

Counsel for the complainant
requests for time to prepare
his reply. Granted.

Re: on 26.02.2025

OS
Judge

Hq/Bal

1. For orders on office objection is
2. For Hearing of said matter

26.02.2025

- M/s. Nooruddin Mahesar, Sahil
Ahmed Vessar and Fariza Khurshid
Charlie Advocates for the Applicant
- Mr. Ali Anwar Mander, Advocate
Arguments heard. Reserved
for Order.

OS
Judge

73

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

Criminal Bail No.S-436 of 2024

**Gulab Sunani
V/S
The State**

Applicant: Gulab son of Gulsher Sunani
Through M/s. Noor-ud-din Mahesar,
Sohail Ahmed Veesar and Faiza
Khurshid Chandio, Advocates

State: Through Mr. Ali Anwar Kandhro,
Additional Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Date of Hearing: 26.02.2025

Date of Decision: 05.03.2025

ORDER

Omar Sial, J.- Gulab Sunani seeks post-arrest bail in crime 29 of 2024, registered under sections 302, 311, and 34 P.P.C. at the Lashari police station.

2. The F.I.R. was registered on 28.05.2024 on the complaint of the State. It was recorded that on 25.05.2024, the Lashari police station received a phone call from Gohar Khatoon in which she informed the police that she and another lady, Shabiran Khatoon, had been fired upon. While Shabiran had died, she (Gohar) was injured. The police reached the identified spot and saw the deceased and the injured woman.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned Additional Prosecutor General. The legal heirs' counsel did not affect an appearance.

4. The learned Additional Prosecutor General confirmed that Gohar Khatoon had not named the applicant as the person who had shot at

OB

and injured her and killed Shabiran. The section 161 Cr.P.C. statement she recorded on 26.05.2024 attributes the killing and injury to Shabiran's husband, Abdul Ghafoor. Ostensibly, the husband doubted his wife's character. The applicant was brought into the case one month after the incident, i.e., on 28.06.2024, when another lady, Tajul Khatoon, recorded a statement saying that the applicant was present when Abdul Ghafoor shot at the two women. The injured woman, however, denies that Tajul was present. Tajul also recorded a section 164 Cr.P.C. statement and gave a slightly differing account. In section 164 Cr.P.C., she stated that Abdul Ghafoor had shot at the women upon the applicant's instigation. Tajul will have to explain at trial why she recorded a statement after one month when she claimed that she was an eyewitness to the incident. At the moment, no such explanation is on record. The applicant has no crime record. No motive for him to kill Shabiran has been brought forward. The record and the evidence collected reflect that the case against the applicant is one of further inquiry.

5. Given the above, the applicant is admitted to post-arrest bail subject to furnishing a solvent surety of Rs. 100,000 and a P.R. Bond for the same amount to the satisfaction of the trial court.


JUDGE

Manzoor