

ORDER SHEET  
**THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,  
MIRPURKHAS**

C.P. No.D-697 of 2025

Present:

**Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon**

**Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar**

**19.11.2025**

Mr. Shanker Lal Meghwar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Zaheer-ud-din Nohri, Advocate for the respondent No.6.

Mr. Muhammad Sharif Solangi, Assistant Advocate General, Sindh  
along-with SIP Muhammad Siddique PS Islamkot.

Mr. Ghulam Abbas, Deputy Prosecutor General, Sindh

==

**ADNAN-UL-KARIM MEMON, J-** Petitioners prayed that this Court to:

1. Quash FIR No. 68/2025 of P.S. Islamkot and all consequential proceedings, being false, fabricated, mala fide, and a counterblast to FIR No. 67/2025.
2. Direct disciplinary/criminal action against IO Muhammad Siddique Sangrasi for biased, unlawful and corrupt conduct.
3. Restrict the respondents and police from harassing or arresting the Petitioners in relation to FIR No.68/2025.
4. Grant any other relief deemed just and proper.

2. The case of the petitioners is that they belong to the marginalized Meghwar Hindu community of Tharparkar, have no criminal history, and permanently reside in Village Ghalib Shah, Taluka Islamkot. They submitted that the Respondent No.6 lodged FIR No. 68/2025 at P.S. Islamkot under Sections 324, 337-F(vi), 147, 148, 149, 114, 504 PPC, alleging that the Petitioners assaulted him and his companions on 11.10.2025; however, the Petitioners were granted pre-arrest bail by the learned 1<sup>st</sup> Additional Sessions Judge, Tharparkar @ Mithi on 27.10.2025. They added that prior to this, FIR No. 67/2025 had already been registered by Petitioner No.1 against Respondent No.6 and others for a violent attack on the Petitioners' house. This FIR involves serious offences including Sections 324, 506/2, 337-A, 337-F(i)(v), 452 PPC etc. meanwhile, the investigation of FIR No.67/2025 was assigned to IO Muhammad Siddique Sangrasi, who is closely related to the accused party. Due to conflict of interest, the IO conducted a biased and partial investigation, failed to arrest any accused persons, and illegally deleted Section 324 PPC. They further submitted that in collusion with the accused party, the same IO facilitated the delayed, false, and mala fide counter-blast FIR No.68/2025, lodged 9 days after the alleged incident without justification. They added that Medical records show only minor injuries inconsistent with any allegation of attempted murder, further supporting fabrication. DIG Mirpurkhas, through a letter dated 20.10.2025, acknowledged that the Petitioners were

the aggrieved party and had been maltreated, yet they were falsely implicated. The Petitioners have submitted multiple complaints to higher authorities and challenged the medical certificate; proceedings are still pending.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that second FIR about the same occurrence is not maintainable, as FIR No.67/2025 was already registered first. The impugned FIR No.68/2025 is a clear counterblast and is liable to be quashed. Lodging the impugned FIR after nine days renders it suspicious, fabricated, and an afterthought. The IO conducted a biased, mala fide and illegal investigation, shielding the real accused and victimizing the Petitioners. The impugned FIR is supported by minor, self-suffered injuries, inconsistent with the alleged offences. He argued that the Supreme Court in **PLD 2018 SC 595**, Sughra Bibi case holds that manifestly mala fide FIRs can be quashed under Article 199 to prevent abuse of process. Continuation of proceedings violates Articles 4, 9, 10A, 14, and 25 of the Constitution and amounts to harassment. He prayed to allow the petition.

4. Learned AAG and APG assisted by the counsel for the private respondent opposed the petition on the premise that both the FIRs have been challaned as such the trial court may be directed to look into the matter and take decision in accordance with law.

5. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioners, learned AAG, and learned APG. Perusal of the record reflects that serious allegations of bias, misconduct, and conflict of interest have been raised against the Investigating Officer, Muhammad Siddique Sangrasi, particularly regarding the investigation of FIR No. 67/2025 and the subsequent registration of the counter-blast FIR No. 68/2025. The material placed before this Court, including the letter of DIG Mirpurkhas dated 20.10.2025, prima facie indicates that the grievances of the Petitioners cannot be brushed aside without an independent and impartial scrutiny. The allegations, if proved, constitute a violation of fair investigation an integral component of the right to fair trial guaranteed under Article 10-A of the Constitution.

6. Although the learned AAG and APG contend that both FIRs have been challaned and therefore the matter may be left to the trial Court, this Court is of the view that where the integrity of the investigation itself is in question, the High Court, in exercise of constitutional jurisdiction, may issue directions to ensure fairness and to prevent abuse of process.

7. In the circumstances, and without touching upon the merits of either FIR, this petition is disposed of with the following directions:

- a) DIGP Mirpurkhas Range is directed to order reinvestigation of FIRs No. 67/2025 and 68/2025 through a senior, impartial officer not below the rank of DSP, who shall conduct the investigation strictly in accordance with law and

submit his findings before the competent Court, which shall pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

- b) The conduct of IO Muhammad Siddique Sangrasi shall be placed before the departmental authorities, who shall initiate disciplinary proceedings against him if he is found involved in any misconduct, bias, suppression of facts, or manipulation of investigation as alleged by the Petitioners.
- c) Pending conclusion of such departmental proceedings, the said IO shall not be assigned any operational or field posting.
- d) The trial Court shall proceed further after receiving the reinvestigation report and shall decide the matter strictly on merit, uninfluenced by any observations made herein.

8. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Muhammad Danish