

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

Cr. Bail Appl. No. S- 1507 of 2025
[Khan Muhammad Panhwar v. The State]

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

13.05.2026

For hearing of main case

Applicant is present on interim pre-arrest bail
Mr. Mashooq Ali Mahar, Advocate for applicant
Mr. Ghulam Rasool Mallah, Advocate for Complainant
Ms. Sana Memon, D.P.G.

*Crime No. 125 of 2025
P.S. Bhan Syedabad
u/s 397, 384, 324, 109, 114 & 34 PPC*

ORDER

Adnan Iqbal Chaudhry J. - Applicant seeks pre-arrest bail in the aforesaid crime after the same has been declined by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sehwan by order dated 2.12.2025.

2. Heard learned counsel and perused the record.

3. The Informant, Javed Ali, reported that he had obtained agricultural land on lease from Tariq Hussain Abbasi for cultivation; that when the crop was ripe for picking, co-accused Riaz and Allah Warrayo raised a false claim to said land to demand extortion money of Rs. 50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lacs only) from the Informant and his brother; that on 15.10.2025, the Informant, his brother Abdul Hameed, cousin Muhammad Hussain, munshi Zubair Pirzada and Naveed Joyo were present at the Informant's shop, when the accused persons namely (i) Riaz with a rifle (ii) Ayaz with a pistol (iii) Imtiaz with a repeater (iv) Khan Muhammad (**Applicant**) with a revolver (v) Allah Warayo with a lathi (vi) Abdul Jabbar with an iron rod (vii) Meer Muhammad and two unknown persons came to said shop on motorcycles and threatened to kill the Informant and his companions unless they make payment; that upon resistance, the accused Riaz, Ayaz and Imtiaz fired upon Abdul Hameed (Informant's brother), the shots hitting his legs and thigh; and the accused Jabbar, Meer and Khan Muhammad (Applicant) stole cash of Rs. 15 to 20 lacs, cheque book, stamp paper from the Informant's shop.

4. The incident of extortion and dacoity with the attempt to cause grievance injury, is spelt out from the FIR. The incident is corroborated by

injuries suffered by Abdul Hammed. The Applicant was nominated as one of the dacoits armed with a revolver who robbed the Informant of cash. The other persons present at the shop alongside the Informant have recorded supporting statements under section 161 Cr.P.C. Therefore, even though firearm injuries caused to Abdul Hameed are not attributed to the Applicant, he has nonetheless been assigned a specific role in the FIR. The submission by learned counsel for the Applicant that he has been falsely implicated, has yet to be investigated as only an interim challan has been submitted in the case.

5. Learned counsel for the Applicant then places reliance on the rule of consistency in view of the bail granted by the trial court to the co-accused Abdul Jabbar and Meer Muhammad. However, firstly, the case of said co-accused persons appears to be different, as it was not alleged that they were armed with deadly weapons. Secondly, they were granted bail post-arrest. It is settled law that considerations for pre-arrest bail are entirely different from post-arrest bail.

6. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant does not make out a case for pre-arrest bail. The bail application is therefore dismissed.

JUDGE