

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR**Crl. Bail Application No. S-646 of 2026**

Applicant: Alladin son of Bago bycaste Shar, **through** Mr. Amanullah G. Malik Advocate.

The State **Through** Mr. Shafi Muhammad Mahar, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Date of hearing: 28-08-2026.

Dated of order 04-09-2026

ORDER.

Suresh Kumar, J.--- Through, instant bail application, applicant named above seeks post arrest bail in a case bearing crime No. 85/2025, offence u/s 302, 311, 148, 149 PPC registered at Police Station Wasti Jeewan Shah, District Ghotki.

2. The facts of the prosecution case, as depicted in the FIR lodged by complainant ASI Khamiso Khan on 12-09-2025, are as follows: On the day of the report, he, along with his subordinate staff, left the police station for patrolling in the area. During their patrol, upon reaching Bayiaa Camp 11, they received intelligence indicating that on 11-09-2025 at 1200 hours, the accused Din Muhammad @ Dino, Gulsher, Dost Ali, Nandho, all by caste Shar and residents of the Katcha area Ronti, Taluka Ubauro, along with two unidentified individuals, allegedly committed the murder of Mst. Allah Rakhi, aged approximately 18 years, Mst. Latifan, aged approximately 20 years, and Mai Hawa, aged approximately 22 years, and subsequently disposed of their bodies in the Sindh River. Following this information, they proceeded to the specified location, where they observed signs of dragging and footmarks of the accused, as well as recovered empty cartridges from the scene. A mashirnama of the place of incident and the recovery of the cartridges was prepared on-site.

Ultimately, the complainant lodged the aforementioned FIR. After the registration of the FIR, the complainant recorded a further statement under Section 162 of the Cr.P.C., wherein he disclosed the names of the unidentified accused as Alladin, son of Bago Shar, and Allah Bux, son of Gulabi alias Ghulam Nabi Shar.

3. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant/accused and learned Deputy P.G for the State.

4. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the learned counsels representing the respective parties, and having perused the relevant record, it is revealed from the perusal of the FIR that the complainant allegedly received spy information indicating that the accused Din Muhammad, Gulsher, and Nandho, along with two unidentified individuals, committed the murder of Mst. Allah Rakhi, Mst. Latifan, and Mst. Hawa by inflicting firearm injuries and subsequently disposed of their bodies in the River Indus to conceal the evidence. Upon receiving such information, the complainant, along with his subordinate staff, arrived at the land of Ghous Bux, situated beside the Indus River, where they found dragging marks of the dead bodies, footprints of the accused, and also recovered four empty cartridges of 7.62 mm Kalashnikov, five empty cartridges of a 12-bore gun, and two empty cartridges of a 30 bore pistol. The record further reveals that the applicant/accused has been named in the further statement of complainant ASI Khamiso Khan, as well as in the statements of PWs HC Noor Muhammad Shaikh, HC Shabbir Ahmed Channa, PC Zahid Hakro, and PC Sodho Khan, recorded on 12-09-2025. These witnesses stated that they learned through spy information that the applicant/accused Alladin Shar and co-accused Allah Bux were the unidentified individuals who,

along with the nominated accused, were involved in the commission of the murder of the three women. From the perusal of the FIR, it is evident that the complainant is not an eyewitness to the incident and lodged the FIR based on spy information, as well as the statements of witnesses. Furthermore, the record indicates that the bodies of the deceased have not yet been recovered. There is no tangible material available on record to connect the applicant/accused with the commission of the offence, aside from the alleged spy information regarding the applicant/accused's involvement. Moreover, the crime weapon has not been recovered from the applicant, despite his arrest and investigation. The complainant and PWs are not eyewitnesses to the incident, and no direct evidence is available on record against the applicant/accused; therefore, the case of the applicant/accused falls within the ambit of further inquiry.

5. For the foregoing reasons above, I am of considered view that the applicant/accused has successfully made out a case for the grant of bail, therefore, the he is admitted to bail subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs. 500,000/- lacs and P.R bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

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

J U D G E