

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

Cr. Bail Appl.No. 2657 of 2026

Date	Order with signature of the Judge
------	-----------------------------------

Present: **Mr. Justice Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro.**
Mr. Justice Khalid Hussain Shahani.

Uzair ul Hassan @ BatteryVs. The State

17.09.2026.

Mr. Umar Farooq, Advocate for applicant
Ms. Amna Ansari, Addl. P.G. a/w PI I.O. Tarique Qayoom
SIU/CIA, Karachi

O R D E R

=

MUHAMMAD IQBAL KALHORO J: Complainant registered an FIR No.307/2024 U/s 385, 386, 34 PPC r/w section 7 ATA at P.S. Super Market, Karachi on 22.06.2024 alleging that he had received a phone call from some unknown accused demanding Bhatta from him and in case of his failure, to face dire consequences.

2. In the investigation, applicant was identified to be the person whose WhatsApp number was used by co-accused Hammad, still absconder, for demanding Bhatta from complainant and threatening him, hence applicant was arrested on 06.07.2024 and is still in jail without any progress in the trial.

3. Meanwhile some of co-accused including Muhammad Moosa and Mirza Faraz Baig, who were related to co-accused Saboria Baig, a friend of applicant, who had obtained WhatsApp number from him and forwarded it to the main accused Hammad, her husband, have been granted bail. Applicant's bail application has been rejected by the trial court on the ground that his number was used for demanding Bhatta from the complainant.

4. Learned defence counsel citing the above facts and grounds has pleaded for bail opposed by learned Addl. P.G. I.O. is present and has confirmed that not a single witness has been examined since applicant is in jail. According to him, complainant is not feeling well and the trial court wishes to examine him first before any other witness.

5. Be that as it may, applicant is in jail for more than two years without any progress in the trial for no fault of him. Meanwhile co-accused whose case is more or less identical to the applicant, have been granted bail. Further the investigation is silent that although number of applicant was used for demanding Bhatta but whether he was in such knowledge or not. Therefore his guilt is yet to be established in the trial. Therefore, we find the case against the applicant to be one of further inquiry and grant him bail subject to furnishing a solvent surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/- and P.R bond in the same amount to the satisfaction of the trial court.

The Cr. Bail Application is disposed of.

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

JUDGE

JUDGE

A.K