

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

**Criminal Bail application No.S-556 of 2025**

**Applicant** : Ramzan son of Deedar Ali through Mr. Amjad Hussain Shar, advocate.

**Respondent** : The State, through Irfan Ali Talpur, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

**Complainant** : Nemo.

**Date of hearing** : **29.09.2025**

**Date of order** : **29.09.2025**

**ORDER**

**TASNEEM SULTANA, J.-** Through this bail application, the applicant Ramzan seeks post arrest bail in Crime No.123/2025, for the offence under Section 381-A PPC, registered at PS Market, District Hyderabad. Prior to this application applicant/accused filed 1st Bail Application No.99 of 2025 before Judicial Magistrate-X Hyderabad the same was dismissed vide order 10.05.2025 thereafter the applicant/accused filed 2nd Bail application No.1181 of 2025 before Additional Sessions Judge-VIII Hyderabad the same was also dismissed vide order dated 19.05.2025.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 24.04.2025, complainant went along with his cousin and his brother on motorcycle Honda C.G-125, towards Civil Hospital LUMHS at about 1730 hours for visiting his ailing uncle. The said motorcycle was parked outside the Emergency Ward with side lock. When they returned at about 1830 hours, the motorcycle was found missing. Despite making search, the same could not be traced. Later, complainant obtained CCTV video clip of the theft, and upon inquiry came to know that applicant Ramzan S/o Deedar Ali, by caste Solangi, had stolen the motorcycle and was in possession thereof. Hence, the complainant appeared at Police Station, produced the USB recording, and lodged the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that neither any offence under Section 381-A PPC has taken place as alleged, nor the applicant/accused has any concern with the same. The entire story is false, fabricated, untrustworthy, and unbelievable, without any independent or corroborative evidence, and has been concocted to humiliate, disgrace, and victimize the

applicant; that the complainant party is habitual of blackmailing and falsely implicating innocent persons in fabricated cases for monetary gain. Those who fulfill their demands are let off, while poor and innocent persons suffer in jail; that the case of the present applicant/accused requires further inquiry within the meaning of Section 497 Cr.P.C. and merits consideration for grant of bail; that there is neither any eye-witness, chance witness, circumstantial evidence, nor last-seen evidence available on record to substantiate the prosecution's accusation; that there is an unexplained delay of six days in lodging of FIR, during which period the complainant remained silent and did not approach the police or register any NC; that the alleged recovery has been foisted upon the applicant/accused by police, and false implication cannot be ruled out.

4. Conversely, learned Deputy Prosecutor General opposed the bail on the ground that the applicant is a habitual offender as three cases of similar nature were also registered against him; that recovery of property has been affected from him; that he was identified on the basis of CCTV footages which is part and parcel of investigation. Therefore, he is not entitled for the concession of bail.

5. Heard. Record perused.

6. I am not inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail as there exists a prima facie case connecting him with the commission of the alleged offence. The applicant has been specifically nominated in the FIR after having been identified through CCTV footage. Furthermore, the snatched motorcycle was recovered on his pointation, thereby corroborating his involvement.

7. The record further reflects that the applicant has a criminal history, as the CRO report shows his involvement in three other cases of a similar nature. This indicates his habitual tendency towards committing such offences. The allegations against him pertain to a heinous offence which directly affects the peace and security of society at large.

8. In view of the above circumstances, the applicant does not deserve the concession of bail. Accordingly, the instant bail application was dismissed vide my short order dated 29.09.2025, and these are the reasons in support thereof.

9. The observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and shall not prejudice the trial Court at the stage of final determination.

**JUDGE**