

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

Cr. Bail App. No. S – 885 of 2025
(*Rashid Ali alias Rashid Pitafi v. The State*)

Cr. Bail App. No. S – 886 of 2025
(*Rashid Ali alias Rashid Pitafi v. The State*)

Date of hearing : **13.01.2026**

Date of decision : **13.01.2026**

Mr. Shabbir Ali Bozdar and Ms. Aaraf Soomro, Advocates for applicant in both matters.

Mr. Sikandar Ali Siyal, Advocate for complainant in Cr. Bail App. No. S-885 of 2025.

Mr. Khalil Ahmed Maitlo, Deputy Prosecutor General.

ORDER

Mahmood A. Khan, J. – Through Cr. Bail App. No. S-885 of 2025, present applicant seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.33 of 2025, registered at Police Station Dad Laghari, District Ghotki, under Sections 324, 337-F(iii), 337-H(2), 504, 147, 148, 149, PPC, wherein he is nominated specifically for causing firearm injuries to one of the injured, whereas, connected Cr. Bail App. No. S-886 of 2025 has been filed in respect of Crime No.35 of 2025, registered at Police Station Dad Laghari, District Ghotki, under Section 24 of Sindh Arms Act, 2013, wherein recovery of one .30 bore pistol along with a magazine loaded with three live bullets has been alleged.

2. Learned Counsel for the applicant contends that delay of one day in lodging of the FIR of main case is present, whereas the prosecuting witnesses are close witnesses; that no repetition of firing being alleged, the applicability of Section 324, PPC, is to be concluded at the trial stage, and the present injuries are attributed for punishment of three (03) years only. He further contends that the applicant has joined the investigation; and that the complainant is an influential person.

3. Learned Counsel for the complainant, however, relying upon the case of Ghulam Murtaza v. The State reported as **2025 MLD 703** and an unreported order of this Court dated 16.10.2025 passed in **Cr. Bail Application No. S-706 of 2025** (*Re: Liaqat Pitafi v. The State*), contends that the injuries under Section 337-F(iii), PPC, are not the only ground for consideration of concession of bail, and in the two said cases such was present, however, bail was declined.

4. Learned DPG, however, contended that injuries attributed to the present applicant have been caused in the abdomen area as coming out in the medical record; as such, the same is liable to be considered as vital part. He also contends that the empties recovered were sent for the forensic examination and the report is found positive to the weapon recovered in the matter.

5. Having heard the learned Counsels and gone through the record, specific role assigned to the present applicant, who is said to have caused the injuries at the vital part / abdomen and the forensic result coming up at this stage, it is not found reasonable to entertain the concession of bail for the applicant merely on the ground that injuries under Section 337-F(iii), PPC, have been caused and no repetition of fire has been available, as the overt act already indulged into.

6. Accordingly, both bail applications are **dismissed**; however, prima facie as six important witnesses are there, learned trial Court is expected to conclude the matter within a period of three (03) months hereof.

Both the bail applications stand **disposed of** in the above terms. Office to place a signed copy of this order in the captioned connected matter.

J U D G E