

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Misc. Appln. No.S-214 OF 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For hearing of MA-5554/2017

15.08.2017.

Mr. Ghulamullah Chang, Advocate for applicants.  
Mr. Bhagchand Bheel, Advocate for respondent No.2.  
Mr. Shahid Ahmed Shaikh, Deputy Prosecutor General.

**ORDER**

**ABDUL MALIK GADDI, J:-** Through this Criminal Miscellaneous Application under Section 561-A Cr.P.C, the applicants have assailed the legality and propriety of the order dated 11.05.2017 passed by the learned Civil Judge and Judicial Magistrate, Khipro on Criminal Complaint under Section 506(2), 504, 337-H(ii), 147, 148 & 149 PPC, filed by the respondent No.2 against the applicants, whereby the learned Trial Court after recording the statement of respondent No.2 and his witnesses under Sections 200 and 202 Cr.P.C respectively brought the Direct Complaint on record with direction to the office to issue Bailable Warrants against the applicants/accused in the sum of Rs.10,000/- each, to be served through the concerned SHO.

2. The main grievance of the learned Counsel for the applicants is that the aforesaid direct complaint has been filed by the respondent No.2 malafidely, although according to him, on the same cause of action, F.I.R. No.59 of 2017 registered by Gulzar (respondent No.2) at Police Station, Khipro, has already been disposed of in N.C Class by the learned Magistrate, therefore, according to him the Direct Complaint filed by the respondent No.2 on the same cause of action was not maintainable. He further submits that there is a contradiction in between the statement of P.Ws and the complainant

recorded during the preliminary inquiry by the Trial Court, therefore, according to him on the basis of contradictory statements the said Director Complaint should have been dismissed instead of that the same was brought on record without assigning any good reason. He further submits that on perusal of the impugned order, it reveals that the same is non-speaking and has been passed in a hot hasty manner, therefore, the same is liable to be set-aside.

3. Learned Counsel for the respondent No.2 has supported the impugned order by stating that the impugned order has been passed after recording the statement of the complainant under Section 200 Cr.P.C, which has been supported by the evidence of the P.Ws namely Loung and Abdul Shakoor recorded under Section 202 Cr.P.C. He further submits that this criminal miscellaneous application is not maintainable as according to him, the learned Trial Court has taken cognizance of the offence and if the applicants are aggrieved by the order passed by the Trial Court, then they have the remedy to approach the Trial Court by filing an application under Section 249-A Cr.P.C or 265-K Cr.P.C whatever the case may be for premature acquittal.

4. Learned Deputy Prosecutor General submits that though the impugned order is non-speaking but according to him that in view of the case law reported as *DIRECTOR GENERAL, ANTI-CORRUPTION ESTABLISHMENT & OTHERS V. MUHAMMAD AKRAM KHAN & OTHERS (PLD 2013 Supreme Court 401)*, the applicants may approach the Trial Court for redressal of their grievances, if any, by filing an application under Section 249-A Cr.P.C and the Trial Court shall then decide the same in accordance with law.

5. I have heard the learned Counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

6. It is an admitted fact that in this matter the learned Trial Court has taken cognizance of the offence by passing the order, which is impugned by the applicants, whereby the Bailable Warrants have been issued against the applicants in the sum of Rs.10,000/- each and the matter is at the initial stage, therefore, at this stage it could not be said that the process issued against the applicants is without any basis. As observed above, the cognizance of the offence has already been taken by the learned Trial Court, therefore, under the circumstances the process issued by the Trial Court at this stage cannot be set-aside. However, the fate of the case as well as of the accused persons challaned in this criminal miscellaneous application is to be determined by the Trial Court itself. The accused persons in such circumstances could avail the remedy if so desired by filling an application under Section 249-A Cr.P.C to seek their premature acquittal if the charge is found to be groundless or there is no probability of their conviction and the Trial Court shall decide such application as per law. In this regard, I am satisfied with the case law referred to above.

7. In view of the above, the present criminal miscellaneous application is dismissed being meritless alongwith listed application.

**JUDGE**

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET****IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**

C.P.NO.S-1249 OF 2017

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. For orders on office objection. |  |
| 2. For orders on MA-2625/2017      |  |
| 3. For katcha peshi.               |  |

15.08.2017.

Mr. Nehroo Lal Bheel, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Sher Muhammad Laghari, State Counsel a/w ASI Hammad Ali of P.S Jam Nawaz Ali and SIP Dur Muhammad Khoso, SHO P.S Daano Dandal, Tharparkar.

Respondent No.7-Sawan present in person.

=

Through this petition, the main grievance of the petitioner is that the official respondents are harassing the petitioner at the behest of the private respondents.

Learned State Counsel filed comments of respondents No.2 to 4, which are taken on record, copies whereof supplied to the learned Counsel for the petitioner. The official respondents in their comments have stated that they will act strictly in accordance with law.

Private respondent No.7 is present in person. He submits that neither he harassed the petitioner nor intends to do so in future. Other private respondents are not present. Since the official respondents have categorically submitted that they will act strictly in accordance with law.

In view of the above, this petition is being disposed of with direction to the official respondents to act strictly in accordance with law and the private respondents are restrained from causing any harassment to the petitioners.

JUDGE

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
C.P.NO.S-1037 of 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. For orders on office objection.<br>2. For katcha peshi. |  |
|--|--|

15.08.2017.

Mr. Sher Muhammad Laghari, State Counsel.

=

Mr. Chetan S. Kella, Advocate has filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of private respondents, which is taken on record.

Mr. Nehroo Lal Bheel, Advocate holding brief for Mr.Ashar Majeed Khokhar, Advocate for petitioner, who is stated to be unwell.

Adjourned to 14.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
C.P.NO.S-861 of 2017

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For katcha peshi. 2. For hearing of MA-1880/2017	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel.

=

Respondent No.1-Saifullah is present in person. None present for respondent No.2. Mr. Mahzar Ali Laghari, Advocate holding brief for Mr.Sartar Iqbal Panhwar, Advocate for petitioner, who is stated to be busy before another Bench, requests for a date. Request is allowed.

Adjourned to 07.09.2017. Repeat notice to respondent No.2.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-515 OF 2017**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on office objections. 2. For katcha peshi.  <u>15.08.2017.</u>	<p>Mr. Khalilur Rehman Pirzada, Advocate for Petitioner.</p> <p>Mr. Khadim Hussain Soomro, Advocate for respondent No.4.</p> <p>Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel a/w Inspect Mushtaque Ahmed Almani, SHO P.S Gupchani and o/b of SSP Shaheed Benazirabad and SIP Sikandar Ali Vistro of P.S Taluka Nawabshah.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">=</p> <p>At the very outset, learned Counsel for the petitioner does not press his prayer clause (a) of the petition.</p> <p>Through this petition, the main grievance of the petitioner is that the official respondents at the behest of the private respondents are harassing him and his family without any justification. Official as well as private respondents have filed their written comments/objections, which are taken on record and copies whereof have been supplied to the learned Counsel for the petitioner. In the comments, it is stated by the official respondents that they will act strictly in accordance with law. The private respondents have also stated in their written objections that they will not cause any harassment to the petitioner.</p> <p>In view of the above, this petition is being disposed of with direction to the official respondents to act strictly in accordance with law. Private respondents are also directed to refrain from causing any harassment to the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin-top: 20px;"><b>JUDGE</b></p>

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
R.A No.68 of 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on MA-594/2017	
2. For katcha peshi.	
3. For orders on MA-595/2017	

15.08.2017.

Mr. Balmiyo, Advocate for appellant.  
Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel.  
=

In this matter, respondents have not yet been served. Office is directed to issue notice to the respondents as already ordered. It is submitted by the learned Counsel for the appellant that IInd Appeal No.100 of 2017, which arises out of the same order/judgment already fixed on 31.08.2017 may be fixed alongwith this civil revision in order to avoid conflicting orders. Order accordingly.

Adjourned to 31.08.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid



**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
IInd Appeal No.33 of 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. For katcha peshi.<br>2. For hearing of MA-1005/2017 |  |
|--|--|

15.08.2017.

Mr. Umaid Ali Khuwaja, Advocate for appellants.  
Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel.

=

Repeat notice to the respondents as already ordered.

Adjourned to 26.09.2017. Office is directed to call R&Ps.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
R.A No.332 of 2016

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

- 1. For katcha peshi.
- 2. For hearing of CMA-1998/2016

15.08.2017.

Mr. Faisal Nadeem Abro, Advocate for applicants.  
Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel.

=

Repeat notice to the private respondents as already ordered.

Adjourned to 26.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
R.A No.248 of 2016

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For hearing of MA-1465/2016	
2. For katcha peshi.	

15.08.2017.

Mr. Rana Raheel Mehmood, Advocate for Respondents.  
Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel.

=

Applicant is present in person. He requests for adjournment on the ground that his Counsel is unable to attend the matter today. At his request, the matter is adjourned to 25.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
R.A No.215 of 2016

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

- 1. For katcha peshi.
- 2. For hearing of CMA-2248/2016

15.08.2017.

Mr. Naveed Ahmed, Advocate holding brief for Mr. Aqeel Ahmed Siddiqui, Advocate for applicant.

=

Repeat notice to the respondents as already ordered.

Adjourned to a date in office.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
R.A No.186 of 2016

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For katcha peshi. 2. For hearing of CMA-1660/2016	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Chetan S. Kella, Advocate for applicant.  
Mr. Muhammad Iqbal Kassar, Advocate for respondent No.4.  
Mr. Sher Muhammad Laghari, State Counsel.  
=

It is stated by the learned Counsel for the applicant that applicant has expired, therefore, he may be allowed to file amended title. At the first instance, he is directed to file proper application in this regard.

Adjourned to 11.11.2017.

**JUDGE**

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
C.P.NO.S-1274 of 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on office objection.	
2. For orders on MA-2681/2017	
3. For katcha peshi.	
4. For hearing of MA-2682/2017	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Karamullah Memon, Advocate alongwith petitioners.

Mr. Ashraf Samo, Advocate has filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of respondents No.5 to 8.

Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel a/w I.O/S.I Ghulam Murtaza Kaka of P.S Boat Basin, Karachi and ASI Riaz Ahmed of P.S Khipro.

=

Investigating Officer/Sub-Inspect Ghulam Murtaza Kaka has filed his written reply alongwith certain documents, which are taken on record and copies whereof have been supplied to the Counsel for the petitioners as well as Counsel for the respondents, who seek some time to go through the same. Time is granted.

Adjourned to 14.09.2017. Interim order passed earlier to continue till next date.

JUDGE

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
C.P.NO.S-1272 of 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on office objection.	
2. For orders on MA-2668/2017	
3. For katcha peshi.	

15.08.2017.

Mr. Irfan Ali Rahujo, Advocate for petitioner a/w petitioner

Mr. Ali Abbas Memon, State Counsel a/w SI/SHO Hadi Bux and  
SIP Najamuddin of P.S Qasimabad and o/b of SHO Qasimabad.

None present for private respondents.

=

It appears from the record that petitioner Mst.Sughran has contracted marriage with one Irtiza S/o Sikandar Ali Khoso, according to her freewill. It also appears from the record that after execution of freewill, the applicants were entered into registered marriage with each other on 26.07.2017 and this fact caused annoyance to the private respondents, who are issuing threats of dire consequences to the petitioner. Respondents No.1, 4 and 5 have filed their written replies, which are taken on record, copies whereof supplied to the Counsel for the petitioner. In the comments, it is stated by the official respondents that neither they have harassed the petitioner nor they intend to do so in future and they will act strictly in accordance with law.

In view of the above statement of the official respondents, Counsel for the petitioner is satisfied and seeks disposal of this petition. Since the petitioner has recently married with the above named person as per valid *Nikahnama*, therefore, the present petition is being disposed of with the direction to the official respondents that they shall conduct themselves strictly in accordance with law and shall not harass the petitioner.

JUDGE

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Revision Appln.No.S-141 of 2016

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.P.P.  
=

Mr. Bilawal Bajeer, Advocate has filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of the applicant, which is taken on record and he requests for a date. Request is allowed.

Adjourned to 21.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid



**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Appeal No.S-125 of 2015

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.PP.

=

Mr. Muhammad Zainuddin Baloch, Advocate holding brief for  
Mr.Nisar Ahmed Durrani, Advocate for appellant, who is stated to be busy  
before another Bench of this Court and requests for a date. Request is allowed.

Adjourned to 14.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Appeal No.S-133 of 2013

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

Mr. Muhammad Dilawar Qureshi, Advocate has filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of respondent No.1.

Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.P.P  
=

Appellant present in person submits that his Advocate could not reach to the Court due to some unavoidable circumstances and requests for a date. Request is allowed.

Adjourned to 13.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
 Cr. Appeal No.S-256 of 2012

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.	
----------------------	--

15.08.2017.

Appellants are present on bail.  
 Mr. Muhammad Jamil Ahmed, Advocate alongwith appellants.  
 Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.P.P.

=

It is pointed out that Mr. Ashok Kumar D. Lohano, Advocate for complainant is on general adjournment till 04.09.2017. This appeal is pending since 2012 and the appellants are appearing in this Court regularly. Under the circumstances, the matter is adjourned to 07.09.2017 with direction to the office to issue notice to the complainant as well as intimation notice to his Counsel for the next date and in case nobody appears on behalf of the complainant, the matter will be heard and decided on the basis of the material available on record.

**JUDGE**

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Appeal No.S-299 of 2011

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.P.  
=

Appellants and their surety are called absent. Let notice be issued to the appellant and their surety through the concerned SHO for 27.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Appeal No.S-256 of 2011

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.P.P.  
=

Mr. Altaf Ahmed Shahid Abro, Advocate holding brief for Mr.Muhammad Hashim Leghari, Advocate for complainant, who could not reach to the Court due to some unavoidable circumstances and requests for a date. Request is allowed.

Adjourned to 26.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Jail Appeal No.S-97 of 2009

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

- 1. For orders on office objection.
- 2. For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

Mr. Nadir Hussain Junejo, Advocate for appellant.  
Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.P.P.  
Complainant present in person.  
=

Office is directed to call jail roll of the appellant from the  
Superintendent Central Prison, Hyderabad.

Adjourned to 13.09.2017.

JUDGE

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Appeal No.S-79 of 2009

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

Mr. Fazal Hussain Jamali, Assistant Attorney General.  
=

Appellant present in person submits that his Advocate could not reach to the Court due to some unavoidable circumstances and requests for a date. Request is allowed.

Adjourned to 29.08.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Appeal No.S-197 of 2007

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
-------------	--------------------------------------

For regular hearing.

15.08.2017.

None present for the appellant.  
Mr. Erum Ahmed, D.D.P.P.  
=

The appellant who is on bail is not present today. No intimation received. As an indulgence, this time the matter is adjourned to 25.09.2017 with a note of caution that in case none appears on behalf of the appellant on the next date, the matter will be heard and decided on the basis of the material available on record. Office is directed to issue notice of intimation to the Counsel for the appellant for the next date. Notice of intimation may also be issued to the Advocate for the complainant.

JUDGE

Shahid



**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1360 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
	1. For orders on MA-2931/2017
	2. For orders on office objection.
	3. For orders on MA-2932/2017
	4. For katcha peshi.
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	
	Mr. Altaf Ahmed Shahid, Advocate for Petitioner.
	=
	1. Urgency granted.
	2. Deferred for the time being.
	3. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
	4. Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G
	for 14.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1359 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For orders on MA-2927/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-2928/2017	
4. For katcha peshi.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	
	Mr. Zulqarnain Talpur, Advocate for Petitioner.
	=
1.	Urgency granted.
2.	Deferred for the time being.
3.	Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4.	Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G
	for 14.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1358 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For orders on MA-2918/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-2919/2017	
4. For katcha peshi.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	
	Mr.Nasrullah A. Khaskheli, Advocate for Petitioner.
	=
1.	Urgency granted.
2.	Deferred for the time being.
3.	Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4.	Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G
	for 13.09.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1357 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For orders on MA-2920/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-2921/2017	
4. For katcha peshi.	
5. For orders on MA-2922/2017	

15.08.2017.

Mr. Jagdish R. Mullani, Advocate for Petitioner.  
=

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.   | Urgency granted.  |
| 2.   | Office objection to be completed within three days.               |
| 3.   | Granted subject to all just exceptions.                           |
| 4&5. | Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G |
- for 22.08.2017.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
C.P.NO.S-1356 OF 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on MA-2908/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-2909/2017	
4. For katcha peshi.	

15.08.2017.

Mr. Aijaz Bhutto, Advocate for Petitioner.  
=

1. Urgency granted.
2. Deferred for the time being.
3. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4. It is stated by learned Counsel for the petitioner that alleged detenue namely Mst.Aasma is the wife of the petitioner but she has been wrongfully confined by respondents No.6 to 8 and they are not allowing her to meet and see the petitioner.

Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G for 28.08.2017. In the meantime, respondent No.4 is directed to recover the alleged detenue and produce her before this Court for recording her statement.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**

Cr. Bail Application No.S-671 OF 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on MA-5803/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-5804/2017	
4. For hearing.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Shabir Hussain Umrani, Advocate alongwith applicant.

=

1. Urgency granted.
2. Deferred for the time being.
3. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4. Applicant/accused is present alongwith his Advocate, who has been heard for grant of interim pre-arrest bail in favour of the applicant in Crime No.146 of 2017 registered at P.S Shahdadpur under Section 302, 337-A(i), F(i), 114, 506(2), 147, 148, 149 and 504 PPC. It is stated by learned Counsel for the applicant that the applicant has been falsely involved in the aforesaid crime; that the applicant has not played any active role in the commission of the alleged crime. He further submits that the applicant/accused had applied for pre-arrest bail before the Trial Court but the same was rejected by the Trial Court without assigning any good reasons and the local police wants to arrest the applicant malafidely. Contention raised needs consideration.

Without touching the merits/demerits of the case, applicant/accused is admitted to interim pre-arrest bail subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/- (Rupees One Lac) and P.R Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Additional Registrar of this Court. Let notice be issued to the complainant as well as Additional P.G

To come up on 07.09.2017 for confirmation or otherwise.

JUDGE

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
 Cr. Bail Application No.S-672 OF 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on MA-5821/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-5822/2017	
4. For hearing.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Faisal Nadeem Abro, Advocate alongwith applicant.  
 =

1. Urgency granted.
2. Deferred for the time being.
3. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4. Applicant/accused is present alongwith his Advocate, who has been heard for grant of interim pre-arrest bail in favour of the applicant in Crime No.118 of 2017 registered at P.S A-Section Latifabad, Hyderabad under Section 489-F PPC. It is stated by learned Counsel for the applicant that the case against the applicant is false and has been registered due to enmity. He further submits that the applicant has issued cheque in bonafide intention but the complainant party is using the same malafidely. He also submits that the applicant had applied for pre-arrest bail before the Trial Court but the same was rejected without assigning any good reason and the local police is after the applicant to arrest him in this case. Contention raised needs consideration.

Without touching the merits/demerits of the case, applicant/accused is admitted to interim pre-arrest bail subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) and P.R Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Additional Registrar of this Court. Let notice be issued to the complainant as well as Additional P.G

To come up on 07.09.2017 for confirmation or otherwise.

JUDGE

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
 Cr. Bail Application No.S-673 OF 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on MA-5823/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-5824/2017	
4. For hearing.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Nazeer Ahmed A. Bhatti, Advocate alongwith applicant.  
 =

1. Urgency granted.
2. Deferred for the time being.
3. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4. Applicant/accused is present alongwith his Advocate, who has been heard for grant of interim pre-arrest bail in favour of the applicant in Crime No.59 of 2017 registered at P.S Hussainabad, Hyderabad under Section 489-F PPC. It is stated by learned Counsel for the applicant that the case against the applicant is false and has been registered due to enmity. He further submits that the applicant has issued cheque in bonafide intention but the complainant party is using the same *malafidely*. He also submits that the applicant had applied for pre-arrest bail before the Trial Court but the same was rejected without assigning any good reason and the local police is behind the applicant to arrest him in this case. Contention raised needs consideration.

Without touching the merits/demerits of the case, applicant/accused is admitted to interim pre-arrest bail subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) and P.R Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Additional Registrar of this Court. Let notice be issued to the complainant as well as Additional P.G

To come up on 11.09.2017 for confirmation or otherwise.

JUDGE



**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
Cr. Rev. Appln. No.S-128 OF 2017

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For orders on MA-5798/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-5597/2017	
4. For katcha peshi.	

15.08.2017.

Mr. Ayaz Ali Rajper, Advocate alongwith applicant.  
=

Learned Counsel for the applicant seeks some time to place on record the certified true copy of diary dated 16.06.2017 in Criminal Case No.17 of 2017 pending in the Court of IInd Judicial Magistrate, Kunri. Time is granted.

Adjourned to a date in office.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
C.P.NO.S-1354 OF 2017

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE</b>
1. For orders on MA-2906/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-2907/2017	
4. For katcha peshi.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Kaleemullah Memon, Advocate for Petitioner.  
=

1. Urgency granted.
2. Deferred for the time being.
3. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4. It is stated by learned Counsel for the petitioner that the wife of the petitioner namely Mst.Fatima is in the wrongful custody of respondents No.3 to 6, who are not allowing him to meet and see.

Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G for 25.08.2017. In the meantime, respondent No.2 is directed to recover the alleged detainee and produce her before this Court for recording her statement.

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1353 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For orders on MA-2903/2017	
2. For orders on MA-2904/2017	
3. For orders on office objection.	
4. For orders on MA-2905/2017	
5. For katcha peshi.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Ali Khan Laghari, Advocate for Petitioner.  
=

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | Urgency granted.   |
| 2. | It is stated by learned Counsel for the petitioner that he is not the enrolled Advocate of the High Court but filed this petition, therefore, he may be granted permission to appear in this case. Only one time permission is granted to the Counsel in this case only. |
| 3. | Deferred for the time being.   |
| 4. | Granted subject to all just exceptions.  |
| 5. | Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G for 26.09.2017.  |

JUDGE



**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1341 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
	1. For orders on MA-2913/2017
	2. For orders on office objection.
	3. For orders on MA-2914/2017
	4. For katcha peshi.
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	
	Mr. Raja Hans Raj Naurang, Advocate for Petitioner.
	=
	1. Urgency granted.
	2. Deferred for the time being.
	3. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
	4. Notice to the respondents as well as Additional A.G for
<u>25.09.2017.</u>	

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1332 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For orders on MA-2915/2017	
2. For orders on office objection.	
3. For orders on MA-2916/2017	
4. For katcha peshi.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	
	Mr. Nisar Ahmed Channa, Advocate for Petitioner.
	=
1.	Urgency granted.
2.	Deferred for the time being.
3.	Granted subject to all just exceptions.
4.	Notice to the respondents as well as Additional A.G for
<u>14.09.2017.</u>	

JUDGE

Shahid

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-1306 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1. For orders on MA-2910/2017	
2. For orders on MA-2911/2017	
3. For orders on office objection.	
4. For orders on MA-2912/2017	
5. For katcha peshi.	
<u>15.08.2017.</u>	

Mr. Muhammad Anwar Arain, Advocate for Petitioner.  
=

1. Urgency granted.
2. It is stated by learned Counsel for the petitioner that he is not the enrolled Advocate of the High Court but filed this petition, therefore, he may be granted permission to appear in this case. Only one time permission is granted to the Counsel in this case only.
3. Deferred for the time being.
4. Granted subject to all just exceptions.
5. Let notice be issued to the respondents as well as Additional A.G for 14.09.2017.

JUDGE

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT HYDERABAD**  
**C.P.NO.S-380 OF 2017**

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
1.	For orders on MA-2929/2017
2.	For orders on office objection.
3.	For katcha peshi.
4.	For hearing of MA-1145/2017
5.	For orders on MA-2930/2017

15.08.2017.

Syed Tahir Hussain, Advocate for petitioners.  
=

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 1.      | Urgency granted.   |
| 2.      | Deferred for the time being.                                 |
| 3 to 5. | Let fresh notice be issued to the respondent for 23.08.2017. |

JUDGE

Shahid



