IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR

Cr. Bail Appln. No. S - 528 of 2022 Cr. Bail Appln. No. S - 529 of 2022

DATE

ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE

Hearing of bail application

- For orders on office objection at Flag 'A'
- 2. For hearing of bail application-n

25.08.2023

Mr. Alam Sher Bozdar, Advocate along with Applicant in both matters Mr. Shafi Muhammad Mahar, Deputy Prosecutor General for the State

> ====== O R D E R

======

MUHAMMAD IQBAL KALHORO, J.- Applicant has been booked in two cases under Section 489-F, PPC for issuing dishonest cheques to two different people. In Crime No.353/2022 (*Cr. Bail Appln. No.S- 528/2022*) applicant is alleged to have issued a cheque of Rs.1000000/- (*ten lacs*) against the loan obtained by him from complainant, which on presentation in the bank was dishonoured. Whereas, in Crime No.351/2022 (*Cr. Bail Appln. No.529/2022*), he is alleged to have issued a cheque of Rs.7000000/- (*seventy lacs*) to the complainant against selling him a shop but then failed to either give him possession thereof or cause mutation in his favour.

- 2. Applicant's counsel submits that he has been falsely implicated in these cases, in fact he had already given money to the complainant in FIR No.353/2022 and in FIR No.351/2022 he had issued only a blank cheque as a guarantee without mentioning the amount. He submits that the offence is punishable for 03 years only. In support of his contentions, he has relied upon the cases of Mian Allah Ditta vs. The State and others (2013 S C M R 51) and Moiz Aly Manji vs. The State and others (2013 Y L R 1198 [Lahore]).
- 3. On the other hand, learned Deputy PG for the State has opposed grant of pre-arrest bail to the applicant.

4. I have considered submissions of parties and perused material available on record. It appears from the record that the applicant is involved in two similar nature of offences registered in a row suggesting that he is a habitual offender. The justification furnished in defence appears to be impalpable for the purpose of granting extra-ordinary concession of pre-arrest bail to the applicant. Reasonable grounds exist in shape of dishonoured cheques coupled with investigation, in which he has been prima facie found guilty. Therefore, I do not find the applicant to be entitled to the concession of pre-arrest bail. Consequently, both these applications are dismissed and the interim pre-arrest bail already granted to the applicant vide orders dated 18.10.2022, respectively, are hereby recalled.

Office is directed to place a signed copy of this order in the connected captioned matter.

Judge

<u>ARBROHI</u>