

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI**

Crl. Bail Application No. 1317 of 2025  
Crl. Bail Application No. 1318 of 2025

Applicant : Muhammad Shahid  
through Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan,  
advocate

Respondent : The State  
through Mr. Muhammad Iqbal  
Awan, Addl. Prosecutor General

Date of hearing : 24.09.2025

Date of short order : 24.09.2025

Date of reasons : 29.09.2025

**ORDER**

Omar Sial, J: F.I.R. No. 72 of 2025 was registered under sections 397 and 34 P.P.C. at the Darakhshan police station on 04.02.2025. The F.I.R. was registered on information provided by Faizan of an incident that occurred on 25.01.2025. Faizan reported that while he was withdrawing money from an ATM on 25.01.2025, a man wearing a helmet snatched his money and phone from him and ran away.

2. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned Additional Prosecutor General.

3. It has been explained to me that the applicant was arrested on 16.02.2025 when, allegedly, he was roaming around suspiciously, and when stopped and checked, he had an unlicensed pistol. He was arrested, and F.I.R. No. 101 of 2025 was registered against him under section 23(1)(a) of the Sindh Arms Act. Allegedly, during interrogation, he told the police that he was the same person who had robbed Faizan.



To date, there is no explanation as to how the applicant was identified as the man who robbed the complainant. The investigating officer admitted that no identification parade was held. The complainant, who appeared in person, submitted that he had not seen the face of the man who robbed him and therefore cannot identify him.

4. There is no explanation for why the complainant waited nearly ten days to report the incident to the police. In specific incidents, delay is justified. In others, the victim, having little faith in the law enforcement agencies, never reports such incidents; however, there are a few examples where a person who has been robbed goes to report the incident ten days after its occurrence. The complainant, too, was unable to explain why it took him so long to report the incident to the police.

5. The police claim that after his arrest, the applicant took them to a place where the robbed phone was recovered. The authenticity of the recovery story needs to be probed at trial. The case against the applicant requires further inquiry. No number or specific description of the pistol seized from the applicant is given. The manner in which he was arrested in the weapon case is also unnatural. The investigating officer could not explain how it was determined that a random man standing on the road was suspicious and therefore required checking.

6. Above are the reasons for the short order dated 24.09.2025.

JUDGE