

Order Sheet  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH,  
CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD**

Cr. Bail Appl. No. S- 1455 of 2025  
[Ali Murad & another v. The State]

---

DATE ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE

---

13.04.2026

For orders on office objections  
For hearing of main case

Mr. Muhammad Nawaz Narejo Advocate, along with Applicants  
Ms. Sana Memon, A.P.G. Sindh

*Crime No. 13 of 2025  
P.S. Lakhath, Shaheed Benazirabad  
u/s 215, 380 & 457 PPC*

**ORDER**

**Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry J.** - The Applicants pray for pre-arrest bail in the aforesaid crime after the same has been declined by the Additional Sessions Judge-II, Shaheed Benazirabad by order dated 20.11.2025.

2. Heard learned counsel and perused the record.

3. The Informant (Nazeer Ahmed), who is the step-brother of the Applicants (Ali Murad Jatoi and Manzoor Ali Jatoi), alleged in the FIR that he, his real brothers and his step-brothers (Applicants) reside in a joint property in a village, with each brother occupying a separate room; that in the room in the Informant's possession, he had stored wheat seed and fertilizer and had locked the same; that on 16.09.2025, when he returned home, he found that the door, window and roof of his room had been demolished, and the wheat seed, fertilizer and iron girders of the room had been stolen; and that when he confronted the Applicants, they admitted to the theft.

4. The learned trial court had granted interim pre-arrest bail to the Applicants, but did not confirm the same when the I.O. reported that the Applicant No.1 refused to visit the criminal record office for accessing his criminal record, whereas the Applicant No.2 did not join the investigation. Responding to that, learned counsel for the Applicants submits that both Applicants had in fact appeared before the I.O. on more than one occasion, but he demanded illegal gratification for recording their statements. The trial

court's order dated 20.11.2025 notes that Applicant No.1 had visited the P.S. to join the investigation. The order dated 22.12.2025 passed by Additional Sessions Judge in CrI. Misc. No. 4197/2025 also notes that his statement was subsequently recorded by the I.O. Therefore, there is force in the Applicants' submission that when Applicant No.1 had joined the investigation, there was no reason for the Applicant No.2 to avoid the same.

5. Though the Informant alleges that the theft took place on 15.9.2025, he made the FIR on 27.10.2025, with a delay of one month and 12 days. While the Informant stated that he had involved local elders for a resolution of the matter, that seems to be a statement made after-the-thought.

6. As per the Applicants, the Informant did not ordinarily reside at said house, and no such incident ever took place; in fact, there is a dispute between the Applicants and the Informant over property inherited by them from their father, and the Informant lodged a false FIR against the Applicants when they demanded a share in such property. Admittedly, the Informant was not present at the house at the time of the alleged theft. No other witness was cited by him who witnessed the theft. In such circumstances, the version of the Applicants seems plausible.

7. In view of the foregoing, the interim pre-arrest bail granted to the Applicants Ali Murad Jatoi and Manzoor Ali Jatoi is confirmed on terms recorded in the order dated 28.11.2025. Bail application disposed of.

JUDGE

karar\_hussain/PS\*