

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI**

**Crl. Bail Application No.756 of 2026**

*(Arshad Masih v. the State)*

---

Date	Order With Signature Of Judges
------	--------------------------------

---

For hearing of bail application

Dates of hearing

& short order: **22.06.2026**

Mr. Waqarullah Korejo, advocate for the applicant

Ms. Shaista Gul, advocate alongwith Complainant Tariq

Mr. Muhammad Iqbal Awan, Deputy Prosecutor General  
Sindh

-----

**Omar Sial, J.** On 10.12.2025, at 7:00 p.m., Tariq Bin Yousufi was in the process of assisting his semi-paralyzed wife to go to the bathroom when three men barged into their house. Yousufi was tied up, and in the process, his wife fell on the floor. The three men, one of whom was armed with a pistol and another with a knife, then stole all the valuables from the house. F.I.R. No. 659 of 2025 was registered under sections 392, 397, and 34 P.P.C. at the Gizri police station. Arshad Masih was arrested on the basis of disclosures made by co-accused Gulzar Masih.

2. I have heard the applicants and the complainants learned counsel, and the learned Deputy Prosecutor General. The latter two have supported the impugned order. My observations and findings are as follows.

3. The applicant's learned counsel has argued at length. Primarily, he has submitted that Arshad was arrested on the statement of the co-accused Gulzar; that the F.I.R. does not disclose the description of the robbers; that the punishment for the offenses with which the applicant was charged falls within

the non-prohibitory clause; lastly, he argued that no identification parade was held. The learned counsel is correct in his submissions.

4. The reason I am dismissing the bail application is that the victim, Tariq Bin Yousufi, himself came to court with his sons. Yousufi, a very old, infirm, and dignified gentleman, categorically said that he had seen the applicant Arshad Masih (albeit not in an identification parade) and confirmed that he was one of the three people who had robbed him. He further narrated that the fall his paralyzed wife suffered during the incident together with the accompanying trauma and trauma his wife suffered, subsequently led to her death. Upon a query from the learned counsel as to what grudge or ill-intent Yousufi had to falsely accuse the applicant, learned counsel was of the view that it was a case of mistaken identity. Based on a tentative assessment, I am not satisfied with the justification at this stage.

5. While dismissing bail in a case that falls within the non-prohibitory clause, I have considered the incident an exceptional case warranting denial of bail due to the exponential rise in home robberies in the city.

6. These are the reasons of my short order dated 22.06.2026, whereby instant bail application was dismissed.

***JUDGE***