

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA

**Criminal Bail Application No. S-52 of 2026**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Order with signature of Judge</i>
<b>Applicant</b> :	Sadam @ Muhammad Sallah son of Abdul Qadir Bukejo, through Mr. Rafique Ahmed K. Abro, Advocate
<b>The State</b> :	Through Mr. Sardar Ali Solangi, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh.
<b>Complainant</b> :	Mumtaz Ali son of Haji Roshan Ali @ Sikandar Ali Bhangar, through Mr. Karim Yar Bohio, Advocate
<b>Date of Hearing</b> :	04.06.2026
<b>Date of Order</b> :	04.06.2026

**ORDER**

**Riazat Ali Sahar, J:-** Through this application, the applicant, Sadam alias Muhammad Sallah, seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.53 of 2024, registered at Police Station Warrah, District Kamber-Shahdadkot, for offences punishable under Sections 302, 427, 395, 337-H(ii), 148 and 149, P.P.C.

2. Briefly stated, the prosecution case, as set out in the F.I.R., is that the complainant, along with his relatives, was returning from Larkana when, near Mangneja Curve on the Waggan-Warrah Road, six unknown armed persons intercepted their vehicle and opened indiscriminate fire. One firearm shot pierced the windscreen and struck the complainant's father, namely Sikandar, on the left side of his chest. Thereafter, the assailants resorted to aerial firing, compelling the complainant party to stop their vehicle, and allegedly committed dacoity by depriving them of cash amounting to Rs.17,300/- and one Vivo mobile phone. The injured was immediately shifted towards Larkana for medical treatment but succumbed to the firearm injury on the way. Consequently, the instant F.I.R. was lodged against unknown accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that the F.I.R. is admittedly a blind one, wherein neither the name nor any description of the present applicant was mentioned. He submits that no incriminating article has been recovered from the possession of the applicant and that his nomination was made subsequently through a further statement recorded under Section 161, Cr.P.C. It is further argued that the applicant has remained in custody since 03.11.2025, the investigation has been completed, and the challan has already been submitted; therefore, his further detention serves no useful purpose. He thus prays for the grant of post-arrest bail.

4. Conversely, learned counsel for the complainant, assisted by the learned Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh, has opposed the bail application, contending that the applicant, along with his co-accused, committed a heinous offence of road dacoity during which the complainant's father was murdered. It is argued that the complainant, due to local social pressures and in the hope of an amicable settlement through a "brotherly Faisla," initially withheld the names of the culprits and subsequently disclosed them after such efforts failed. It is further pointed out that the applicant had earlier sought pre-arrest bail, which was declined by the trial Court as well as by this Court through order dated 08.01.2025 passed in Criminal Bail Application No.S-561 of 2024, and thereafter his post-arrest bail application was also dismissed by the learned trial Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have carefully examined the material available on record.

6. Admittedly, the present applicant was not nominated in the F.I.R; however, the complainant has categorically identified him and has offered an explanation for the delayed disclosure of his identity by stating that, owing to local customs and pressure exerted by the accused party for settlement through a brotherly Faisla, the names of the culprits were initially withheld. Prima facie, such explanation cannot be discarded outright at the bail stage, particularly when the complainant claims to have known the applicant, who belongs to the same locality.

7. It is also noteworthy that the applicant had previously approached this Court for the grant of pre-arrest bail, and after examining the merits of

the matter, the same was declined vide order dated 08.01.2025. The present application substantially rests upon the same grounds which have already been considered. No exceptional circumstance, change in the prosecution case, or fresh material has been brought on record warranting a different view.

8. The allegation against the applicant **pertains to the commission of road dacoity coupled with murder, offences carrying capital punishment and falling within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C.** At this tentative stage, without touching the merits of the case, there appears to be sufficient material connecting the applicant with the commission of the alleged offence.

9. In view of the foregoing circumstances, and the reasons already recorded by this Court while dismissing the earlier bail application, I am not persuaded to extend the concession of post-arrest bail to the applicant. Consequently, the instant Criminal Bail Application is dismissed. However, the learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial preferably within four (4) months under intimation to this Court.

10. Needless to observe that the observations made herein are purely tentative in nature and shall not prejudice either party during the trial.

Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the learned trial Court, for compliance.

**JUDGE**

Zulfiqar