

ORDER SHEET

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI
Cr. B.A. No. 1058 of 2023

Date	Order with signature of Judge
------	-------------------------------

1. For order on office objections.
2. for hearing of bail application.

03.07.2023

Mr. Waseem Saif Khoso, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Rubina Qadir, APG.

1. Overruled.
2. Applicant Dur Muhammad son of Muhammad Ali is seeking bail after arrest in FIR No. 2407/2022 lodged under Section 353, 324, 186, 397, 34 PPC at P.S. Korangi Industrial Area, Karachi. It is inter alia contended by the learned counsel for the applicant/accused that prosecution failed to recover any empty bullets from the place of incident as according to the prosecution there was a firing between the police party as well as accused party, this sole fact is sufficient which casts a heavy doubt in the prosecution story, therefore, this benefit is to be given to the applicant/accused at bail stage. He further contended that the alleged recovery of amount and .30 bore pistol is yet to be proved by the prosecution through trial. While concluding his submission, learned counsel requested for releasing the applicant/accused on bail.

On the other hand, learned APG contended that applicant/accused was arrested at spot, recovery of looted amount has also been recovery from the possession of the applicant/accused which are sufficient facts to connect the applicant/accused with the

commission of the alleged offence, therefore, the applicant accused is not entitled for bail.

I have heard the submissions of learned counsel for the applicant as well as learned APG and scanned the available material. It unfurls from the record that the prosecution established its case on the grounds that the malefactor looted the complainant party as well as deterred the police party from discharging their official duties and fired upon the police party with intention to commit their murder, however, it has not been introduced on record that the prosecution has produced any empty recovered from the place of incident through according to the police applicant/accused fired upon the police party which is a sufficient ground to form a prima facie view that case at hand needs further inquiry. The perception and discernment of the expression “further inquiry” is a question which must have some nexus with the result of the case and it also pre-supposes the tentative assessment which may create doubt with respect to the involvement of accused in the crime. The *raison d'etre* of setting the law into motion in criminal cases is to make an accused face the trial and not to punish an under trial prisoner or let him rot behind the bars. It is a well settled principle of the administration of justice in criminal law that every accused is innocent until his guilt is proved and this benefit of doubt can be extended to the accused even at the bail stage, if the facts of the case so warrant¹. The basic philosophy of criminal jurisprudence is that the prosecution has to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt and this principle applies at all stages including pre-trial and even at the time of deciding whether accused is entitled to

¹ *Per Muhammad Ali Mazhar J. in Fahad Hussain v. The State (2023 SCMR 364)*

bail or not which is not a static law but growing all the time, moulding itself according to the exigencies of the time. In order to ascertain whether reasonable grounds exist or not, the Court should not probe into the merits of the case, but restrict itself to the material placed before it by the prosecution to see whether some tangible evidence is available against the accused person(s). Reasonable grounds are those which may appeal to a reasonable judicial mind, as opposed to merely capricious, irrational, concocted and/or illusory grounds. However, for deciding the prayer of an accused for bail, the question whether or not there exist reasonable grounds for believing that he has committed the alleged offence cannot be decided in a vacuum.

I have cautiously scanned and ruminated the material placed on record and reached to a tentative assessment that the case of the prosecution can only be resolved and determined by the trial court after full-fledged trial of the case but keeping in view the present set of circumstances, the case of the applicant/accused requires further inquiry.

As a result therefore, this bail application is allowed. Applicant Dur Muhammad is granted bail subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.20,000/- (rupees twenty thousand) with P.R bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of Nazir of learned trial Court.

JUDGE

Aadil Arab