IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR.

Criminal Bail Application No.S-1012 of 2026.

DATE OF HEARING	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE

Applicant: Eidan Khan S/O Mitho Khan by caste Junejo
Through Mr.Rukhsar Ahmed Junejo, Advocate.

Complainant: Mst. Malookan W/O Sohno Khan.

The State: **Through Mr. Ashfaque Ahmed Abro, AAG.**

Date of hearing & order: **18.11.2026**.

Suresh Kumar J:- Through instant Criminal Bail application applicant/ accused Eidan Khan Junejo, seeks his post-arrest bail in Crime No.11/2026, for Offences U/S 420, r/w Section 17 and 22 B of Emigration Ordinance,1979, registered at Police Station, FIA Composite Circle Shaheed Benazir-abad.

2. Concisely, the facts as narrated in the FIR are that complainant, Mst. Malookan, wife of Eidan Khan, lodged a complaint on 17.03.2026, stating therein that the accused, Piyar Ali and Eidan Khan Junejo, fraudulently received Rs. 650,000 from the complainant for arranging a Saudi Arabian work visa and employment for her husband, Sono Khan, for loading and unloading drinking water bottles in Makkah. However, upon reaching Saudi Arabia, her husband was not provided with employment. During the inquiry, the accused Eidan Junejo admitted to the transaction, and the mobile phone of one of them was found to contain copies of the work visa, relevant WhatsApp chats, and a payment slip of Rs. 650,000. It further transpired from the Bureau of Emigration and Overseas Employment (BEOE) record that the accused, Piyar Ali, son of Eidan Junejo, was not a registered agent through an Overseas Employment Promoter (OEP). Consequently, after approval, the instant FIR was registered.

3. The applicant/accused applied for grant of post arrest bail before Special Court (Central) Sukkur, which was dismissed vide order dated 07.10.2026, therefore, being aggrieved by this dismissal order, the applicant has approached this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for applicant, and learned A.A.G Sindh assisted by complainant at length. Learned A.A.G and complainant have strongly opposed the grant of bail on the ground that sufficient material has been collected by the I/O against the applicant/accused.

5. Having given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the respective parties and perused the relevant material available on record. From the perusal of the FIR, it reveals that the applicant/accused and co-accused Piyar Ali induced the husband of the complainant to obtain a Saudi work visa for employment involving the loading and unloading of drinking water bottles in Makkah against an agreed amount of Rs. 650,000, which was paid. It is further alleged that after reaching Saudi Arabia, Sono Khan was not provided with the promised employment. During the course of the inquiry, the alleged persons admitted to the transaction, and his mobile device was found to contain copies of the work visa, relevant WhatsApp chat conversations, and a payment chit showing the payment of Rs. 650,000; the said mobile phone was seized. Moreover, the Investigating Officer found that the applicant/accused was not a registered Overseas Employment Promoter (OEP). From the available material, it is evident that sufficient evidence has been collected during the investigation to connect the applicant/accused with the commission of this offense.

6. Even otherwise, Sections 17 and 22-B of the Emigration Ordinance, 1979, and Section 420 PPC have been applied in the FIR. Section 22-B of the Emigration Ordinance, 1979, is punishable up to fourteen years and, therefore, falls within the ambit of prohibitory clause of Section 497(1) Cr.P.C. Furthermore, no ill-will or mala fide intention has been brought on

record by the applicant/accused against the complainant to falsely implicate him in the present case.

7. For the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the applicant/accused has failed to make out a case for the grant of post-arrest bail. Consequently, the instant Criminal Bail Application is dismissed.

8. 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

Hizbullah/PA