

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,
LARKANA**

**Criminal Appeal No.D-30 of 2021
Criminal Jail Appeal No.D-39 of 2021**

Present:

**Mr. Justice Amjad Ali Sahito
Mr. Justice Ali Haider 'Ada'**

Appellant : Gul Shah son of Abdul Ghafoor Pathan
Through Mr. Abdul Baqi Jan Kakar,
Advocate.
in Criminal Appeal No.D-30 of 2021

Appellant : Muhammad Rasool son of Muhammad
Shah Pathan, through Mr. Abdul Baqi
Jan Kakar, Advocate.
in Criminal Jail Appeal No.D-39 of
2021

Complainant : The State through Mr. Ali Anwar
Kandhro, Additional Prosecutor
General, Sindh.

Date of hearing : **21.10.2025**

Date of decision: **__.10.2025**

J U D G M E N T

AMJAD ALI SAHITO, J;- This judgment shall dispose of the fate of captioned Appeals filed by the above-named appellants/accused, assailing the judgment dated 15.10.2021, passed by learned Special Judge (CNSA&MCTC) Jacobabad, in CNS Case No.44 of 2020 (*Re. The State Vs. Gul Shah and another*), the outcome of FIR bearing Crime No.131/2020, offence Under Section 9 (c) of Control of Narcotic Substance Act, 1997, registered with Police Station, Saddar, Jacobabad, whereby they were convicted and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for R.I

for life and to pay a fine of Rs.300,000/= (rupees three hundred thousand) each and in default thereof, to undergo Simple Imprisonment for two years more, with the benefit of Section 382-B Cr.P.C.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case as mentioned in FIR lodged by complainant SIP/SHO Hidayatullah Bijarani on 05.07.2020 at 1700 hours are that on the same date, he along with his subordinate staff, namely, PC Nazir Ahmed, PC Liaquat Ali, PC Ihsan Ahmed, PC Muhammad Mithal, PC Israr Ahmed, PC Qalati Khan and DPC Muhammad Ramzan duly armed & uniformed left PS vide roznamcha entry No. 08 at about 1000 hours for patrolling in Police mobile No. SPN-272. After patrolling different places they reached at Shambay Shah Bypass road at 1030 hours, where the complainant received spy information that two persons trafficking charas in secret cavities of Mazda Truck No.TKU-757 Quetta. After receipt of such information, the complainant called SIP Muhammad Ali Khokhar Incharge CIA Unit Jacobabad in help through wireless message, who along with PC Mansab & DPC Mushtaq Ahmed reached there at 1040 hours in their official mobile No. SPE-716. Thereafter they all started checking and at 1100 hours they noticed the above mentioned Mazda Truck came from Baluchistan side which was stopped by them, wherein they saw one person was sitting with the driver and one white colour sac was lying between them. They alighted the driver of the Mazda along with other person and opened the sac lying between them and found 40 packets of charas, each packet was containing 2/2 slabs of charas. The complainant appointed SIP Muhammad Ali Khokhar & PC Nazir Ahmed as mashirs and made enquiries from the driver, as well as, other person. The other person sitting with driver of Mazda disclosed his name as Gul Shah S/O Abdul Ghafoor Pathan r/o Pasheen Baluchistan, whereas driver disclosed his name Muhammad Rasool S/O Muhammad Shah Pathan r/o Killa

Abdullah Baluchistan. Thereafter, they checked the Mazda truck and found 11 secret cavities in floor of its 'Dala'. They opened those secret cavities and found 1160 packets of charas lying therein. They opened the same and found 2/2 slabs of charas lying in each packet. On directions of the complainant, PC Nazir brought computerized scale from the mobile and then the recovered charas was weighed on the spot and each packet became 1000 grams of charas. Total weight of recovered 1200 packets of charas became 1200 kilograms. Thereafter they sealed 40 packets of charas in one sealed parcel and total 1200-K.G charas sealed in 30 separate sealed parcels and arrested the accused for committing offence u/s 9(C) C.N.S Act. From body search of driver/accused Muhammad Rasool they recovered 04 currency notes of Rs.1000/- total Rs.4000/- alongwith 02 mobile phones, whereas from body search of other accused Gul Shah, they recovered one currency note of Rs.500/- and one mobile phone. Such mashirnama of arrest, search and recovery was prepared on the spot in presence of above mashirs. The arrested accused persons along with recovered properties including Mazda Truck were brought at PS Saddar Jacobabad, where the complainant lodged FIR of the incident on behalf of the State.

3. After completion of the usual investigation, the investigation officer submitted a report under section 173 Cr.P.C before the competent Court of law and thereafter the case papers were supplied to the accused under receipt.

4. The charge against the appellants/accused was framed at Exh.3, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial vide their plea(s) recorded at Exh.3-A & 3-B respectively.

5. In order to establish the accusation against the appellants/accused, the prosecution examined PW.1, complainant SIP Hidayatullah Bijarani at Ex.7, he produced mashirnama of arrest, search and recovery at Ex.7/A, attested

copies of roznamcha entries No. 08 and 15 (one sheet) at Ex.7/B, attested photo copies of entries at Ex.7/C, FIR at Ex.7/D, letter of permission issued by SSP Jacobabad as Ex.7/E, attested photo copies of roznamcha entries 30 & 31 (One sheet) at Ex.7/F, carbon copy of R.C No.214 as Ex.7/G, attested copy of roznamcha entry No.40 as Ex.7/H. PW.2, mashir SIP Muhammad Ali Khokhar has been examined at Ex.8, he produced attested copy of roznamcha entry No.3 as Ex.8/A. PW.3, I/O SIP Faqir Muhammad at Ex.9. PW.4, PC Sajid Ali has been examined at Ex.10. PW.5, I/O Inspector Bashir Ahmed has been examined at Ex.11, he produced report of Chemical Examiner bearing letter No.18580 dated 26.08.2020 at Ex.11/A. Thereafter, learned State Counsel closed the side of prosecution vide statement kept on record at Ex.12.

6. The appellants/accused in their statements recorded in terms of Section 342 Cr.P.C, denied the allegations leveled against them by pleading their innocence. However, appellant / accused Gul Shah further stated that he is innocent. He has not committed any crime. The complainant implicated him in this case falsely with malafide purpose. On 05.07.2020, he took left from S.K... Petrol Pump for going to Sukkur at his work place Sharja Goods Company. He prayed for justice as nothing was recovered from his possession. He has no concern with vehicle from which alleged charas has been recovered, whereas driver accused Muhammad Rasool stated that on 03.07.2020, he was arrested by Saddar police near Pakistan hotel, Tower road Jacobabad. He was not in possession of his CNIC, hence he was taken into custody as Afghani National. The said SIP/Police officer demanded Rs.,2,00,000/- for his release which he could not pay. Subsequently on 05.07.2020, he was falsely implicated in this case. The charas has been foisted upon them/him. He prayed for Justice. However, the driver accused Abdul Rasool has neither examined himself on oath u/s 340(2) Cr.P.C, nor

examined any witness in his defence, whereas accused Gul Shah examined himself on oath at Ex.15 and examined defence witnesses, namely, Syed Muhammad Azam and Muhammad Jaffer at Ex.16 and 17 respectively.

7. The learned trial Court on evaluation of the evidence and after hearing the counsel for the parties, convicted and sentenced the appellants/accused vide **Judgment dated 15.10.2021**, which they have impugned before this Court by preferring both these Appeals.

8. Learned counsel for the appellants has submitted written synopsis to substantiate his contentions, same are taken on record. Per learned defence counsel, the prosecution failed to prove that the recovered contraband (1200 kilograms of Charas) was kept in safe custody at the police station and thereafter was sent to the chemical examiner for analysis, without being tampered with, that the complainant failed to maintain Daily Diary of Roznamcha entry No.15, as required by section 167 of the Police Act and Rule 22.45 of the Police Rules; that the name of the incharge of Malkhana or the person responsible for depositing the recovered contraband, was not disclosed in the relevant registers or Roznamcha entry; that the appellant Gul Shah was merely present in the vehicle but was not the driver and there is no evidence to connect him directly to the contraband; that the appellants are in jail since the date of their arrest viz. 05.07.2020 having no prior criminal record; that there are several contradictions in the evidence of prosecution witnesses which have shattered the veracity of their evidence; that that the complainant and his witnesses are police officials and no independent person has been cited to witness the recovery proceedings, which has clearly disregarded the mandatory provisions of Section 103 Cr.P.C and that both mashirs are subordinates to the complainant. He lastly

contended that the prosecution has miserably failed to prove its case against the appellants and in such circumstances they are entitled to their acquittal. In support of his contentions, he has relied upon case law i.e. 2023 P.Cr.L.J 1720, 2025 SCMR 704, 2025 SCMR 923, 2021 SCMR 380, 2021 SCMR 363, 2018 SCMR 2039, 2015 SCMR 1002, an un-reported judgment Cr.Appeal 484 & 485 of 2019 Supreme Court of Pakistan decided on 31.3.2022, 1994 PLD Federal Shariat Court page 37, 2023 YLR 2369, 2023 MLD 1831, 2023 PC.LJ 1720, 2022 PCr.JL note 20, 2025 SCMR 1351, 2014 PC.LJ 1295, 2007 YLR 1601, 2007 YLR 3096, 2008 MLD 797 and an unreported judgment passed by this Court in Cr.Appal No.D-46/2019 (Muhammad Naseem Barech V/s the State).

9. On the other hand, learned Additional Prosecutor General, Sindh while supporting the impugned judgment has contended that the prosecution has successfully proved its case against the appellants who were found in possession of 1200 kilograms chars; that the police officials had no hostility to foist such a huge quantity of narcotics substance against the appellants of their own, as such, he prayed for dismissal of the Appeals.

10. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have minutely gone through the material made available on record.

11. The appellants were caught red-handed by the police party of PS Saddar Jacobabad headed by SIP/SHO Hidayatullah Bijarani and recovered 1200 packets of chars total weighing 1200 kilograms from their possession. The deeper analysis of the material brought on record is entailing that the entire case of prosecution is based upon the evidence of Complainant SIP Hidayatullah Bijarani (PW-1) and mashir SIP Muhammad Ali (PW-2). These both witnesses have narrated the prosecution story

in a natural manner and remained consistent throughout and their testimony could not be shattered by the defence despite lengthy cross-examination. The said witnesses had no enmity with the appellants to falsely implicate them in the present case. Even otherwise a huge quantity of 1200 kilograms of chars in no circumstances can be planted/foisted by the complainant of his own volition.

12. The prosecution also examined PW-3 SIP Faqir Muhammad. He had deposed that he along with PC Sajid Ali and PC Shahzad were deputed for taking 30 sealed case property for depositing the same at chemical examiner office Karachi. The permission letter, road certificate, mashirnama of arrest, search and recovery and R.C were handed over to them along with sealed parcels of case property. On the same day at 1950 hours, they proceeded to Karachi in private hired Shahzore vehicle under roznamcha Entry No.31 at 1950 hours. On the next day i.e. 08.07.2020, they deposited all sealed case property parcels with Chemical Examiner Karachi and obtained such receipt from office of chemical examiner. He produced office copy of road certificate at Ex.7/G.

13. It is stated by PW/PC Sajid Ali in his deposition available at (Exh.10), that being posted at PS Saddar Jacobabad on 07.07.2020, he along with SIP Faqir Muhammad and PC Shahzad were deputed for taking 30 sealed case property bags by I.O SIP Hidayatullah for depositing the same at chemical examiner office at Karachi. Accordingly, they took the parcels and proceeded to Karachi under entry No.31 at 1950 hours on 07.07.2020. On 08.07.2020, the sealed parcels were deposited with chemical examiner office by incharge SIP Faqir Muhammad and obtained receipt therefrom. On 09.07.2020 at 0700 hours, they returned back at P.S and handed over such receipt to the I.O where his 161 Cr.P.C statement was recorded. In cross-

examination, he deposed that I.O himself handed over case property for depositing it with the chemical examiner to him. He denied the suggestion that he had not deposited the case property with chemical examiner.

14. As regards the contention of learned defence counsel that the prosecution has failed to prove safe custody/ transmission of case property i.e. charas to the office of Chemical Examiner and that too with considerable delay. It may be mentioned here that in the cross-examination of PWs, no such question has been raised by the defence that there was tampering with the case property at the police station or during its transmission to the Chemical Laboratory. In this regard, SIP Faqir Muhammad in his evidence (Exh.9) deposed that a sealed parcel of case property of this crime was received by him on 07.07.2020 from I.O/ Inspector SIP Hidayatullah with a letter for depositing it with Chemical Examiner's office Karachi which he deposited, as such, the prosecution examined the person who had taken the case property to the Chemical Laboratory. Further, the I.O in his examination-in-chief has deposed that he deposited case property in the Police *Malkhana* vide entry No. 7/C of register No.19 through WHC Muhammad Zafar. On 07.07.2020 he sent case property to the Chemical Examiner in supervision of SIP Faqir Muhammad Brohi with staff PC Shahzad & PC Sajjad vide entry No.31, who after depositing the case property returned at PS vide entry No.40 on 09.07.2020, handed over the receipt of depositing the case property with chemical examiner to him and such report was received in positive which he produced at **(Exh.7/E)** and the report confirms that the parcel so received through PC Sajid Ali was on 08.07.2020. Further P.W/ I.O SIP Hidayatullah deposed in his examination in chief that on the day of incident the case property of this crime was kept in Malkhana through WHC vide an entry of register No.19 and then on 08.07.2020 the case property was sent to the Chemical Examine through PC Sajid Ali.

Therefore, it can safely be said that the safe chain of custody of the recovered narcotics and its transmission without any delay was not compromised at all. The reliance is placed to the case of ***Faisal Shahzad Vs. The State [2022 SCMR-905] and Ajab Khan Vs. The State [2022 SCMR-317]***.

15. The requirement of Rule 4 of Control of Narcotic Substance (Government Analysis) Rules, 2001 is that the reasonable quantity of samples from the entire narcotic drug, psychotropic substance or the controlled substances seized, shall be drawn on the spot of recovery and dispatched to the office in charge of nearest Narcotic Testing Laboratory for the test either by insured post or through a special messenger. No question was put by the defence counsel that there was tempering with the case property and it is also confirmed by the Chemical Examiner that 30 sealed parcels containing dark brown slabs received in his office on **08.07.2020** by the hand of PC Sajid Ali. Further, Rule 5 of Control of Narcotic Substance (Government Analysis) Rules, 2001 provides a condition that it should be received in a sealed condition in the Laboratory. The incharge officer shall observe full protocol by carefully opening and giving a distinct laboratory number. For that, a separate register shall be maintained. All samples shall be passed to the analyst on the same day and kept in safe custody and examined and recorded, weighed in the test memorandum. He will compare the markings on the test Memorandums with the markings on the packages envelopes and will ensure that he tests the relevant sample. Rule 6 of C.N.S (Government Analysts) Rules, 2001 further provides that on analysis the result thereof together with full protocols the test applied, shall be signed in quadruplicate and supplied forthwith to the sender as specified in Form-11. Now the question here is whether the report received from the office of the Chemical Examiner is according to Rules 4,5 & 6 of C.N.S (Government Analysts) Rules, 2001 or not. The requirement of R.4 is only that

the parcel/envelope should be received in the office of the Chemical Examiner in a sealed condition. We have perused the Chemical Examiner's report available as Exh.7/E, and in our humble view, it is according to its Rules and the full protocol was observed by the office of the Chemical Examiner. It is appropriate to reproduce the report received from the office of the Chemical Examiner, which reads as under:-

1. Gross weight: 1200.000 K.G
2. Net weight: 1199.600 K.G

Physical examination: Thirty sealed cloth parcels each containing nylon sack which contains forty pockets each contains plastic shopper which contains two dark brown slabs each wrapped in panni.

Protocols followed: The test analysis protocols are in line with United Nation office on Drug and Crime (UNODC) guidelines of 2009.

Physical appearance: Dark brown slabs.

Fast Blue B Salt test: Positive.

TLC Test : Positive

RESULT OF EXAMINATION.

The submitted sample is identified to contain Charas

16. The procedural detail is mentioned in the Chemical Examiner's report Ex.07/E about the tests applied do not fall short of "**protocol**". In an unreported case of **Mushtaq Ahmed Vs. The State & others (Criminal Petition No.370 of 2019)** the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that;

"3... Argument that Forensic report sans protocols as mandatorily required in the case of State Vs. Imam Bakhsh (2018 SCMR 2039), is beside the point and so is a reference to Rule 6 of the Control of Narcotic Substance (Govt. Analysis)

Rules, 2001, for the convenience of reference reproduced below:-

“Report of the result of test analysis:--After test or analysis the result thereof together with full protocols of the test applied, shall be signed in quadruplicate and supplied forthwith to the sender as specified in Form-II”.

The above requires reference to the test applied for analysis, specifically mentioned in Form-II thereof. We have perused the forensic report, relied upon the prosecution, which substantially meets the legal requirements in the following terms:-

“Test Performed on Received Item(s) of Evidence

- 1. Analytical Balance was used for weighing.***
- 2. Chemical spot Tests were used for Presumptive Testing.***
- 3. Case Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry was used for confirmation.***

Results and conclusions

“Item # 01 72.87 gram(s) of blackish brown resinous material in sealed parcel contains Charas”

Details mentioned in the Forensic report procedure/test applied do not short of ‘protocol’ as insisted by this court in the supra case. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, 6th Edition, the expression “protocol’ in relation to a forensic test means.

“ A formal or official statement of a transaction or proceedings; spec, a record of (esp. scientific) experimental observations”.

17. The reliance is also placed on an un-reported case of Hon’ble Supreme Court of Pakistan vide judgment dated 09-01-2020 passed **in Criminal Petition No.370 of 2019 Re. Mushtaq Ahmad Vs The State & another;**

“4. It has been argued before us that the report submitted by the Chemical Examiner did not mention the necessary protocols followed or tests applied but we have seen the said report available on the record of the

trial court and have found that the said report not only referred to the protocols adopted but also to the tests applied and, thus, we have not been able to find any deficiency in the said report.”

18. As regards the arguments of learned counsel for the appellants about violation of Section 103 Cr.P.C is concerned, it would be appropriate to refer Section 25 of the Control of Narcotics Substance Act 1997, which reads as under;-

“25. Mode of making searches and arrest.--- The provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, except those of section 103 Cr.P.C shall mutatis mutandis, apply to all searches and arrests in so far as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of section 20, 21, 22 and 23 to all warrants issued and arrest searches made under these sections.

19. It means that the applicability of Section 103 Cr.P.C in the narcotics cases has been excluded and the non-inclusion of any private witness is not a serious defect to vitiate the conviction. The complainant in his evidence deposed that no private person attracted towards the place of incident during proceedings.

20. So far the evidence of police officials is concerned, they are more competent than others and their evidence cannot be discarded merely for the reason that they are police officials. They have furnished straightforward and confidence-inspiring evidence and there is nothing on record to show that they have deposed against the appellant/accused maliciously or out of any animus and it cannot be believed that the police officials would plant or foist such a huge quantity of narcotics substance (1200 K.G) against the appellant/ accused at their own resources. It is a settled principle of law that the statement of the official witnesses cannot be discarded only on the pretext that they are police officials. The reference in this context is made to the case of **Zaffar Vs. The State (2008 SCMR-1254)**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that;-

“Police employees are the competent witnesses like any other witnesses and their testimonies cannot be discarded merely on the ground that they are police officials”

21. In instant case, no proof of enmity with the complainant or the other witnesses has been brought on the record, thus, in the absence thereof, the competence of prosecution witnesses being police officials was rightly believed. Moreover, a procedural formality cannot be insisted at the cost of completion of an offence and if an accused is otherwise found connected then mere procedural omission and even allegation of improper conduct of investigation would not help the accused. The reference in this context is made to the case of the **State/ANF Vs. Muhammad Arshad (2017 SCMR-283)**, wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court of Pakistan has held that;-

“We may mention here that even where no proper investigation is conducted, but where the material that comes before the Court is sufficient to connect the accused with the commission of crime, the accused can still be convicted, notwithstanding minor omissions that have no bearing on the outcome of the case”.

22. Even otherwise, mere status of one as an **official** would not alone prejudice the competence of such witness until and unless he is proved to be **interested**, who has a motive, to falsely implicate an accused or has the previous enmity with the person involved. The reliance in this context is made to the case of **Farooq vs. The State (2008 SCMR 970)**.

23. It is now settled proposition of law that by flex of time in the case of transportation or possession of narcotics, technicalities of procedural nature or otherwise should be overlooked in the larger interest of the country if the case stands otherwise proved, the approach of the Court should be dynamic and pragmatic, in approaching true facts of the case and drawing correct and rational inferences and conclusions while deciding

such type of cases. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan in the case of **Ghulam Qadir Vs. The State** reported in **(PLD 2006 SC-61)** has held that;-

“S.9(c)---Appreciation of evidence.---No acquittal on technicalities---Court in such like cases are supposed dispose of the matter with dynamic approach, instead of acquitting the drug paddlers on technicalities.”

24. On re-assessment of evidence of the prosecution witnesses, we find it confidence-inspiring and trustworthy; as such appellants Gul Shah and Muhammad Rasool were found in possession of 1200 kilograms charas at the time of their arrest on 08.07.2020 at 1040 hours from Shambay Shah Bypass. The version of the complainant SIP Hidayatullah Bijarani has been fully corroborated by mashir of arrest and recovery, which is substantiated with the memo of arrest and recovery (Exh.7/A), FIR (Exh.7/D) and Chemical Examiner's report in **positive** (Exh.7/E).

25. No previous enmity, ill-will or grudge has been alleged or proved against prosecution witnesses to implicate appellants Gul Shah and Muhammad Rasool falsely in this case. The prosecution successfully discharged its lawful duty thereby shifting the burden upon the appellants within the meaning of Section 29 of the Act. Such burden would require the accused to firstly cause a dent in the prosecution case and secondly to establish at least justify the possibility of false implication or foistation of Charas but the defense has failed to do so. While recording their statements in terms of Section 342 Cr.P.C, appellants Gul Shah and Muhammad Rasool have simply denied the prosecution allegation without taking any plea, whereas accused Gul Shah stated that on 05.07.2020, he took left from S.K... Petrol Pump for going to Sukkur at his work place Sharja Goods Company and he has no concern with the vehicle from

which alleged charas has been recovered, whereas, driver accused Muhammad Rasool stated that on 03.07.2020, he was arrested by Saddar police near Pakistan hotel, Tower road Jacobabad, he was not in possession of CNIC, hence, he was taken into custody as Afghani National. The said police officer demanded Rs.2,00,000/- for his release which he could not pay and on 05.07.2020, he was falsely implicated in this case. In cross-examination, PW-01 Complainant ASI SIP Hidayatullah, has denied that suggestion that he demanded Rs.2,00,000/- from accused Muhammad Rasool for his release and that charas was not recovered from the possession of appellants/accused.

26. The deeper analysis of the whole prosecution evidence i.e., the recovery of charas, happening of occurrence on the main road, sealing the charas in a prescribed manner and sending the same to the Chemical Examiner, report of the Chemical Examiner and the evidence of the prosecution witnesses when evaluated conjointly leaves no room to conclude that appellants Gul Shah and Muhammad Rasool were in possession of charas weighing 1200 kilograms at the time of their arrest.

27. No illegality or irregularity and mis-appreciation of evidence were found, so far the case is concerned. The case of the prosecution is based upon the appraisal of the evidences, supported with reasons placed on record. No incriminating evidence was produced to show misreading and omission from consideration of the evidence. The incomes of narcotics are largely utilized in anti-State/terrorist activities which this country has been facing for decades and it obviously has affected the society at large. When the prosecution can prove its case on its salient features then unnecessary technicalities should not be allowed to hamper the very purpose of the law on the subject. Reliance is placed in the case of ***FAISAL SHAHZAD v. THE STATE (2022 SCMR 905)***.

28. For what has been discussed above and while relying upon the case laws of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, we are of the unanimous view that the prosecution has successfully established the charge of carrying packets containing charas total weighing 1200 kilograms against the appellants Gul Shah and Muhammad Rasool, beyond a shadow of any reasonable doubt. Resultantly, the Criminal Appeal No.D-30 of 2021 and Criminal Jail Appeal No.D-39 of 2021 being devoid of merits are **dismissed** accordingly. The conviction and sentence awarded to them by the learned trial Court are hereby **maintained**.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Zulfiqar