IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S- 1008 of 2026

Applicants:	Abdul Rauf son of Awnar Siyal **through Mr. Dhan Raj, Advocate.**
Complainant:	None present for complainant.
The State	**Through** Mr. Shafi Muhammad Mahar, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Date of hearing & Order: 16.11-2026.

O R D E R.

Suresh Kumar, J --- Through instant bail application, Applicant named above seek post arrest bail in a case bearing crime No. 56/2025, offence u/s 302, 324, 452,148, 149, 114, 504, 429, 337-A(iv), 337-F(vi), 147 PPC registered at Police Station Mithiani.

2. The brief facts of the case, as depicted in the FIR, are that on 10.07.2025 complainant Muhammad Morial lodged FIR wherein it is alleged that presnt applicant/accused Abdul Rauf along with co-accused named in the FIR on the isntatigation of accused Muzaffar Siayl made direct firing and has committed the murder of Saddar alias Safdar while Umed Ali, Piyaral and Zahid sustained fire arm injuries, after the incident complainant went to P.S and lodged FIR.

3. The applicant initially sought post arrest bail from the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-II Naushahro Feroze, which was dismissed vide order dated 25.09.2026. Aggrieved by this dismissal, the applicant has approached this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant/accused and the learned Deputy Prosecutor General for the State who opposed for grant of post arrest bail.

5. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the parties and having perused the material available on record. From perusal of record it reveals that applicant/accused has assigned role of causing injury to PW Umed Ali and no any injury was alleged to have caused to deceased Safdar and Piyaral. It is well settled law that vicarious liability can be determined at the time of trial and after recording of

evidence, therefore, case against applicant/accused falls within the ambit of further enquiry.

6. Learned counsel for applicant has relied upon the order dated 22.04.2026 whereby co-accused Wazir Ali alias Ghulam Sarwar was granted bail on the ground that he has assigned role of causing injury to P.W Zahid Hussain who appeared and raised no objection while case of present applicant is at par with him as applicant/accused has also assigned role of causing injury to P.W Umed Ali who has also raised no objection before trial Court. Admittedly role of present applicant/accused is at par with co-accused, therefore, present applicant/accused Abdul Rauf is also entitled for bail on the rule of consistency.

7. In view of above facts and circumstances, I am of the considered view that bail application of applicant Abdul Rauf Siyal is allowed, and he is granted bail subject to furnishing a surety in the sum of Rs. 100,000/- (one lac) and a PR bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial court.

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

J U D G E

Irfan