

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD

CP No. D-876 of 2025

[*Ghulam Shabir vs. SHO PS B-Section TMK and others*]

Before:
Mr. Justice Abdul Mobeen Lakho
Justice Ms. Sana Akram Minhas

Petitioner/Accused : Through, Mr. Jehanzaib Memon, Advocate

Respondent: : Through, Mr. Siraj Ahmed Bijarani, Addl. Prosecutor General

Date of Hearing : 05.6.2025

Date of Decision : 05.6.2025

ORDER

1. **ABDUL MOBEEN LAKHO, J:** The Petitioner/Accused was booked under FIR No.62/2025, registered at Police Station "B"-Section, District Tando Muhammad Khan, under Sections 9(1) and 1(b) of the *Sindh Control of Narcotics Substances Act, 2024* ("**Act 2024**"). Having been taken into custody, he has approached this Court seeking post-arrest bail.
2. The Petition for post-arrest bail has been submitted before this Constitutional Bench pursuant to the Order dated 22.04.2025, passed in CP No.D-937/2025 (*Syed Sahir Hasan v. Province of Sindh & Others*) by a Full Bench of this Court, which affirmed that, despite the prohibition on the grant of bail under the Act 2024, this Bench retains jurisdiction to hear bail applications filed through Constitutional Petitions.
3. The brief facts of the case according to the FIR are that on 06.5.2025, a police party was patrolling, when upon reaching Shaheed Baba Check-Post, they started snap checking of vehicles. During checking, they noticed that one person who was coming on motorcycle having white colour sack, on seeing them attempted to turn back, but they apprehended him alongwith said sack at about 1700 hours. Upon inspecting the sack, Bhang was found, weighing a total of 5000 grams. Consequently, the Petitioner was booked in the aforementioned FIR and taken into custody.
4. We have heard the arguments advanced by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner/Accused as well as the learned Additional Prosecutor General and have carefully perused the record.

5. At the outset, we observe that the Petitioner's arrest was made under the provisions of the Act, 2024, which, by virtue of Section 35, expressly bars the grant of bail and excludes the applicability of Sections 496 and 497 of the *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898*. In these circumstances, the Petitioner has approached this Court under its constitutional jurisdiction for the grant of bail.
6. In **KhanAsfandyarWali v. Federation of Pakistan(PLD 2001 SC 607)**, the Supreme Court held that where a statute bars the grant of bail during trial, the Petitioner nonetheless retains the right to seek relief before the High Court under its constitutional jurisdiction.
7. As per the contents of the FIR, the Petitioner was apprehended at the scene with 5000 grams of Bhang in his possession. He was taken into custody along with the recovered narcotics, which, prima facie, were secured in safe custody. According to both the Counsel for the Petitioner and the Additional Prosecutor General, based on the alleged recovered quantity, the prescribed sentence under the relevant statute is imprisonment for a term extendable to seven years, but not less than three years, along with a fine that may be up to Rs.200,000/-.
8. It is a well-established principle that bail in narcotics-related offences is to be granted sparingly, given the grave threat such offences pose to society, particularly to the youth. This rationale underpins the statutory bar on the grant of bail under the Act 2024. Nonetheless, in the present case, the relatively minor quantity of the recovered substance warrants consideration in favour of bail rather than its outright refusal. What weighs heavily in our deliberation, however, is the fact that the Petitioner has remained in custody since 06.05.2025, without any charge having been framed or trial proceedings having commenced.
9. In response to our query, the learned Additional Prosecutor General submitted that the Government of Sindh has, to-date, neither established the special courts nor appointed judges as required under Section 30 of the Act 2024. However, in our view, the non-establishment of special courts cannot serve as a justification for delaying the trial of cases, particularly in light of the proviso to Section 30(3), which specifically addresses this contingency in the following terms:

30. *Establishment of special court:*

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

Provided that until the Special Courts are established under this section, the existing competent court shall continue to perform its functions for the speedy disposal of narcotics cases.

10. Given the lack of progress in the trial, the Petitioner is faced with the very real prospect of prolonged incarceration. Such a situation amounts to a violation of the Petitioner's fundamental rights, including the right to a speedy trial, which, under Section 35(2) of the Act 2024, mandates conclusion of the trial within six months. Considering also the relatively minor quantity of narcotics allegedly recovered, we are of the view that the grant of post-arrest bail to the Petitioner is justified.
11. Accordingly, the Petitioner is granted post-arrest bail upon furnishing surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Fifty Thousand) along with a personal bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Additional Registrar of this Court. The Petitioner is directed to ensure his presence on each and every date of hearing without fail before the Trial Court.
12. The Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.
13. By our short order dated 05.6.2025 we had granted bail to the Petitioner. These are our reasons for doing so.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Tufail