

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH,
BENCH AT SUKKUR**

Crl. Bail Application No.S-250 of 2026
(Muhammad Haneef Bhayo v. The State)

Crl. Bail Application No.S-256 of 2026
(Ghulam Fareed v. The State)

Date of hearing	Order with signature of Judge.
-----------------	--------------------------------

M/s Shamsuddin N. Kobhar and Nawab Ali Pitafi, Advocates along with applicants.

Mr. Aftab Ahmed Shar, Additional P.G for the State along with complainant.

Date of Hearing & Order: **01-06-2026**

ORDER

Adnan-ul-Karim Memon J.- The applicants, namely Muhammad Haneef and Ghulam Fareed, have filed the instant applications seeking confirmation of pre-arrest bail after dismissal of their earlier bail applications by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Daharki, vide orders dated 11.03.2026 in Crime No.35 of 2026, registered at Police Station Daharki for offences punishable under Sections 506-II, 420, 468, 465, 471, and 34 PPC.

2. Learned counsel for the applicants contended that the applicants had no knowledge whatsoever regarding the alleged mutation entries in the record-of-rights and were not involved in any fraudulent activity concerning tampering with the revenue record or incorporation of false entries in collusion with revenue officials. It was further argued that the applicants have no concern with the land in question and that the allegations levelled by the complainant, to the effect that the applicants, along with their co-accused, had drawn pistols and issued threats of dire consequences, are false and baseless. Learned counsel further submitted that the applicants apprehend their arrest at the hands of the police with mala fide intentions aimed at humiliating and

disgracing them and, therefore, sought the extraordinary relief of pre-arrest bail.

3. This Court, vide orders dated 16.03.2026 and 19.03.2026, granted interim pre-arrest bail to the applicants subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- each along with personal recognizance bonds in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Additional Registrar of this Court. Pursuant thereto, the applicants furnished the requisite surety documents, which are available on the record.

4. During the course of the hearing, the complainant, who is present in Court, stated that he will have no objection to the confirmation of bail to the applicants in both bail applications provided the applicants to furnish undertakings to the effect that they would not cause any harassment or interference with him in any manner. Learned Additional Prosecutor General also expressed no objection to such a course. The request seems to be reasonable.

5. In view of the statements made by the complainant and the learned Additional Prosecutor General, and with the consent of the parties, the instant bail applications are disposed of on the same terms and conditions as contained in the orders dated 16.03.2026 and 19.03.2026. Their bail stands confirmed. The applicants are further directed to execute bonds in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) each before the Additional Registrar of this Court, undertaking that they shall not harass, intimidate, or interfere with the complainant in connection with the present crime. It is, however, clarified that any civil dispute relating to the subject property matter, the same shall be adjudicated by the competent forum in accordance with law, if and when brought before it. Meanwhile, parties to act strictly in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, these bail applications stand disposed of in the above terms.

The office is directed to place a signed copy of this order in the file of the connected matter as well.

JUDGE

Ahmad