

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR**Crl. Bail Application No. S- 830 of 2026**

Applicant: Manzoor Ahmed son of Manjhi bycaste Mahar,
through M/s Shabbir Ali Bozdar and Hajjan Shah, Advocates.

Complainant: Riaz Raheem Mahar present in person.

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

ORDER.
28.10.2026.

Suresh Kumar, J.--- The applicant named above seeks confirmation of the ad-interim pre-arrest bail granted to him by this Court vide order dated 01.09.2026, in a case bearing crime No. 78/2026, for offences under sections 324, 506/2, 337-H(ii), 34 PPC, registered at Police Station Adilpur, District Ghotki.

2. The brief facts of the case, as depicted in the FIR, are that on July 29, 2026, the complainant, Riaz Raheem, lodged an FIR at P.S. Adilpur, alleging that on the same date at 11:00 hours, the present applicant, Manzoor Ahmed, fired directly at the complainant with a pistol, hitting him on his right arm and issuing threats of murder. The complainant then went to the police station and lodged the FIR.

3. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant/accused and learned DPG as well as complainant. Learned DPG has opposed for confirmation of interim pre-arrest bail. Complainant has strongly opposed confirmation of pre-arrest bail and further states that he has challenged medical certificate issued by M.O before Medical Board.

4. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, it is revealed from the perusal of the FIR

that the applicant/accused allegedly fired a pistol, which hit the complainant on his right arm. This injury has been declared as Ghary Jaifah Mutalihimah and falls under Section 337-A(iii) of the PPC, carrying a punishment of up to three years, and does not come under the prohibitory clause of Section 497 of the Cr.P.C. The Medical Officer also opined that manipulation of the injury cannot be ruled out. The Investigating Officer has recommended disposing of the case as 'B' class, and such a summary is pending before the Magistrate. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of Muhammad Faisal v. The State and another (2020 SCMR 971), granted bail after arrest on the ground that the injury was on a non-vital part of the body. In the present case, the applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail; therefore, no useful purpose would be served by refusing bail on the ground of absence of mala fide if, otherwise, the accused has made out a case for the grant of bail after arrest on the merits. In this regard, reliance is placed on the cases of Muhammad Ramzan v. Zaffarullah (1986 SCMR 1380) and Khalil Ahmed Soomro v. The State (2017 SC 730). The learned counsel for the applicant has placed FIRs registered by both parties against each other. The cumulative effect of all such facts and circumstances creates doubt regarding the truthfulness of the prosecution's version; hence, the case against the applicant requires further inquiry. The applicant/accused has joined the investigation and has been regularly appearing before the trial court as well as before this Court, and he has not misused the concession of pre-arrest bail.

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

direction to appear before the trial court. The complainant is at liberty to file an application for the cancellation of bail if the applicant misuses the concession of bail or on any other ground provided by law.

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