IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD

Cr. Bail Application No.S-972 of 2026
(Asif Ur Rehman @ Bablo son of Bakhte Rawan Pathan versus The State)

Criminal Bail Application No.S-973 of 2026
(Bilal son of Muhammad Saleem versus The State)

Date of hearing: **10-11-2026**

Date of order: **10-11-2026**

Mr. Imtiaz Ali Abbasi Advocate holding brief on behalf of Mr. Shoukat Ali Kaka, Advocate for applicants.
Applicants present on interim pre-arrest bail
Mr. Shahid Ahmed Shaikh, Addl. P.G.

O R D E R

OMAR SIAL, J:- Through this common order, I intend to dispose of captioned bail applications filed by applicants seeking pre-arrest bail in Crime No.61 of 2025, registered at Police Station SITE, Hyderabad, for offences punishable under Sections 324, 147, 149, 504 PPC.

2. The case of prosecution is that on 15.04.2025, at about 08:30 a.m., the complainant was proceeding towards the Court on a motorcycle along with his relative, Adil, and, upon reaching near Al-Qamar School Chowk, Labour Colony, Site Area, Hyderabad, allegedly spotted the nominated accused, Asif alias Bablo and Bilal alias Kana, accompanied by three unidentified persons, riding two motorcycles. It is alleged that accused Asif alias Bablo fired three pistol shots at him, one of which struck his left leg below the knee, while accused Bilal alias Kana fired two shots, hitting his right leg. The accused thereafter allegedly fled from the spot while extending threats. The complainant was initially taken to Shah Bhitai Hospital, Latifabad, from where he was referred to Civil Hospital for further treatment. Such FIR was lodged.

3. I have heard the applicants' learned counsel and the learned Deputy Prosecutor General Sindh.

4. The injuries sustained by the two injured fall within the ambit of Sections 337-F(iii) and 337-F(vi) PPC. The punishment for which falls within the non-prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C. Keeping in mind the principles enunciated ***in Tariq Bashir and 5 others v. The State*** (PLD 1985 SC 34), I do not see any exceptional or extraordinary reason to deny the applicant's bail. The applicants say that there is dispute between the parties over some Real State transaction. Malafide, therefore, cannot be conclusively

ruled out at this stage. Consequently, the case of the applicant calls for further inquiry within the meaning of Section 497(2), Cr.P.C.

5. Given the above, both bail applications are allowed and the interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicants is confirmed on the same terms and conditions.

JUDGE

Ali Haider