

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT
LARKANA**

Criminal Bail Application No.S-348 of 2026

Applicant : Ahmed alias Ahmed Khan son of
Haji Koral @ Koro by caste Khoso,
through Mr. Habibullah G. Ghouri,
Advocate.

The State : Through Mr. Nazeer Ahmed
Bangwar, Deputy Prosecutor
General.

Complainant : Lakhe Dino son of Dhani Bux by
caste Khoso, *Through* Mr. Ashique
Ali Jatoi, Advocate.

Date of hearing : 21.09.2026.
Date of Order : 21.09.2026.

ORDER

Ali Haider 'Ada' J:- Through this bail application, the applicant seeks post-arrest bail in FIR No.143 of 2025, registered at Police Station Nasirabad, on the complaint of Lakhe Dino Khoso, for offences punishable under Sections 337-A(iii), 337-F(i),(v), 337-A(i), 114 and 34, P.P.C. Prior to this, the applicant approached before the Courts below for bail but remained unsuccessful.

2. The crux of the prosecution case is that the present applicant, along with the co-accused, in furtherance of their common intention, allegedly caused injuries to PWs Mst. Sumbul and Mst. Shaista, which were opined by the Medical Officer to fall under Section 337-A(iii), P.P.C. The date of incident is shown as 18.10.2025, whereas the same was reported at the Police Station on 06.11.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case by the complainant with mala fide intention and

ulterior motives due to a previous grudge. He further contends that the FIR was lodged with considerable delay and that the offences with which the applicant has been charged requires further inquiry.

4. Conversely, learned Deputy Prosecutor General and learned counsel for the complainant submit that the applicant is nominated in the FIR with a specific role of causing injury to the complainant's wife, Mst. Sumbul, and that there is no mala fide on the part of the complainant to falsely implicate him. They, therefore, submit that the applicant does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. Heard and perused.

6. As per the FIR, the present applicant, along with the other co-accused, is alleged to have caused injuries to the prosecution witnesses, which were subsequently opined to fall under Section 337-A(iii), P.P.C. Although the said offence falls within the prohibitory clause, the gravity or nature of the offence, by itself, cannot constitute an absolute bar to the grant of bail where the circumstances available on record render the guilt of the accused doubtful or call for further inquiry. In the present case, the incident allegedly occurred on 18.10.2025, whereas the matter was reported to the Police on 06.11.2025, and no satisfactory explanation for such delay is apparent at this stage.

7. The record further reflects that, in the provisional medical certificate, the final opinion was reserved subject to the X-ray examination. However, it was not clear whether any fracture of the bone, with or without dislocation, was present, which is relevant to the alleged attraction of Shajjah-i-Hashimah. Thus, the material available on record, at this stage, does not conclusively establish the applicability of Section 337-A(iii), P.P.C. The medical aspect, therefore, requires further probe and determination at trial. Reliance in this regard is placed upon **Muzamil Hussain v. The State and another (2026 SCMR 917)**.

8. Keeping in view the foregoing discussion, the applicant has made out a case for grant of post-arrest bail. Consequently, the instant bail application is allowed, and the applicant is directed to be released on bail subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with P.R. bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court.

9. Needless to notice that the above observations are tentative in nature and shall not prejudice the case of either party at the trial.

JUDGE

.