

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

Criminal Bail Application No.S- 311 of 2026

Date of hearing: 24.08.2026.

Date of order: 24.08.2026.

Mr. Mashooque Ali Jan, Advocate for applicants along with applicants (on bail).

Ms. Rameshan Oad, D.P.G for State.

Nemo for complainant.

ORDER

ABDUL MOBEEN LAKHO, J.- Applicants/accused Syed Sajid Ahmed @ Sajid and Ali Raza @ Ali seek pre-arrest bail in Crime No.09/2026 registered at P.S. A-Section Hyderabad for offences u/s 448, 452, 147, 148, 149, 504, 506/2 PPC. Previously, the applicants/accused applied for the same relief before the learned 2nd Additional Sessions Judge, Hyderabad but the same was declined vide order dated 04.03.2026.

2. The details and particulars of the F.I.R. are already available in the bail application and F.I.R., same could be gathered from the copy of F.I.R. attached with such application, hence needs not to reproduce the same hereunder.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants/accused mainly contended that the applicants/accused are innocent and have falsely been implicated in the case in hand with malafide intention of complainant on account of some dispute between the parties over the portion of share in the house; that there are general allegations attributed to the applicants/accused. He lastly contended that co-accused have already been enlarged on bail by the trial Court.

4. On the other hand, learned D.P.G concedes that there are general allegations and co-accused having identical role have already been granted bail.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the entire material available on record.

6. Admittedly, as per contents of FIR there is a family dispute between the parties as the complainant is said to be sister-in-law of the applicant/accused. There are general allegations and no specific allegation has been attributed to the applicants/accused in the commission offence. Moreover, co-accused Syed Maqbool Ahmed has already been granted post arrest bail by the trial Court vide order dated 14.01.2026 whose name also appears in the FIR having identical role to that of present applicants. Today the counsel for applicants/accused has also placed on record the certified true copy of order dated 30.03.2026 whereby the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to co-accused Syed Manzoor Ahmed was also confirmed. Hence, on the rule of consistency the present applicants/accused are also entitled for the same relief. The offences with which the applicants/accused stand charged does not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497 Cr.P.C. Learned Additional P.G also candidly conceded that this is the case of further inquiry. The deliberation and consultation in lodgment of FIR cannot be ruled out at this stage. The investigation has been completed and the applicants/accused are attending the trial regularly. Per learned counsel for the applicants/accused the case before the trial Court is fixed for framing of charge.

7. Serious malafides on the part of complainant and police have been alleged. Co-accused more or less in similar circumstances have already been granted the concession of pre-arrest bail. Present applicants/accused have also made out a good case for the same relief. Case against the applicants/accused calls for further inquiry within the ambit of Section 497(2) Cr.P.C. Accordingly, instant bail application is allowed and the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicants/accused on 10.03.2026 is hereby confirmed on same terms and conditions.

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

JUDGE