

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S- 702 of 2020

For hearing of bail application

Mr. Ghulam Rasool Narejo Advocate along with Applicant.
Mr. Shafi Muhammad Mahar, Deputy P.G for the State.

Date of Hearing: 07-12-2020
Date of Order: 07-12-2020

ORDER

Aftab Ahmed Gorar J. On 30.11.2020, complainant put his appearance and sought time to engage counsel and at his request matter was adjourned for today, but today neither complainant is not in attendance nor any intimation is received on his behalf.

2. Applicant Ali Mardan Doongrani seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.131 of 2020 registered at P.S, Shaheed Murtaza Mirani, Khairpur for offence under Section 395 PPC. Earlier the bail plea of the applicant was declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge-I/MCTC, Khairpur vide order dated 07.08.2020.

3. Heard learned counsel for the Applicant and learned Deputy P.G for the State. The latter had conceded to the confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicant by Court on the rule of consistency as co-accused Inayatullah Korejo and Abdul Wahab having been attributed similar and identical role to that of present applicant have already been admitted to pre-arrest and post-arrest bail

respectively by this Court vide order dated 14.09.2020, passed on Crl. B.As No.S- 437 & 438 of 2020.

4. Admittedly, the role assigned to the present applicant is similar and identical to that of co-accused Inayatullah Korejo and Abdul Wahab, who have already been admitted to pre-arrest and post-arrest bail respectively by this Court vide order dated 14.09.2020, passed on Crl. B.As No.S- 437 & 438 of 2020, therefore, the present applicant is also entitled for the same leniency under the rule of consistency. Furthermore, after grant of interim bail, applicant is regularly attending the trial court as well as this Court and there is no complaint from trial Court regarding misuse of concession of bail granted to the applicant by this court, therefore, learned Deputy P.G for the State is justified in recording no objection to the confirmation of interim bail earlier granted to the applicant by this Court on the ground of rule of consistency.

5. For what has been discussed above, I am of the considered view that the applicant has succeeded to make out a case for confirmation of his interim pre-arrest bail, earlier granted to him by this Court vide order dated 23.11.2020. Accordingly, following the rule of consistency, interim pre-arrest bail, already granted to the applicant by this Court is hereby confirmed on same terms and conditions.

6. The captioned Crl. Bail Application stands disposed of in the above manner.

J U D G E

Ahmad