

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S- 829 of 2026

Applicants: 1. Inayat son of Bhagiyal,
2. Rafique son of Qaimuddin,
3. Imran son of Nazar Muhammad,
through Mr. Achar Khan Gabol, Advocate.

Complainant: Through Mr. Bilal Ahmed Soomro, Advocate.

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

Date of hearing & Order: 27.10-2026.

ORDER.

Suresh Kumar, J ---Applicants named above seek post arrest bail in a case bearing crime No. 105/2026, offence u/s 324, 147, 148, 149, 114, 504 PPC registered at Police Station Airport Sukkur.

2. Briefly facts of the prosecution case as depicted in the FIR are that on 06.08.2026 at 11.00 p.m on the instigation of accused Sharafuddin and Qaimuddin, accused made direct firing from pistol to Rashid Ali but the fire hit to shutter, other accused caused injuries with lathies and iron pipe, then complainant lodged FIR.

3. The applicants initially sought post arrest bail from the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-V Sukkur, which was dismissed vide order dated 24.08.2026. Aggrieved by this dismissal, the applicants have approached this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants/accused. Learned counsel for complainant and learned DPG for State who did not oppose for grant of bail.

5. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the respective parties and having perused the relevant material, it is revealed from the perusal of the FIR that a specific role of firing is attributed to co-accused Haneef, while the applicants/accused Rafique and Imran have not been assigned any specific role in causing injuries while applicant Inayat has also not caused any injury as his fire missed and did not hit to injured Rashid Ali, therefore, the case against

the applicants falls within the ambit of further inquiry. Moreover, the complainant is present and has expressed no objection to the grant of post arrest bail on the ground that he has reconciled with the applicants/accused due to the intervention of nekmards.

6. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the applicants/accused have made out their case for bail. Therefore, they are granted post-arrest bail, subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Fifty thousand) each and a PR bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. Needless to say that above observations are tentative in nature and will not prejudice the case of either party.

J U D G E