IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR.
Crl. Bail Application No.S-852 of 2026.

DATE OF HEARING	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE

Applicant:	Rao-Farman S/O Rao-Riyasat Ali Rajput **Through Mr.Mujeeb ur Rehman Malano Advocate.**
Complainant:	Abdul Ghafoor S/O Moula Bux Ghoto Through Mr. Achar Khan Gabol Advocate
The State:	**Through Mr.Shafi Muhammad Mahar, D.PG.**

Date of hearing & order: **16.11.2026**.

Suresh Kumar J:- Through instant Criminal Bail Application, the applicant/accused Rao-Farman Ali Rajput seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.269/2026 for the Offences punishable U/Ss 457, 382 PPC registered at Police station A-Section Ghotki..

2. The facts of the prosecution case, as depicted in the FIR, are that on 25.07.2026, the complainant, Abdul Ghafoor, lodged an FIR stating that on 27.06.2026, his family went for medical treatment, leaving the complainant at home. On 01.07.2027, at 06:30 hours, the complainant returned home and saw that the applicant/accused, along with three unknown culprits who were armed, were in his house. They had taken golden ornaments, prize bonds, and cash, and the complainant remained silent out of fear while the accused persons escaped.

3. The applicant/accused previously applied for grant of bail after arrest before learned Addl. Session Judge, Ghotki which was dismissed, vide order dated 17-08-2026. Being aggrieved by this dismissal order, the applicant/accused has approached this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for applicant/accused, and learned D.P.G Sindh assisted by learned counsel for complainant. Learned D.P.G, and learned counsel for complainant have strongly opposed the grant of bail

to the applicant/accused on the ground that recovery has been effected so also forensic report.

5. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the respective parties and having perused the material available on record, it is observed from the perusal of the FIR that the applicant/accused allegedly committed theft of cash, two sets of jhumkion weighing one tola, and two gold rings weighing one tola. The record further reveals that the FIR was registered on 25.07.2026, while the incident took place on 01.07.2026; however, the delay in the FIR has been explained. The version of the complainant is supported by the statements of the PWs. The forensic report indicates that the incident was reported on the very next day, and fingerprints were collected, which were subsequently matched with the fingerprints of the accused. Moreover, the recovery of the receipt for the deposited cash, ATM card, and driving license was affected. Therefore, there is prima facie sufficient material available on record to connect the applicant with the commission of the offence. Furthermore, the offences under Section 382 PPC and Section 457 PPC are punishable by up to 10 years and 14 years, respectively; thus, the punishments for both sections fall within the ambit of the prohibitory clause of Section 497(1) Cr.P.C.

6. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the applicant/accused has failed to make out his case for grant of bail, therefore he is not entitled for grant of bail after arrest accordingly instant bail application is dismissed.

7. 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