IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Crl. Bail Application No. S- 919 of 2026

Applicants:	**1.** Meer Muhammad son of Sharafuddin, Kalhoro,
	2. Nazeer Ahmed alias Soofi Nazeer Ahmed son of Major Khan, Arain, through M**/s Ali Gul Abbassi and Muhammad Zohaib Azam Advocate.**
Complainant:	**Through Mr.** Gulshan Ahmed Shujjrah holding brief for Mr. Rahib Islam Malano, Advocate.
The State	**Through** Mr. Mansoor Ahmed Shaikh, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.

O R D E R.
16.11.2026.

Suresh Kumar, J.--- The applicants named above seek confirmation of the ad-interim pre-arrest bail granted to them by this Court vide order dated 17.09.2026, in a case bearing Crime No. 323/2026, for the offence under Section 380 PPC registered at Police Station 'A' Section, Ghotki.

2. The brief facts of the case, as depicted in the FIR, are that the applicants/accused, along with co-accused, allegedly cut down trees standing within the premises of Government Degree College Ghotki, committed theft, and took the same away in a tractor trolley.

3. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants/accused, the learned counsel holding brief for the complainant, and the learned DPG for the State. The counsel holding brief for the complainant sought an adjournment, which was turned down while complainant present in Court along with D.P.G opposed the confirmation of bail.

4. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the counsel for the respective parties and having perused the relevant material,

it reveals from the perusal of the FIR that some trees were cut by the applicants/accused through five unidentified laborers. The learned counsel mainly relied upon the report of the Divisional Forest Officer, Guddu Barrage Afforestation Division, Mirpur Mathelo, submitted to the learned Sessions Judge, Ghotki/Chairman Forest Committee. From the perusal of the said report, it reveals that the contractor caused environmental losses by cutting down five healthy green trees due to the construction of a sports complex. Nowhere is it mentioned in this regard about the role of the present applicants/accused in the cutting of trees; therefore, the case against the applicants calls for further inquiry. Moreover, there is a three-day inordinate delay in lodging the FIR, for which no plausible explanation has been furnished. After the grant of interim pre-arrest bail, the applicants appeared before the trial court and have not misused the concession of bail.

5. For the foregoing reasons above and guidance taken from above case laws, I am of considered view that the applicants/accused have successfully made out a case for the grant of pre-arrest bail, therefore, the interim pre arrest bail already granted to the applicants, is hereby confirmed on same terms and conditions with direction to appear before trial Court.

6. Needless to mention that the above observations are tentative in nature and will not prejudice the case of parties at the time of trial.

J U D G E

Irfan