

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR.

Cr. Bail Application No.S-639 of 2026

Mr. Saeed Ahmed Bhatt, Advocate along with Applicant.
Mr. Sardar Ali Shah, Additional P.G for the State a/w complainant.

Date of Hearing: **20-07-2026**

Date of Order: **20-07-2026**

ORDER

ZULFIQAR ALI SANGI, J.- Through instant Criminal Bail Application applicant Ghulam Nabi Kalhoro seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No.32 of 2026, registered at P.S, Shaheed Murtaza Mirani-Khairpur, for offences under Sections 365 PPC (in FIR), 302, 376-A, 377-A, 120-B, 201, 368 PPC (in Challan), after rejection of his bail plea by learned Additional Sessions Judge-IV/GBV, Khairpur vide order dated 29.06.2026.

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 mala fide intentions and ulterior motives. He submits that the name of the applicant does not transpire in the F.I.R.; rather, it surfaced subsequently through the further statement of the complainant; however, the complainant filed an affidavit before the trial Court expressing his no objection to the confirmation of the interim pre-arrest bail granted to the applicant. Learned counsel further submits that, after the grant of interim pre-arrest bail by this Court, the applicant has regularly attended the proceedings before the trial Court and has not misused the concession of bail.

4. Conversely, learned Additional P.G. as well as complainant, present in Court, have conceded the confirmation of the interim

pre-arrest bail on the ground that the matter has already been settled between the parties outside the Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant, the learned A.P.G., the complainant, present in Court, and have also perused the material available on record. The record reflects that the name of the applicant was not mentioned in the F.I.R. and surfaced subsequently through the further statement of the complainant. It is also an admitted position that the complainant filed an affidavit before the trial Court expressing his no objection to the confirmation of the interim pre-arrest bail granted to the applicant. Today, complainant is also present in Court and has no objection for the confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicant by this Court. Furthermore, since the grant of interim pre-arrest bail by this Court, the applicant has regularly attended the proceedings before the trial Court and has not misused the concession of bail.

6. In the circumstances and coupled with no objection raised by learned APG as well as complainant, the instant bail application is **allowed** and the interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicant 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