

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,  
HYDERABAD.**

Criminal Bail Application No.S-1234 of 2024

Applicant : Liaqat Ali present on interim pre-arrest bail through Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Daudani, Advocate.

Respondent : The State through Ms. Rameshan Oad, Assistant Prosecutor General Sindh.

Complainant : None present.

Date of hearing : 21.11.2024.

Date of Order : 21.11.2024.

**ORDER.**

**Amjad Ali Sahito, J:-** Through instant bail application, the applicant/accused namely, Liaqat Ali s/o Nawaz Ali seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.231/2024, registered at Police Station Matli for the offence under sections 324, 337-A(i), 337-F (i), 504, 509, 35 PPC. Earlier the bail plea of the applicant/accused was declined by the learned 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional Sessions Judge, Badin vide order dated 15.10.2024.

2. The details of the FIR are included in the bail application and its attached copy, so there is no need to restate them here.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant/accused has falsely been implicated in this case otherwise, he is innocent. He further contends that the applicant has also received injuries at the hands of complainant. He further contends that the role assigned against the applicant is general in nature and has also relied upon the order dated 13.11.2023 passed by learned trial Court whereby co-accused namely, Mumtaz Ali, Noman and Rashid Ali have been admitted to post-arrest bail except co-accused Ashraf, as such, the applicant is also entitled for grant of bail and prays that the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicant may be confirmed.

4. On the other hand, learned A.P.G. Sindh opposes the confirmation of bail to the applicant.

5. Heard and perused the record.

6. The record shows that the applicant is originally resident of Village Sonaro Khan Laghari, Fatehpur, Taluka and District Tando Muhammad Khan whereas complainant is residing in Village Baran Laghari, Taluka Matli, District Badin and the place of incident is street of complainant's house, where

the applicant along with co-accused entered into the house of complainant. The motive of incident is that one brother-in-law of the applicant Mumtaz wanted to marry with Miss Fiza the daughter of complainant; however, on refusal, the accused entered into the house of complainant and caused lathi and blunt side hatchet blows to the complainant, her father Allah Ditto and Ali Hassan. During such scuffle, they received various injuries. The seriousness of the offence and the nature of the attack on the complainant party after the refusal of a marriage proposal, demonstrates the dangerous mindset of the accused persons which cannot be overlooked they need custodial interrogation to discover the full extent of their criminal actions. The eyewitness accounts and medical evidence fully support each other. It is important to note that, at the bail stage, only a tentative assessment is made. At present, there is sufficient evidence available that could connect the applicant to the commission of the offense.

7. In view of the above facts and circumstances, learned counsel for the applicant has failed to make out the case for further inquiry as envisaged in subsection 2 of section 497 Cr.P.C. Consequently, instant criminal bail application is **dismissed**. Resultantly, interim order dated 12.11.2024 passed earlier by this Court is hereby recalled.

8. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the learned trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits.

JUDGE