

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD

Cr. Bail Appl. No. S-830 of 2026
[Teekamdas and 4 others v. The State]

31.08.2026

For orders on office objections
For orders on M.A. 5156/2026
For hearing of main case

Mr. Bashir Ahmed Talpur, Advocate along with applicants on interim pre-arrest bail
Mr. Altaf Hussain Khokhar, DPG along with complainant Dr. Yasir Imam Khoso and
ASI Muhammad Hashim Mallah PS S.F. Rahoo

ORDER

Abdul Mobeen Lakho, J.- Applicants seek pre-arrest bail in Crime No.158 of 2026 registered at Police Station Shaheed Fazil Rahu (S.F. Rahu), District Badin, for offences under Sections 419, 420, 269, 270, 420 PPC, after dismissal of their application for pre-arrest bail by the learned Sessions Judge-I, Badin, vide order dated 19.06.2026.

2. The details and particulars of the case are already available in the bail application and the FIR and may be gathered therefrom; hence, the same need not be reproduced herein.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants contends that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case; that no video is was ever recorded or photographs were taken; that no medical report, complaint of any patient, or forensic analysis of the articles allegedly recovered from the applicants is available on record; that alleged recovery has been foisted upon the applicants; that no name of any persons allegedly present at the clinic(s) at the time of raid is given in the FIR; that the applicants were not arrested from the place of incident and that nothing was recovered from their exclusive possession; that all the PWs are police officials / interested witnesses and no patient allegedly present at the clinic(s) has been made as a witness of the incident; and, that the case of the prosecution calls for further inquiry, Lastly, learned counsel submits that the applicants have remained on interim pre-arrest bail without misuse of the concession and prays for confirmation of the same.

4. On the other hand, learned DPG appearing for the State has opposed the pre-arrest bail application on the ground that the applicants are specifically nominated in the F.I.R with serious allegations of illegal and unauthorized medical practice.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have examined the available material with their assistance. In the present case, although the applicants are nominated in the FIR however, the available material does not, at this stage, justify their arrest. No video recording of the incident was ever made nor were the photographs taken. The raid, according to the FIR, was conducted during day time between 03:30 to 04:30 p.m. but no patient was associated to act as a witness. The allegations regarding illegal and unauthorized medical practice against the applicants are yet to be determined at trial. The record does not show any medical report or complaint of any patient, nor any forensic analysis of the allegedly recovered articles. The applicants were not arrested from the place of occurrence, and the alleged recovery was not made from their exclusive possession. At this stage, this Court is not required to conduct a deeper appreciation of the evidence or record a final opinion on the guilt or innocence of the applicants. The material presently available, when considered in its entirety, does not provide such clear and unimpeachable grounds as would justify depriving the applicants of their liberty through arrest. The prosecution witnesses are police officials. The case has been challaned and the applicants are no more required for further investigation. The applicants are on interim pre-arrest bail and there is nothing on record to suggest that they have misused the concession, attempted to influence or intimidate any witness, tampered with the prosecution evidence, or otherwise obstructed the course of investigation. Moreover, the offence with which the applicants are charged does not fall within the prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C.

6. In view of above discussion, I am of the tentative view that the applicants have been able to make out a case for confirmation of the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to them. Consequently, the instant bail application is allowed and the interim pre-arrest bail granted to the applicants vide order dated 24.06.2026 is hereby confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

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

JUDGE