

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR**Crl. Bail Application No. S- 851 of 2026**

Applicants: 1. Ghulam Nabi
2. Ghulam Hussain
3. Ghulam Shabbir, all sons of Muhammad Bachal, Chachar, **through Mr. Liaquat Ali Malano, Advocate.**

Complainant: **Through** Mr. Irshad Ali Soomro, Advocate

The State **Through** Mr. Muhammad Raza Katohar, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

ORDER.
27.10.2026.

Suresh Kumar, J.--- The applicants named above seek confirmation of the ad-interim pre-arrest bail granted to them by this Court vide order dated 04.09.2026, in a case bearing crime No. 67/2026, for offences under sections 337-F(v), A(i), F(i), 147, 148, 149, 504 PPC, registered at Police Station Sarhad, District Ghotki.

2. The brief facts of the case, as depicted in the FIR, are that on 20.08.2026, at 11:30 hours, the complainant, Muhammad Chachar, lodged an FIR alleging that the present applicants/accused, along with co-accused, caused injuries to various parts of the body of the complainant and his brother, Makhno. Subsequently, the complainant obtained a letter for a medical certificate and lodged the FIR.

3. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants/accused and learned DPG as well as counsel for complainant. Learned DPG and counsel for complainant strongly opposed for confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail.

4. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the respective parties, I have perused the relevant material. From the perusal of the FIR, it is revealed that applicant/accused Ghulam

Nabi allegedly caused a lathi blow to the complainant, which hit his right palm; applicant/accused Ghulam Qadir caused a hatchet blow to his head; applicant/accused Ghulam Hussain caused a lathi blow to his brother Makhno, which hit his right ear and right arm; and accused Ghulam Shabbir caused a lathi blow to Muhammad Murad, which hit his abdomen and buttock. The Medical Officer has declared the injuries as Shujjah-e-Khafifah and Jurh Ghair Jaifah, and other hurts which fall within the ambit of sections 337-A(i), F(v), and L(ii) and carry a punishment of up to five years, thus not coming under the prohibitory clause of section 497(1) Cr.P.C. Previous enmity over land is admitted in the FIR; therefore, malafide intention cannot be ruled out. Moreover, the delay of six days in the registration of the FIR has not been plausibly explained; hence, all the above cumulative facts require further inquiry, as embedded in section 497(2) of the Cr.P.C. The applicants/accused have joined the investigation and have been regularly appearing before the trial Court as well as before this Court, and they have not misused the concession of pre-arrest bail.

5. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the applicants/accused have successfully made out a case for the grant of pre-arrest bail. Therefore, the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicants is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions, with a direction to appear before the trial Court.

6. Needless to mention that the above observations are tentative in nature and will not prejudice the case of parties at the time of trial.

J U D G E

Irfan