

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

Criminal Bail Application No.3103 of 2025

Applicant : Arshadullah Ahmed through  
Mr. Syed Maqbool Hussain Shah, Advocate.

Complainant : Sadruddin present in person.

Respondent : The State, through Mr. Qamaruddin Nohri,  
D.P.G.

Date of Hearing : 28.11.2025

Date of Order : 28.11.2025.

**O R D E R**

**TASNEEM SULTANA-J.:-**Through this Criminal Bail Application, the applicants Arshaduddin Ahmed son of Moizuddin Ahmed and Muhammad Azam Basheer son of Muhammad Basheer seek pre-arrest bail by invoking the concurrent jurisdiction of this Court in Crime No.843 of 2025, registered at Police Station Malir City, Karachi, under sections 504, 506 & 34 PPC read with sections 3 & 4 of the Lawyers Protection Act, 2023.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that the complainant Sadruddin son of Abdul Jabbar, an Advocate by profession, alleged that on 21.10.2025 at about 12:00 noon, while present outside the courtroom of learned ADJ-V, Malir, applicant No.2 threatened and abused him on the assertion that the complainant had filed a petition against an international company, and further conveyed that applicant No.1, being Chief Executive Officer of the said company, had stated that any advocate appearing against the company would face dire consequences; that upon the complainant contacting other advocates, applicant No.2 fled from the spot; and that on these allegations the present FIR was lodged.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants contended; that the applicants have been falsely implicated; that applicant No.1 was not present at the alleged place of occurrence and his implication is indirect; that applicant No.2 had already left the Court premises prior to the alleged time; that the FIR was lodged after an unexplained delay; that despite the alleged occurrence having taken place within court premises, no independent witness has been cited; that the essential ingredients of the invoked provisions are not attracted; and that during investigation the complainant submitted a statement on oath before

the Investigating Officer expressing his unwillingness to pursue the matter further, whereupon a report under section 168, Cr.P.C. has been forwarded to the higher authorities proposing disposal of the case under clause "C".

4. Conversely learned Deputy Prosecutor General has not opposed the instant bail application, while the complainant, who was present before the Court in person, admitted that the matter has been resolved between the parties and that he has no objection to confirmation of pre-arrest bail.

5. Perusal of the record reflects that the role attributed to applicant No.1 is not founded on presence at the spot; that the alleged occurrence is stated to have taken place within court premises, yet no independent witness has been cited; that the FIR has been registered after a delay; and that investigation the complainant has made a statement on oath expressing his desire not to pursue the matter further, pursuant where to a report under section 168, Cr.P.C. proposing disposal of the case under clause "C" has been submitted.

6. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, the case, at this stage, calls for further inquiry within the meaning of section 497(2), Cr.P.C. The interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicants on 10.11.2025 is confirmed, subject to the same terms and conditions. The applicants shall continue to cooperate with the investigation and appear before the trial Court as and when required. These are the reasons of my short order dated 28.11.2025.

7. The observations made herein are tentative in nature and shall not prejudice the case of either side at trial.

**JUDGE**