

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Special Criminal Bail Application 129 of 2024

Muhammad Raheem

vs.

The State

For the Applicant / Accused : Messrs. Musharaf Azhar
and Tarique Ali Jakhrani,
Advocates

For the Prosecution / State : Ms. Alizeh Bashir
Assistant Attorney General

Date of hearing : 27.11.2024

Date of announcement : 27.11.2024

ORDER

Agha Faisal, J. The applicant seeks post-arrest bail, in respect of F.I.R. No.02/2024-25 registered on 22.09.2024, before Deputy Collector Customs (Preventive) Sukkur, pertaining to offence/s under Section/s 2(s), 16 of the Customs Act, 1969 read with SRO 566(1)/2005 dated 06.06.2005, further read with SRO 499(1) 2009 dated 13.06.2009, punishable under clause 8 & 89 of section 156(1) of Customs Act 1969 and Section 157 (1) & (2) (a) of the Customs Act, 1969.

2. Learned counsel submits that the earlier plea for bail by the applicant was rejected by the Court of the Special Judge (Customs, Taxation & Anti-Smuggling-I), Karachi in Case No.191 of 2024, hence, the present proceedings.

3. After considering the submissions of the learned counsel and sifting¹ through the material placed before the court, for and against the applicant, reproduction whereof is eschewed herein², it is observed as follows:

- a. The allegation against the applicant is that he was driving a truck in which allegedly smuggled items including milk, salt, betel nuts and tyres were recovered.
- b. Learned counsel for the applicant pleaded entitlement to the concession of bail on the premise that applicant is mere driver; has no nexus with any goods / contraband; is not aware the nature of goods, contraband or otherwise, and in any event the matter falls within the non-prohibitory clause.

¹ *Shoaib Mahmood Butt vs. Iftikhar Ul Haq & Others* reported as 1996 SCMR 1845.

² *Chairman NAB vs. Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif & Others* reported as PLD 2019 Supreme Court 445; *Muhammad Shakeel vs. The State & Others* reported as PLD 2014 Supreme Court 458.

Despite notices having been issued on two subsequent occasions to the learned Special Prosecutor Customs he remained absent without intimation or justification. Such conduct cannot be appreciated and neither can it be employed as grounds for delay in consideration of bail.

- c. There is no laboratory report on record with respect to the nature, origin and / or quantum of the item/s recovered. The nexus of the applicant, with the recovery, remains to be established.
- d. The alleged offence admittedly does not fall within the prohibitory clause and it is settled law in such matters the grant of bail is the rule³ and its refusal an exception⁴. The Supreme Court has illumined⁵ that in such cases Courts may consider favorably the granting of bail and decline to do so only in exceptional cases. No exception has been demonstrated in the present matter.
- e. Upon tentative⁶ assessment of the material⁷ collected by the prosecution, for and against the applicant, it is manifest that the case, pertaining to the involvement of the applicant / accused in commission of the alleged offence/s, merits further enquiry⁸, hence, demonstrably qualifying the present matter within the remit of Section 497(2) Cr.P.C. The Supreme Court has maintained that in matters requiring further enquiry, grant of bail is the rule rather than the exception⁹.
- f. In addition to the foregoing, the material placed before the Court does not indicate any criminal record of the applicant, in cases of an identical nature or otherwise; no argument has been articulated requiring the applicant's presence for further investigation at this stage¹⁰ or denoting him as a flight risk; no apprehension has been expressed with regard to tampering of evidence by the applicant or repeating the offence/s, if enlarged on bail¹¹; hence, no cause is apparent presently warranting the continued incarceration of the applicant *pendente lite*.

4. Therefore, it is the assessment of this Court that the learned counsel for the applicant has made out a fit case for grant of post arrest bail, hence, the applicant is hereby admitted to bail, subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) and a personal recognizance bond, in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

5. It is considered pertinent to record that the observations herein are of tentative nature and shall not influence and / or prejudice the case of either party at trial.

JUDGE

³ *Muhammad Tanveer vs. The State & Another* reported as PLD 2017 SC 733.

⁴ *Tariq Bashir & Others vs. The State* reported as PLD 1995 Supreme Court 34.

⁵ *Zafar Iqbal vs. Muhammad Anwar & Others* reported as 2009 SCMR 1488.

⁶ *Shahzaman vs. The State* reported as PLD 1994 Supreme Court 65.

⁷ *Asif Ayub vs. The State* reported as 2010 SCMR 1735.

⁸ *Awal Khan & Others vs. The State* reported as 2017 SCMR 538.

⁹ *Muhammad Shafi vs. The State* reported as 2016 SCMR 1593; *Nisar Ahmed vs. The State* reported as 2014 SCMR 27.

¹⁰ *Riaz Jafar Natiq vs. Muhammad Nadeem Dar & Others* reported as 2011 SCMR 1708.

¹¹ *Subhan Khan vs. The State* reported as 2002 SCMR 1797.