

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, HYDERABAD
Criminal Bail Application No.S-19 of 2021

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

1. For orders on office objections.
2. For hearing of main case.

28.01.2021.

Mr. Ahsan Gul Dahri, Advocate along with applicant.
Ms. Sobia Bhatti, A.P.G for State.
Complainant Abdul Kareem in person.

=

Irshad Ali Shah J.- It is alleged that the applicant issued cheque dishonestly, it was bounced when was presented before the concerned Bank for encashment by complainant Abdul Kareem, for that the present case was registered

2. The applicant on having been refused pre-arrest bail by learned 3rd Additional Sessions Judge, Shaheed Benazirabad has sought for the same from this Court by way of instant application under section 498 Cr.P.C.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant being innocent has been involved in this case falsely by the complainant, the cheque actually was stolen for that an FIR was registered and the offence alleged against the applicant is not falling within prohibitory clause of section 497(2) Cr.P.C. By contending so, he sought for pre-arrest bail for the applicant on point of further enquiry and malafide. In support of his contention

he has relied upon case of *Iftikhar Akbar vs The State (2008 MLD 159)*.

4. Learned Assistant Prosecutor General for the State who is assisted by the complainant has opposed to grant of pre-arrest bail to the applicant by contending that the applicant has deprived the complainant of his money by practicing fraud.

5. I have considered the above arguments and perused the record.

6. The FIR of the incident has been lodged with delay of about one month, such delay could not be overlooked. The cheque alleged to be bounced as per the applicant was stolen. The parties even otherwise are disputed over sale and purchase of the Car. The offence alleged against the applicant is not falling clause of section 497(2) Cr.P.C. The case has finally been challenged. The applicant has joined the trial. The applicant has not misused the concession of bail. In these circumstances, a case for grant of bail to the applicant on point of further inquiry and malafide is made out.

7. In case of *Rehmatullah Vs. The State and others (2011 SCMR 1332)*. It has been held by Hon'ble Apex Court that:

"3. Heard. The petitioner was granted bail on 21-11-2008, which was cancelled by the learned High Court on 19-3-2009, when according to the order itself the trial was at the verge of conclusion. Learned Additional Prosecutor-General stated that now one or two witnesses are yet to be recorded. The courts should not grant or cancel bail when the trial is in progress and the proper course for the courts in such a situation would be to direct learned trial court to conclude the trial of the case within specified period."

8. In view of above, the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicant is confirmed on same terms and conditions with direction to learned Trial Court to dispose of very case against the applicant within one month.

9. The instant bail application is disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE

Ahmed/Pa.