

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH CIRCUIT COURT
LARKANA

Criminal Bail Application No. S-319 of 2026

Applicant : Ali Imran Khan @ Imran son of
Ali Baig Luhur, *through* Mr.
Amanullah Luhur, Advocate

The State : *Through* Mr. Sardar Ali Solangi,
Deputy Prosecutor General,
Sindh.

Complainant : Ahmed Khan Luhur, *through* Mr.
Muhammad Ibrahim Brohi,
Advocate.

Date of Hearing : 04-09-2026
Date of Order : 04-09-2026.

ORDER

Ali Haider 'Ada'J.- Through this bail application, the applicant seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.37 of 2026, registered at Police Station New Foujdari, Shikarpur, for offences punishable under Sections 364, 452, 506/2 and 114, P.P.C. Prior to this, his bail application was declined by the learned 3rd Additional Sessions Judge, Shikarpur, vide order dated 05.06.2026.

2. Briefly stated, the prosecution case is that the complainant, along with his family, was present at his house when the accused persons forcibly entered therein and forcibly kidnapped Mst. Nadia, aged about 19 years, daughter of the complainant. It is alleged that the incident occurred because the complainant had refused to give the hand of Mst. Nadia in marriage to the present applicant. The incident was reported on 26.02.2026.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there is a delay of four months in reporting the incident, for which no plausible explanation has been furnished. He further submits that the alleged abductee/kidnappee is residing at the house

of her father and that the entire occurrence has been fabricated as a drama. He further submits that the applicant is behind bars and, therefore, is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant, as well as the learned Deputy Prosecutor General, has opposed the grant of bail on the ground that a young lady was kidnapped. They submit that, prima facie, the applicant is fully implicated by the prosecution witnesses and that the incident occurred because of the refusal to arrange the marriage of Mst. Nadia with the present applicant. They, therefore, pray for dismissal of the bail application.

5. Heard and perused.

6. The record reflects that the present applicant is involved in the commission of the offence of kidnapping a young lady. Although it has been asserted that the present applicant/accused is a relative of the alleged abductee, such assertion does not exonerate him. Rather, it is evident that the allegations tentatively levelled against him directly involve him in the commission of the alleged offence.

7. The allegation regarding the accused's involvement in the crime, coupled with the incriminating material available on record, shows that the present applicant was booked for abducting a young lady. Even at this stage, the said young lady has not appeared before the Court. Consequently, the present applicant has failed to make out a case for the grant of bail or any concession in that regard. In this context, reliance is placed upon ***Hilal Khattak v. The State (2023 SCMR 1182)***, ***Muhammad Tahir Jatoi v. The State (2024 MLD 1344)***, and ***Azhar Ali v. The State (2026 PCrLJ 602)***.

8. In view of the foregoing, the instant criminal bail application is dismissed.

JUDGE