

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

Cr. Bail Application No.2111 of 2026

Present:

Mr. Justice Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro

Mr. Justice Muhammad Abdur Rehman

Applicant:- Ali Waheeduddin Abbasi through Mr. Jahanzeb Khan,
Advocate.

Respondent:- The State through Mr. Ali Ahmed Kandhro,
Additional Prosecutor General a/w SIP/IO
Muhammad Ismail Mir.

Mr. Muhammad Akram, advocate for complainant.

Date of hearing:- 04.08.2026

Date of decision:- 04.08.2026

=====

MUHAMMAD IQBAL KALHORO J: Allegedly, complainant was abducted by unknown accused on 28.03.2026 and was released on the same day after paying ransom amount of Rs.1,70,00,000/- to them through applicant, who happens to be his brother-in-law. In the investigation, the accused who had abducted the complainant were arrested and disclosed that the entire plan was masterminded by the applicant and he had paid them Rs.13,00,000/- for committing such crime.

2. As a consequence, applicant was also booked in this case and arrested. Allegedly from him, Rs.2,70,000/- and Rs.8,00,000/- from the co-accused, some of the ransom amount, were also recovered. Further, in the investigation, when statement of mother of the abductee/complainant was recorded u/s 161 CrPC, she also implicated him.

3. Applicant's counsel has pleaded for bail on the ground that the case against the applicant is one of further inquiry as there are various discrepancies in the FIR, challan and memos; section 7 of ATA is not attracted; FIR is delayed. Hence, applicant is entitled for bail. He has relied upon 2009 P. Cr. L.J., 2012 MLD 120, 2012 MLD

1986, 2012 P. Cr. L.J. 986, 2022 YLR 2046 and order dated 12.06.2018 passed by this Court in Cr. Bail Application No.S-203/2018.

4. On the other hand, learned APG and the counsel for complainant have opposed the bail.

5. We have considered submissions of the parties and the case law cited at bar and are of the view that at this stage when the case is yet to be unfolded and evidence recorded, applicant is not entitled to bail on the basis of *prima facie* evidence against him. In fact, there are three pieces of evidence against him, his name has been taken by the co-accused to be the mastermind of the crime, which is palpably supported by recovery of some of the ransom from him and 161 CrPC statement of mother of the complainant implicating him to be one of the accused. In presence of such evidence, the deeper appreciation, evaluating the alleged discrepancies pointed in defence, cannot be undertaken as this is a prerogative of the trial Court and has to be undertaken only after evidence is recorded. We, therefore, do not find the applicant entitled to concession of bail and hence dismiss this bail application.

6. The Bail Application is disposed of accordingly. The observations herein above are tentative in nature and shall not affect the case of either party on merits before the trial Court. The trial court is, however, directed to expedite the trial, examine material witnesses within three months without fail, after which in any case, the applicant would be at liberty to repeat his bail application, which will be decided on its own merits.

JUDGE

JUDGE

HANIF