

# IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

Cr. Bail App. No. S – 1015 of 2025

*(Rashid Ali Kharos v. The State)*

Date of hearing : 22.12.2025

Date of decision : 22.12.2025

Syed Tarique Hussain, Advocate for applicant.  
Mr. Irfan Ali Soomro, Advocate for complainant.  
Mr. Khalil Ahmed Maitlo, Deputy Prosecutor General.

## ORDER

**Mahmood A. Khan, J.** – Applicant is nominated in FIR No.85 of 2024, registered at Police Station Airport, Sukkur, under Sections 302, 324, 114, 148, 149, PPC, wherein it is alleged that he has conducted firing when the incident of death of the victim occurred.

2. Learned Counsel for the applicant contends that to the present applicant, no dispute is alleged by the complainant. He further contends that no allegation of firing at the victim is made in the matter. It is also contended that the complainant party had lodged an FIR against the present applicant also, wherein he has since been acquitted earlier.

3. Learned Counsel for the complainant, however, contends that the bail of present applicant as filed before the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I / Model Criminal Trial Court-I, Sukkur, was dismissed on 26.10.2024, whereafter about an year being spent in abscondence, this Court has been approached on 21.10.2025, whereas, the father of the present applicant also appeared before the learned Additional Sessions Judge-IV (H), Sukkur in Cr. Bail Application No.2326 of 2025 and thereafter absconded, and whereafter his said bail application was rejected. He also contends that FIR alleged in respect to the complainant was lodged under Section 324, PPC, in the year 2023.

4. Learned DPG contends that no delay is present, and that empties of pistol were recovered from the spot, whereas, the present applicant having absconded, relying upon the authority **2020 SCMR 2089**, the concession of bail may not be provided to the present applicant.

5. Learned Counsel for the applicant, however in rebuttal, contends that the present applicant was having treatment at SIUT, and as such, on account of financial difficulties, was unable to approach this Court earlier.

6. Having heard the learned Counsels and gone through the record, apparently, the present applicant has sought pre-arrest bail before this Court with an abscondence of one year, which is not explained in the bail application. It is further observed that empties of pistol having been recovered, pre-arrest entertainment of the applicant at this stage is not found available.

7. Accordingly, bail application stands **dismissed** not having any merits for the entertainment of bail. Consequently, the ad-interim pre-arrest bail earlier granted to the applicant by this Court, vide order dated 21.10.2025, is hereby **recalled**.

The bail application stands **disposed of** in the above terms.

J U D G E

Abdul Basit