

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Criminal Bail Application No. 3062 of 2025

Applicant : Abdul Razzaq
son of Haji Azaad
Through Mr. Muhammad Yaseen, advocate

Respondent : The State
Through Mr. Sharafuddin Kanhar, A.P.G
Sindh.

Complainant : Ali Murad present in person.

Date of hearing : 30.03.2026.

Date of order : 30.03.2026.

ORDER

Jan Ali Junejo, J.— Applicant Abdul Razzaq son of Haji Azaad seeks pre-arrest bail in a case bearing Crime No. 307/2024, for offence under section 496-A/494 PPC of P.S Saeedabad, Karachi. Prior to this, the applicant had sought the same relief before the learned Additional Sessions Judge-X, Karachi West, which was declined vide order dated 13.12.2024. He was admitted to interim pre-arrest bail by this court vide order dated 06.11.2025, now the matter is fixed for confirmation of interim bail or otherwise.

2. The prosecution case, briefly stated, as reflected from FIR No. 307 of 2024, is that the complainant, Ali Murad, is a private employee. On 18.05.2024, he went to work in the morning, leaving his wife and four-year-old daughter at home. When he returned home in the evening at around 6:00 p.m., he found that his wife, namely Rehana, was not present. Thereafter, he started searching for her and later came to know that some unknown person had kidnapped his wife with the intention of committing adultery with her; hence, this FIR was lodged.

3. Heard and perused record.

4. As per the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant, the applicant has been falsely implicated with mala fide intention. He contends that the FIR has been lodged with unexplained delay of about one day; that no specific role has been attributed to the applicant, and that the applicant has joined investigation and has not misused the concession of interim protection; co-accused Mst. Rehana and Hidayatullah have been

granted bail by the learned trial court; therefore, he prays that the pre-arrest bail be confirmed.

5. The Addl. P. G. Sindh while not opposing the grant of bail, recorded his no objection to the instant application in view of the affidavit of no objection filed by the complainant, same is taken on record, wherein he has expressly raised no objection to the applicant being admitted to bail.

6. Notably, the complainant has since submitted an affidavit in which he has raised no objection to the grant of bail to the applicant. This has resulted in two conflicting versions, one set forth in the FIR and the other contained in the complainant's affidavit. Such divergence creates a situation where the veracity of the complainant's statement and his credibility can only be determined at the time of trial, after the recording of evidence, therefore, applicant has made out a case for further inquiry into his guilt within the meaning of section 497(2), Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the interim bail already granted to the applicant vide order dated 06.11.2025 is confirmed on same terms and conditions.

7. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits. However, in case the applicant misuses the concession of bail in any manner, the trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the same after giving him notice, in accordance with law.

J U D G E