

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH CIRCUIT COURT LARKANA

1st Criminal Bail Application No. D-17 of 2026

Before:

*Mr. Justice Abdul Mobeen Lakho;
Mr. Justice Abdul Hamid Bhurgri.*

Applicant : Aroosa daughter of Muhammad Khan Solangi, through Mr. Munir Ahmed M. Bijarani, Advocate.

The State : Through Mr. Aitbar Ali Bullo, D.P.G for State.

Date of Hearing : 14.04.2026
Date of Order : 14.04.2026.

ORDER

Abdul Hamid Bhurgri J.- The Applicant Aroosa daughter of Muhammad Khan Solangi seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.213 of 2025, registered at Police Station Kashmore, District Kashmore @ Kandhkot, for offences punishable under Sections 384 and 216-A, P.P.C., read with Sections 6 and 7 of the Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997, after dismissal of her bail application by the learned Special Judge, Anti-Terrorism Court, Kashmore @ Kandhkot, vide order dated 09.10.2025.

2. According to the F.I.R., on 23.09.2025 at about 1600 hours, the complainant ASI Illahi Bux Mirani, acting on spy information, apprehended the applicant/accused, who was allegedly having contacts with Bakhtu Shar Gang and Bhooro Shar. Her search was carried out by lady police constables, which led to recovery of a hand purse containing a VIVO mobile phone bearing SIM No.03042428492, cash amounting to Rs.1,200/-, a lipstick, and a small box of powder.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case at

the instance of her ex-husband due to matrimonial disputes and a custody issue relating to a minor. He argued that the ex-husband had procured different SIMs in the name of the applicant and had been misusing the same. He further contended that all the witnesses are police officials subordinate to the complainant and no independent private witness was associated despite prior information. He also submitted that the applicant was arrested by the SHO of Police Station Bhan Saeedabad, who had also taken away the minor, and that an application under Section 491, Cr.P.C., had been filed by her mother. Learned counsel further argued that the alleged offence does not fall within the prohibitory clause and that the applicant, being a woman, is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. Conversely, learned State counsel opposed the bail application on the ground that the applicant is nominated in the F.I.R. and that the prosecution case is supported by ocular evidence.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

6. Tentatively, it appears that although a mobile phone and certain other articles have been recovered from the possession of the applicant, the prosecution has yet to establish any nexus between the said recovered mobile phone/SIM and the alleged crime. The police papers do not disclose in whose name the said SIM number i.e. 03042428492 is registered, nor does the investigation show any material connecting the applicant with the alleged gang or the commission of the alleged offences. This material aspect has not been properly investigated by the Investigating Officer. Moreover, the

applicant is stated to be a resident of Bhan Saeedabad, District Jamshoro, whereas she was arrested by the police of Police Station Kashmore, and it has also been brought on record that her mother had filed an application under Section 491, Cr.P.C., before the Court of Sessions for her recovery. These circumstances, taken together, prima facie make the matter one of further inquiry. Furthermore, the alleged offence does not fall within the prohibitory clause. The other grounds raised by learned counsel for the applicant require deeper appreciation of evidence, which can only be undertaken at trial. In the circumstances, the case of the applicant falls within the ambit of further inquiry as contemplated under Section 497(2), Cr.P.C.

7. Accordingly, this bail application is allowed. The applicant is admitted to post-arrest bail subject to her furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) and a personal recognizance bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

8. The observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and shall not prejudice the case of either party at trial.

J U D G E

J U D G E