

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

Criminal Bail Application No.S-670 of 2020

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

18.08.2020

Mr. Farhad Ali Abro, Advocate for applicant.

Mr. Nazar Muhammad Memon, Addl.P.G.

-.-.-.-

RASHIDA ASAD, J: Through this application, the applicant Muhammad Ibrahim seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.32/2020 registered at P.S Baldia for offence under section 8 of Sindh Prohibition of Preparation, Manufacturing, Storing, Sale and Use of Gutka and Manpuri Act, 2019, after having failed to obtain such relief from the trial court.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 07.06.2020 at 2100 hours complainant ASI Niaz Ali Dahri apprehended the applicant from Toyota Show Room having three (03) bags containing the white pan parag gutka, world pan parag gutka, Rana and Safina gutka as detailed in the F.I.R. Samples were sealed and sent for chemical analysis. According to prosecution, the recovered substance is injurious to human health.

3. It is, inter alia, contended by learned Counsel for the applicant that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case by the complainant with ulterior motives and malafide; the case under section 8 of Sindh Prohibition of Preparation, Manufacturing, Storing, Sale and Using Gutka and Manpuri Act, 2019, is not made out against the applicant; that the case property has been foisted upon the applicant; that there is violation of section 103 Cr.P.C; and that the offence with which the applicant is charged carries three (03) years punishment and does not fall within the

prohibitory clause of section 497, Cr.P.C. Lastly he prayed for grant of bail to the applicants.

4. Learned Additional Prosecutor General Sindh opposed the grant of bail to the applicant.

5. I have considered submissions of parties and perused material available on record. The section with which the applicant is charged is not bailable but its applicability to the facts and circumstances of the case could only be determined at trial. The evidence of the police officials is required to be scrutinized minutely at the time of trial, whether the alleged incident has taken place in a fashion as stated in the F.I.R. or not. Admittedly, there is no independent witness of the incident. Moreover, a mistaken relief of bail may be repaired by convicting the accused, if proved guilty but no proper reparation can be offered from his unjustified incarceration, albeit, his acquittal in the long run. Reliance is placed on the case of ZAIGHAM ASHRAF versus The STATE and others (2016 SCMR 18). Applicant is behind the bars since his arrest and still trial has not been commenced. Applicant is no more required for any purpose of investigation nor the prosecution has claimed any exceptional circumstances, which would justify keeping the applicant behind the bars for an indefinite period. All the P.Ws are police officials, hence there is no question of tampering the evidence, therefore, keeping in view the peculiar circumstances of instant case, I am of the view that scale tilts in favour of the applicant for grant of bail as no useful purpose is likely to be served with further detention of applicant pending determination of his guilt. Under these circumstances, a case for release of the applicant on bail on point of further inquiry pending trial, obviously is made out.

6. In view of above, the bail application was allowed and the applicant was granted bail subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (one lac) and P.R Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of trial court by my short order dated 17.08.2020 and these are the reasons of the same.

7. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the trial court while deciding the case of applicant on merits.

August 18th, 2020.

JUDGE

Ali Haider

