Date of Hearing : 16.09.2026

Date of Order : 16.09.2026

ORDER

Muhammad Humayon Khan, J.: Through the instant Criminal Revision Application under sections 435 and 439 read with section 561-A, Cr.P.C., the applicant has called in question the order dated 18.05.2026 passed by the learned 2nd Additional Sessions Judge, Mirpurkhas, in Criminal Bail Application No.441 of 2026, to the extent whereby, while confirming his interim pre-arrest bail, the surety amount was enhanced from Rs.50,000/- to Rs.10,00,000/-.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that his grievance is confined to the enhancement of surety. He contends that the applicant is a person of limited financial means and is presently unable to arrange surety in the enhanced amount; he, therefore, seeks reduction thereof. Learned counsel for the complainant and learned D.P.G. for the State support the impugned order.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties and learned D.P.G. and perused the available record. The applicant was initially admitted to interim pre-arrest bail vide order dated 27.04.2026 subject to furnishing surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/-. Subsequently, vide impugned order dated 18.05.2026, the learned Court confirmed his interim pre-arrest bail while enhancing the surety to Rs.10,00,000/-.

4. The quantum of surety is essentially a matter of judicial discretion, to be determined in the circumstances of each case. Interference in revisional jurisdiction is warranted where the discretion exercised by the

subordinate Court is shown to suffer from illegality, material irregularity or arbitrariness. In the present case, after examining the impugned order and the material available on record, I do not find any such infirmity as would justify interference with the discretion exercised by the learned Court merely on the ground of the applicant's stated financial difficulty.

5. Consequently, no case for interference in revisional jurisdiction is made out. The Criminal Revision Application is, therefore, dismissed and the impugned order dated 18.05.2026 is maintained. However, considering the applicant's stated financial difficulty, he is granted ten (10) days from today to furnish the enhanced surety of Rs.10,00,000/- before the learned trial Court, failing which the consequences provided in the impugned order shall follow.

The observations made herein are confined to the disposal of the present revision and shall not prejudice the merits of the case before the learned trial Court.

JUDGE

Faisal