

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI.**  
**Cr. Misc. Application No.784 of 2024**  
*(Bilal Ahmed Bhutto vs. SSP Investigation-I & others)*

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

1. **For orders on office objection**
2. **For hearing of main case**

**19.11.2024.**

Mr. Nadir Khan Burdi, advocate for applicant  
M/s. Abdul Samad Khattak and Farooq Abbas, advocate for respondents  
Ms. Amana Ansari, Addl: PG Sindh

**ORDER**

**MUHAMMAD IQBAL KALHORO J:-** Applicant registered an FIR No.828/2023, u/s 324, 109, 34 PPC at Police Station Sachal, Karachi alleging that he is a government contractor and his office is situated in Johar Complex University Road Karachi. When he was not available in his office, on 15.07.2023 at about 2330 hours, three unknown persons with a female accused travelling in white corolla car came and made firing over his office, which is an offence u/s 324 PPC.

2. After the FIR, at some point in time, investigation was entrusted to SSP Investigation East Karachi, who after a thorough investigation recommended the case to be disposed of under 'C' Class. Yet, the investigation was ordered to be entrusted second time to one DSP Investigation-I Sohrab Goth, who too after examining the entire material including CDR record of the accused recommended the case to be disposed of under 'C' Class. When the report was submitted before the Magistrate concerned, he has passed the impugned order dated 06.07.2024 agreeing with the report and disposing of the case under 'C' Class, which applicant has challenged before this Court through this application.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant. He has contended that investigation was supposed to be conducted by some SSP as per direction given by the Divisional Bench of this Court in some petition, which has not been done, hence, the order is not sustainable in law.

4. The impugned order shows that two investigations have been done in this case, one by SSP, and other by a DSP and both have come to the same conclusion. Although, the case *prima facie* appears to be based on a story, which does not inspire confidence, yet the complainant/applicant by moving various applications has succeeded in compelling two senior police officials against the rules to conduct the investigation in the case, which otherwise,

could have been done by some Sub-Inspector of Police . Not only one but two investigations have resulted into same outcome, yet the complainant is not satisfied. More so, during the arguments, learned counsel for the applicant has failed to satisfy the Court as to how an offence u/s 324 PPC is made out, when it is alleged that firing was made on the wall of the office and was not aimed at same person. I therefore, find the impugned order based on proper reasoning in line with outcome of two investigations. Learned Addl: PG Sindh has also supported the impugned order, so also, learned counsel for the proposed accused. No case, therefore for indulgence is made out. The application in hand is dismissed. The applicant is warned from registering false cases and putting machinery of law in motion unnecessarily to settle personal score with the proposed accused.

The criminal miscellaneous application is disposed of in above terms.

**J U D G E**

Rafiq/P.A