

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT
COURT, MIRPURKHAS.**

Criminal Bail Application No.S-252 of 2025

Applicant : Akhtar Ali s/o Manak Rind through Mr.
Hadi Bux Zardari, advocate.

Respondent : The State through Mr. Neel Parkash,
Deputy Prosecutor General Sindh.

Date of hearing : 08.10.2025.

Date of Order : 08.10.2025.

O R D E R.

Amjad Ali Sahito, J:- Through instant bail application, the applicant/accused namely, Akhtar Ali seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.97/2025, registered at Police Station Shahdadpur for the offence under section 506(ii), 224, 225, 337-H(ii), 147, 353, 148, 149 PPC. Earlier the bail plea of the applicant/accused was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Shahdadpur vide order dated 07.08.2025.

2. The details and particulars of the FIR are already available in the bail application and FIR, the same could be gathered from the copy of the FIR attached with such application, hence, needs not to reproduce the same hereunder.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused has contended that the applicant/accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case with mala fide intention. It is further argued that the co-accused Muhammad Ramzan has already granted bail by the learned trial Court, hence rule of consistency is applicable. He further argued that the role of the applicant/accused was only that he was present at the place of incident. He has further argued that no recovery of any incriminating article has been made from the applicant/accused at the time of his arrest. He also contended that the prosecution witnesses are police officials and subordinate to the complainant

and, therefore, interested witnesses. Learned counsel added that the applicant/accused is presently confined in jail and is no longer required for further investigation, hence he prays for the grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned Deputy Prosecutor General has vehemently opposed the grant of post-arrest bail to the applicant/accused and argued that the applicant/accused deterred the police party from performing their lawful duties. He further contended that the applicant/accused is not entitled to the concession of bail and prayed for dismissal of the bail application.

5. Heard and perused the record.

6. From the perusal of the record, it appears that the name of the applicant transpires in the FIR; however, it is yet to be determined at the time of trial whether he shared a common intention or common object with the co-accused persons. Moreover, there is a previous criminal record of the accused, wherein he had remained absconder and fugitive from law, which shows that he has scant respect for the process of law. Furthermore, there is nothing on record to show that any enmity exists between the applicant/accused and the police, or that he has been falsely implicated on account of such enmity.

7. At the bail stage, only a tentative assessment of the material available on record is to be made. Prima facie, sufficient incriminating material exists to connect the applicant with the commission of the alleged offence.

8. In view of the above and as the learned counsel for the applicant has failed to make out a case for the grant of bail under Subsection (2) of Section 497, Cr.P.C., the post-arrest bail application filed by the applicant/accused is hereby dismissed. However, the learned trial Court is further directed to expedite the proceedings and conclude the trial preferably within sixty (60) days, and to submit a compliance report through the Additional Registrar of this Court.

9. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the learned Trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits.

JUDGE

****Adnan Ashraf Nizamani****