

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR.

Cr. Bail Application No.S-341 of 2026
(*Sakiladho Laghari v. The State*)

Mr. Shahid Ali Memon, Advocate along with Applicant.
Ms. Rabia Bhatti, Advocate for complainant.
Mr. Sardar Ali Shah, APG for the State.

Date of Hearing: **13-07-2026**

Date of Order: **13-07-2026**

ORDER

ZULFIQAR ALI SANGI, J.- Through instant Criminal Bail Application applicant Sakiladho seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.03 of 2026, registered at P.S, Mubarakpur, under sections 452, 337A(i), F(i), 504, 114 PPC. His earlier bail plea was declined by learned trial Court vide order dated 19.03.2026.

2. The facts of the F.I.R. are mentioned in the bail application copy whereof is also attached with the memo of bail application, hence, need not to reproduce the same here.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to grudge and mala fide intentions. He submits that the alleged incident took place on 17.01.2026, whereas the FIR was lodged on 03.07.2026 after a delay of about six months, for which no plausible explanation has been offered by the complainant. He further contends that there exists admitted enmity between the parties and that an earlier FIR was also registered by the same complainant. It is further argued that the offence with which the applicant is charged does not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C. Lastly, he prays that the interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicant be confirmed.

4. Conversely, learned Additional Prosecutor General, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, opposed the bail

application on the ground that the applicant is directly nominated in the FIR with the specific role of causing injuries to Mst. Zainab. He submits that, as per the final medical certificate, the injury is punishable with imprisonment up to seven years; therefore, the applicant is not entitled to the confirmation of pre-arrest bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. The record reflects that enmity between the parties is admitted in the FIR and there is a delay of about six months in lodging the same, for which no plausible explanation has been furnished by the complainant. Admittedly, the complainant himself did not sustain any injury; therefore, it cannot be said that he remained occupied with treatment or was otherwise prevented from approaching the police promptly. It is also an admitted position that the complainant had earlier lodged FIR No.01 of 2026 at Police Station Mubarakpur against the present applicant in respect of an incident that allegedly took place on 15.01.2026, and the said FIR was registered on the same day without any delay. Thus, the unexplained delay in lodging the present FIR prima facie creates doubt. Moreover, the alleged offence does not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C.

6. Under these circumstances, the instant bail application is allowed, and the interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicant by this Court is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

7. The observations made hereinabove are tentative and would not influence learned Trial Court at the time of deciding the case as the same are only for deciding this bail application.

J U D G E

AHMAD