IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

Criminal Jail Appeal No.D-01 of 2025

PRESENT:

Mr. Justice Arshad Hussin Khan.
Mr. Justice Dr. Syed Fiaz ul Hassan Shah.

Appellant	**:**	Muhammad Haneef s/o Muhammad Khan @ Haji Brohi, through Mr. Raja Jawad Ali Saahar, Advocate.
Complainant /State	**:**	Through Ms. Rameshan Oad, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Date of hearing : **08.05.2025**
Date of decision : **08.05.2025.**

J U D G M E N T

Dr. Syed Fiaz ul Hassan Shah, J: The Appellant Muhammad Haneef was tried by learned Anti-Terrorism Court No.II, @ Central Prison Hyderabad, in ATC Case No.45 of 2024 (Re.The State Vs. Muhammad Haneef), emanating from FIR bearing Crime No.33 of 2023 registered with P.S, Udero Lal Station, for offence punishable under sections 324, 353, 332, 337-A(i), 337-F(i), 337-F(iii), 34 PPC R/W section 6/7 of ATA, 1997 and in ATC Case No.46 of 2024 (Re.The State Vs. Muhammad Haneef), arising out of Crime No.34 of 2023 registered at Police Station Udero Lal Station, for offence under section 25 of Sindh

Arms Act, 20113 whereby he has been convicted and sentence in aforesaid ATC cases in the following manner:

> *“Point No.4.*
>
> 42 Resultantly, accused Muhammad Haneef Brohi is convicted U/S 265-H(ii) Cr.P.C and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 10 years and to pay compensation of Rs:1,00,000/-(one lac), in case of non-payment of compensation he shall undergo S.I for six months for offence U/S 6(2)(b) of ATA, 1997 R/W section 324,337-A(i), 337-F(ii), 337-F(iii),34 PPC. The compensation amount if recovered be paid to both the injured PCs Gul Hassan and Tariq Ali. He is further convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 05 years and to pay fine of Rs:50,000/-, in case of non-payment of fine, he shall undergo imprisonment for 03 months more for offence U/S 6(2)(m) of ATA, 1997 R/W section 353,34 PPC. The accused is also convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for 07 years and to pay fine of Rs:50,000/- for offence U/S 25 of Sindh Arms Act, 2013, In case of non-payment of fine he shall undergo imprisonment for 03 months more. All the sentences shall run concurrently. The accused is produced in custody from Central Prison, Hyderabad, he is remanded back to Central Prison, Hyderabad with warrant of conviction to serve out the above sentences.”

2. ASI Rasool Bux of Police Station Udero Lal left the station for patrolling with his subordinate staff as per Roznamcha Entry No. 8. While checking near Saleh Shah Bridge, at about 1300 hours, they noticed a red 125 motorcycle (without registration number) carrying three individuals approaching from Udero Lal. When signaled to stop, two of the pillion riders took out pistols, assaulted PC Tariq Ali with a

pistol butt on his head, and opened fire on the police with intent to commit murder. The police retaliated in self-defense, and the encounter lasted approximately 10 minutes. During the exchange, PC Gul Hassan sustained a gunshot injury to his left leg. Two suspects fled towards Naseer Canal through nearby jungle, while one injured accused fell and was apprehended. Upon inquiry, he identified himself as Muhammad Haneef Brohi. A 30-bore TT pistol with a defaced number and empty magazine was recovered from him, for which he could not produce a license. The motorcycle used was also unregistered and undocumented, and thus seized under Section 550 Cr.P.C. Due to the absence of private witnesses, the memo of arrest and recovery was prepared in the presence of police mashirs PCs Gul Bahar and Akhtiar Hussain. The total eight empties casing of TT pistol and twelve of SMG were recovered and sealed at the scene. The injured accused and police constables were taken to RHC Udero Lal for medical treatment. After treatment, the accused and the recovered property were brought to the police station, where ASI Rasool Bux lodged two separate FIRs against the accused on behalf of the State.

3. The investigation was conducted by Inspector Shah Zaman, who submitted charge sheet before the competent Court of law showing present appellant / accused in custody while accused Ghulam Ali Brohi and Kheto Kachhi Kohi as absconders under section 512 Cr.P.C.

4. The requisite documents of prosecution file were provided to the Accused/Appellant by the trial Court as required under section 265-C of the Cr.P.C. at Exh.4. Initially the charge was framed by learned Additional Sessions Judge Matiari who recorded evidence of complainant ASI Rasool Bux but later case transferred as the offence triable by the Court of Anti-Terrorism. The learned Judge of Anti-

Terrorism took the oath under section 16 of ATA 1997 at Exh.07, whereafter learned APG filed application under section 21-M of ATA, 1997 as Exh.09, whereon order was passed that case Crime No.34 of 2023 being off shoot of main case No.33 of 2023 be tried together. Thereafter, the trial Court has framed the “Consolidated Charge” against the Appellant at Exh.10. The accused pleaded not guilty and claimed for fair trial, vide his plea at Exh.11.

5. During the trial, the prosecution has presented evidence to support the charge and to prove the allegations against the Appellant / accused. The P.W-1 ASI Rasool Bux, who is the Raiding-cum-Seizing Officer, Arresting Officer, Recovery Officer, and Complainant of the case has testified at Exh.12, he had produced both FIRs as Exh.12/A & 12/B as well as confirmed the departure and arrival roznamcha entries, letters issued to M.O for treatment of injured PCs and injured accused, memos of injuries, arrest of accused and recovery through this earlier deposition recorded by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge at Ex.06. P.W-2 PC Gul Bahar, who is witness of event and Mashir had testified at Exh.13, he had produced memo of inspection of place of incident at Ex.13/A and he also confirmed the memos of injuries and memo of arrest of accused and recovery produced through Exh.06/C, E & Exh.06/F. P.W-3 & 4 injured PC Gul Hassan and PC Tariq Ali had testified at Exh.14 & Exh.15. P.W-5 Medical Officer Dr. Fateh Muhammad had testified at Exh.16, who produced various documents such as police letter, provisional and final medical certificates of both injured PCs at Exh.16/A to Exh.16/E respectively. P.W-6 Investigating Officer / Inspector Shah Zaman had testified at Exh.17, who produced his roznamcha entries, sketch of place of incident and report of FSL at Exh.17/A to Exh.17/C

respectively. Learned APG through his statement produced the medical certificate of injured accused Muhammad Haneef as Exh.18 and then he closed the prosecution side at Exh.19 through his statement.

6. Thereafter, the statement of the accused under Section 342 of the Cr. P.C was recorded at Exh.20. In the statement, the accused denied all allegations made by the prosecution and asserted his innocence. The accused, in his statement under Section 342 Cr.P.C, opted not to testify under oath as per Section 340(2) Cr.P.C, nor did he call any defense witnesses despite being given the opportunity. However, while answering to question, appellant Muhammad Haneef stated that he was innocent and actually he was in disputed terms with one Naro Kolhi over rotation of water; when he crossed from the houses of Naro Kolhi, they attacked upon and confined him and produced him before the police, who involved him in this present false case and he prayed for justice.

7. After completion of trial and final hearing of the State Prosecutor and the Counsel for Defence, the learned trial Court passed Judgment and convicted and sentenced to the Appellant as referred at paragraph-1 here-in-above. The Appellant has impugned the said judgment of conviction before us which was passed on 31.12.2024.

8. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of appellant/accused has contended that there are material contradiction in between the evidence of prosecution’s witnesses which ought to have not been ignored by the Trial Court while considering the evidence on record; that it is surprising and unbelievable that from close range firing alleged to have made between the present appellant and police party lasted for 10 minutes but as per admission of prosecution’s no gunshot

injury sustained by present appellant during encounter which is not appealing to a prudent mind; that there is clear violation of section 103 Cr.P.C in respect of recovery of alleged arrest and recovery; that the learned trial Court failed to consider the contradictions made by prosecution witnesses and passed the impugned judgment in haphazard manner; that prosecution has miserably failed to connect the appellant/accused with the recoveries also failed to prove the case without shadow of doubts. Lastly he has prayed for acquittal of accused.

9. The D.P.G while supporting the impugned judgment has contended that the prosecution by examining prosecution witnesses and producing positive FSL report has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt; that the presence of the Appellant has not been denied at crime scene as such the prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt and the trial Court has rightly convicted the Appellant and the present appeal is liable to be dismissed.

10. We have heard the Counsel for Appellant and the DPG for State and with their assistance perused the evidence brought on record. We have re-appraised the evidence with the assistance of Counsel for the Appellant and the DPG. As per prosecution's version, it is the case of a police encounter between the Appellant and the police party, during which **PW-3 PC Gul Hassan** sustained a firearm injury and **PC Tariq** was allegedly assaulted with pistol butts by the absconding accused.

11. We observe that no direct evidence has been adduced to establish the firearm injury sustained by PW-3, Police Constable Gul Hassan, as well as the injury of Shajjah Ghayr Jaiffah sustained by PC Tariq. The testimony of PW-3, being a victim of the incident, fails to unequivocally attribute the act of firing a firearm to the Appellant before

the trial Court during his evidence. Crucially, PW-3 has not assigned any culpability to the appellant in relation to the commission of the offence, thereby creating a substantive lacuna in the prosecution's case. In light of this evidentiary deficiency, it is pertinent to refer to the relevant portion of the deposition made by PW-3, Police Constable Gul Hassan:

> "We signalled them to stop. The accused sitting behind the driver seat on enquired about the documents of the motorcycle, took out pistols and caused butt blows to PC Tarique, who fell down. The accused fired at us, and we also fired in our defense, such encounter continued for about 10 minutes. During which I sustained fire shot injury at my left leg and fell down. The accused tried to run away towards western side. The police party followed the accused. One of the accused fell down on the road and was arrested."

12. Likewise, PW-4, Police Constable Tarique Ali, has not provided any deposition implicating the appellant. His testimony does not specifically establish that his injury resulted from being struck with the butt of a weapon or any other act committed by the appellant. This absence of direct attribution further weakens the prosecution's case, necessitating a careful examination of the evidentiary record. His deposition is against the case set up by the prosecution:

> "After patrolling different places when we reached at Saleh Shah bridge started checking. We found that a motorcycle was coming from Odero Lal. We signal them to stop. The ASI enquired their names. Two of the accused who were sitting behind the driver seat took out pistols from folder of their shalwar caused me butt blows. I fell down on the road. The accused fired at us with intention to commit our Qatl-e-Amad."

13. A comparative assessment of the testimonies of PW-3 and PW-4, who are the key witnesses in this case, clearly demonstrates a fundamental deficiency in the prosecution's evidentiary framework. The prosecution's failure to present evidence concerning the nature of the firing and the injuries sustained by these pivotal witnesses, coupled with the absence of any direct attribution of liability to the appellant, severely undermines its case. Consequently, the Court is compelled to draw an adverse inference from the testimonies presented. The prosecution cannot object if the Court, based on the disclosed facts and evidence, reasonably infers the factual elements that the prosecution has elected to withhold, thereby rendering the status of such facts and evidence as disproved and relegating them to hearsay."

14. Unlike the rule as to relevance, the hearsay rule has a superficial rationality that is appealing. In general, it sounds quite sensible to refuse to consider testimonial evidence which is not given before the Court and have not undergone subject to examination, and cross-examination, in the trial. A witness who changes his stance cannot be deemed reliable, and his testimony should not be trusted. While a resiling witness may be disregarded, a complainant who retracts his statement can completely dismantle the prosecution’s case. Since criminal proceedings are initiated based on the complainant’s allegations, his resilience except in specific types of offences can eliminate the foundation of prosecution case. There is no basis to produce further evidence when the complainant does not support the continuation of the prosecution as whatever he urged is the basis of prosecution case and more importantly when such witness is star witness of the event of commission of offence. There is no justification

for presenting further evidence when the complainant withdraws support for the prosecution, as his statement forms the foundation of the case. More importantly, if the complainant is the **star witness** to the commission of the offence, his retraction can dismantle the prosecution entirely. Reliance can be placed on the case reported as ***"Maulvi Hazoor Baksh vs. The State", (PLD 1985 Supreme Court 233).***

15. The burden remains on prosecution as held in ***"Abdul Majeed v. The State", (2011 SCMR 941)***, the Supreme Court ruled:

> 7. The basic principle of criminal law is that it is the burden of the prosecution to prove its case against the accused beyond reasonable doubt. This burden remains throughout and does not shift to the accused, who is only burdened to prove a defence plea, if he takes one. "

16. The relevance of evidence or a ***probative value of evidence*** has had undoubtedly the reference to such probative value of evidence, it "rational" effect does not invite consideration of its veracity, accuracy, authenticity, exactitude or the weight and capable to rationally affect the assessment or admissibility or probability of the existence of a fact. What happened when all evidence consisting of assertions offered for their truth which were not given before the trial Court? In theory, the legal philosophers, scholar, jurist and in practice, decisions of Courts and precedents developed a rule of law with the name had given as "hearsay". In ***"Azeem Khan v. Mujahid Khan", (2016 SCMR 274)*** it has held that:

> "32. It is also a well embedded principle of law and justice that no one should be construed into a crime on the basis of presumption in the absence of strong

> evidence of unimpeachable character and legally admissible one. Similarly, mere heinous or gruesome nature of crime shall not detract the Court of law in any manner from the due course to Judge and make the appraisal of evidence in a laid down manner and to extend the benefit of reasonable doubt to an accused person being indefeasible and inalienable right of an accused. In getting influence from the nature of the crime and other extraneous consideration might lead the Judges to a patently wrong conclusion. In that event the justice would be casualty.
>
> Line supplied

17. The hearsay rule even more patently involves concealed assumptions, it does not convincingly demonstrate truth of facts and the evidence is so inherently incredible, inconceivable, fanciful, un-compelling or preposterous that it could not be accepted by the Court. In such a case its effect on the probability of the existence of a fact in issue would be nil and it would not meet the criterion of relevance and even mere existence of ***corroborative evidence*** would not alone be sufficient to hold accountable the Appellant or Accused. The reason behind this analogy is the secondary status of such corroborative evidence which primarily is meant to supplement and support the direct evidence. For reference reliance can *safely* be placed on the case ***"Yasin alias Gulam Murtuza v. State", (2008 SCMR 336),*** it has been held by Supreme Court that:

> "Conviction cannot be based on any other type of evidence, howsoever convincing it may be **unless direct or substantive evidence is available**. Even guilt of accused cannot be based merely on high

probabilities that may be inferred from evidence in a particular case."

Line supplied

18. In ***"Ghulam Qadir and 2 others vs. The State", (2008 SCMR 1221)***, the Supreme Court of Pakistan has held:

> "Best evidence has been withheld without any justifiable reason. Needless to add that if an injured witness himself does not appear to charge an accused for his injury and the Court is not satisfied with his disability or incompetence or reasons for not appearing then the conviction for his injury cannot be recorded on the basis of other evidence under Qisas, as held by this Court in Asghar Ali alias Sabah v. The State 1992 SCMR 2088."

19. Similarly, in ***"Asshar Ali alias Sabah and others vs. The State and others", (1992 SCMR 2088),*** the Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that:

> "Under the Injunctions of Islam, if an injured witness himself does not appear to charge an accused for his injury and the Court is not satisfied with his disability or incompetence or reason for not appearing then the conviction for his injury cannot be recorded on the basis of other evidence under Qisas provision. Qisas is a personal right and as it now stands, if the person aggrieved therefrom forgives it, and one way of forgiving the wrong doer is not appearing in support of the case against the wrongdoer, there will be no Qisas."

20. The delay in recording of statement by the investigation officer is also fatal for the case of prosecution. The. PW3 Gul Hassan, who is the victim of event in his cross examination deposed: ***"My statement***

was recorded by the IO after three days of the incident. It is correct to suggest that I had not mentioned the reason for such delay in my statement." In ***"Muhammad Asif v. The State", (2017 SCMR 486);*** the Supreme Court of Pakistan discarded the evidence of a material witness of homicide incident on the ground that his statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. was recorded with unexplained delay of one or two days, with the following observation:

> "There is a long line of authorities/precedents of this court and the High Courts that even one or two days unexplained delay in recording the statement of eye-witness would be fatal and testimony of such witnesses cannot be safely relied upon."

21. In **"*Abdul Khaliq vs. the State", (1996 SCMR-1553)***, it was observed by Hon'ble Supreme Court that;

> "It is a settled position of law that late recording of 161, Cr. P.C. statement of a prosecution witness reduces its value to nil unless there is plausible explanation for such delay."

22. In another case reported as ***"Shamoon alias Shamma vs. The State", (1995 SCMR 1377)*** it was held by Honourable Supreme Court as under:

> "The prosecution must prove its case against the accused beyond reasonable doubts irrespective of any plea raised by the accused in his defence. Failure of prosecution to prove the case against the accused, entitles the accused to an acquittal."

23. In ***"Wazir Mohammad Vs. The State", (1992 SCMR 1134)*** it was held by Hon'ble Supreme Court as under:

> "In the criminal trial whereas it is the duty of the prosecution to prove its case against the accused to the hilt, but no such duty is cast upon the accused, he has only to create doubt in the case of the prosecution."

24. In ***"Abdul Majeed v. The State",*** **(2011 SCMR 941)** held:

> "The basic principle of criminal law is that it is the burden of the prosecution to prove its case against the accused beyond reasonable doubt. This burden remains throughout and does not shift to the accused, who is only burdened to prove a defence plea, if he takes one. "

25. Surprisingly, despite a claimed 10-minute encounter at a close distance of 10 to 12 feet as admitted by **PW-1 ASI Rasool Bux,** the present appellant did not sustain any firearm injury during the episode. This appears to be highly improbable in a crossfire situation of such duration. More importantly, during cross-examination, the complainant admitted: *"**The encounter took place from the distance of about 10 to 12 feet. It is correct to suggest that none from the accused side had sustained any fire shot injury…..** It is correct to suggest that no blood stained earth was collected by me from the place of incident… It is correct to suggest that the recovered pistol produced in court does not show its description as TT pistol or 30' bore….. I can not say if the fire made by the present accused had hit to the police officials… It is correct to suggest that the FIR registered under Sindh Arms Act does not show the description of the weapon recovered from the accused."* These material contradictions, particularly the inability of the complainant to confirm whether the appellant's alleged firing caused injury, significantly

undermine the credibility of the prosecution's case. Such discrepancies cast serious doubt on the prosecution version and entitle the appellant to the benefit of doubt as he could not say whether the fire allegedly made by the present accused actually hit any police official.

26. Moving ahead, according to PW-2 Gul Bahar, the recovered pistol was found with an empty magazine. However, PW-1 ASI Rasool Bux stated that ***"I secured 12 empties of SMG, 08 empties of TT Pistol and sealed the same separately."*** If this version of prosecution hypothetically admitted then it itself contradicts on the point that two of accused escaped sitting behind the driver were having pistols, as such, recovery of sealed 12 SMG empties from the scene also becomes doubtful. It appears that when the ocular account is in direct conflict with forensic evidence or when recovery is not linked to the accused with confidence, benefit of doubt must go to the accused. The recovered weapon is always corroborative piece of evidence. When no connection is established between crime empties and recovered weapon, the recovery becomes doubtful.

27. The determination of cases on the basis of evidence rather than of "facts" is obviously not the result of some arbitrary principle of law, but is the inevitable consequence of the character of problems with which the law deals. The recollections or accumulation of the documents and incrementing material or things relating to the past events constitute the "evidence" on which courts of law act and are the stuff out of which the "facts" are constructed. At best, the cases are decided on such evidence; at worst, they are decided on a refusal to consider this evidence and on a hunch, rule or prejudice as to which party should be favoured in the absence of evidence. The crime empties were sent to the Arms Expert, followed by crime pistol of .30

bore and the Ballistic Expert vide Exh.17/C reported that the three crime empties (C-1, C-2, and C-3) were fired from .30 bore pistol while rest 5 crime empties (C-4 to C-8) were **not fired** from the pistol in question and the following major points i.e. striker pin marks, breech face marks and ejector marks etc are **Dissimilar.** Where recovery of weapon is not supported by the ballistic report or contradicted by ocular evidence, therefore, it was sufficient to discard testimony and benefit of doubt may be given to Accused. In this respect, reliance can be placed on the cases of ***Mst. Rukhsana Begum and others Vs. Sajjad and others (2017 SCMR 596). Mst. Anwar Begum Vs. Akhtar Hussain alias Kaka and 2 others (2017 SCMR 1710) and Mst. -9-Sughra Begum Vs. Oaiser Pervez and others (2015 SCMR 1142).*** A contradiction between the ocular account and the nature of the recovered empties casts serious doubt on the prosecution's case. A conviction cannot be sustained on such unreliable and inconsistent evidence.

28. The over-all discussion arrived at conclusion that the prosecution has miserably failed to prove the guilt against present appellant beyond shadow of any reasonable doubt and it is a well-settled principle of law that for creating the shadow of a doubt, there should not be many circumstances. If a single circumstance creates reasonable doubt in the prudent mind, then its benefit is always extended in favour of the accused not as a matter of grace or concession, but as a matter of right. In this respect reliance is placed on the case of ***Muhammad Mansha v. The State (2018 SCMR 772),*** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that:

> "4. Needless to mention that while giving the benefit of doubt to an accused it is not necessary that there

should be many circumstances creating doubt. If there is a circumstance which creates reasonable doubt in a prudent mind about the guilt of the accused, then accused would be entitled to the benefit of such doubt, not as a matter of grace and concession but as a matter of right. It is based on the maxim, “it is better that ten guilty persons be acquitted rather than one innocent person be convicted”. Reliance in this behalf can be made upon the cases of ***Tariq Pervez v. The State (1995 SCMR 1345), Ghulam Qadir and 2 others v.The State (2008 SCMR 1221), Muhammad Akram v.The State (2009 SCMR 230) and Muhammad Zaman v.The State (2014 SCMR 749)”***.

29. In view of the above discussion when the prosecution has already failed to prove its case against the appellant in main case beyond any reasonable doubt, therefore, Judgment of conviction of Appellant to the extent of Crime No.33 of 2023 registered with PS Ordero Lal is not sustainable. Consequently, by short order dated 08.05.2025 this appeal was partly allowed whereby the Appellant Muhammad Haneef was acquitted from the charge in ATC Case No.45 of 2024 arising out of Crime No.33 of 2023, registered at PS Odero Lal Station, under sections 324, 353, 332, 337-A(i), 337-F(i), 337-F(iii), 34 PPC R/W section 6/7 of ATA, 1997 and judgment of conviction dated 31.12.2024 was set-aside to that extent only.

30. Reverting to the off-shoot case bearing ATC Case No.46 of 2024, arising out of Crime No.34 of 2023, registered at PS Odero Lal Station, under section 25 of Sindh Arms Act, 2013, wherein appellant Muhammad Hashim was arrested on 24.06.2023 at 1300 to 1310 hours by complainant ASI Rasool Bux of P.S. Udero Lal Station along-

with unlicensed 30 bore TT Pistol. Such memo was prepared on the spot and prompt recovery of weapon from the exclusive possession of the appellant was succeeded and FIR was also registered timely. The evidence on this point was not broken down by the Defence Counsel. When confronted the evidence to the learned Counsel which demonstrate that the Defence Counsel has not shaken the evidence of the prosecution during cross examination and failed to put question about false accusation nor any suggestion was given to the prosecution witnesses that the weapon has foisted upon the Appellant. The learned counsel for the appellant had made a submission that appellant is the first offender, therefore, if the period of sentence already undergone by him is treated as sentence, he will not press the appeal on merits and did so.

31. Learned Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh has recorded objection but has not denied that the appellant is the first offender and has been sufficiently punished.

32. We have considered submissions of parties and perused the material available on record. The prosecution witnesses have supported the case against the Appellant on all salient features viz-a-viz his arrest at the spot, recovery of alleged 30 bore pistol from him, etc. However, it is an admitted fact that the appellant is the first offender and no case of like nature or otherwise has ever been registered against him. We are of the view that the punishment appellant has already undergone is sufficient for a first offender like appellant particularly when learned defence counsel has disclosed that the appellant is remorseful of his past and wants to improve himself. While considering these facts, we see no impediment legal or otherwise to accede to the request of learned defence counsel for reduction of sentence. Accordingly, judgment dated

31.12.2024 to the extent of conviction for illegal possession of weapon emanated from FIR No.34 of 2023 was maintained. However, sentence of imprisonment of the appellant was reduced to the period already undergone by him and subject to above modification in the sentence(s), the Criminal Jail Appeal was disposed of.

33. These are the reasons of our short Order dated 08.05.2025.

JUDGE

JUDGE

-