

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Present:

Mr. Justice Omar Sial
Mr. Justice Muhammad Hassan (Akber)

SPL. CR. ANTI TERRORISM APPEAL NO. 133 OF 2024
SPL. CR. ANTI TERRORISM APPEAL NO. 135 OF 2024

Appellants : **Fazal Khaliq**
through Mr. Ajab Khan Khattak,
Advocate

Respondent : **The State**
through Mr. Ali Haider Saleem,
Additional Prosecutor General
Sindh

Date of Hearing : 06.05.2025

Date of Decision : 14.05.2025

JUDGMENT

Omar Sial, J.: The appellant was nominated as accused in a case arising out of F.I.R. No. 19 of 2024 registered under sections 353, 324, 186, 427 and 34 P.P.C. read with Section 7 of A.T.A. of 1997 at Police Station SIU/CIA, Karachi. Appellant was also charged in F.I.R. No. 20 of 2024 registered under section 23(1)(a) of the Sindh Arms Act, 2013. The case against the appellant is that on 29.01.2024, a police party was patrolling for prevention of crime and search of absconding accused in Karachi city, when they reached in the street of Block 13/D-1, opposite Bungalow No. C-35 / C-14, Gulshan-e-Iqbal, Karachi, they signaled two persons (including appellant) riding on

motorcycle to stop, but instead of stopping, the accused sitting on rear seat of motorcyclist opened fire on the police. In retaliation police party also made firing in their defence, resultantly both persons fell down from the motorcycle, the present appellant received bullet injury and was arrested at the spot while the other accused after snatching motor cycle from one Zaryab Gul, Rider of Food Panda, made his escape good from the place of incident. One unlicensed pistol was recovered from appellant. After completing all formalities, the appellant was challaned. Subsequently co-accused Naveed was also arrested and they were sent up to face trial.

2. After a full dress trial, the learned A.T.C. No. 3 at Karachi vide Judgment dated 19.11.2024 convicted the appellant and sentenced to suffer seven years for offence under section 7(b) of ATA, 1997 and for offence under section 324 P.P.C., he was also sentenced to suffer five years for offence under section 7(h) of ATA, 1997 and 24 of the Sindh Arms Act, 2013. He was also sentenced one year for an offence under section 353 P.P.C.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the case against the appellant was not one of terrorism and that he would not argue the case on merits; however, he requested that the sentence already undergone by the appellant be treated as his final sentence.

4. We have heard the learned counsel for the appellant and the learned Additional Prosecution General. Our findings and observations after re-appraising the evidence are as follows.

5. **In Ghulam Hussain vs The State (PLD 2020 SC 61)**, the Supreme Court held:

“For what has been discussed above it is concluded and declared that for an action or threat of action to be accepted as terrorism within the meanings of section 6 of the Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997 the action must fall in subsection (2) of section 6 of the said Act and the use or threat of such action must be designed to achieve any of the objectives specified in clause (b) of subsection (1) of section 6 of that Act or the use or threat of such action must be to achieve any of the purposes mentioned in clause (c) of subsection (1) of section 6 of that Act. It is clarified that any action constituting an offence, howsoever grave, shocking, brutal, gruesome or horrifying, does not qualify to be termed as terrorism if it is not committed with the design or purpose specified or mentioned in clauses (b) or (c) of subsection (1) of section 6 of the said Act. It is further clarified that the actions specified in subsection (2) of section 6 of that Act do not qualify to be labeled or characterized as terrorism if such actions are taken in furtherance of personal enmity or private vendetta.”

6. In the current case, no evidence was produced at trial to establish that the ingredients of section 6(1) (b) or (c) were satisfied. The only reference to insecurity was made by the complainant in his testimony. No witness was produced at trial to prove the alleged insecurity. It is also evident from the very facts of the case that no design or intent was established for the offence to be categorized as a terrorism offence. We have no qualms in concluding that the prosecution failed to justify a section 7 ATA conviction. The same is accordingly set aside.

7. The case against the appellant falling outside the ambit of terrorism would mean he would be entitled to section 382-B remissions. A jail roll was called for that showed that the appellant

had completed 4 years, 2 months and 26 days of the sentence awarded to him. After reviewing the record and confirming that the appellant had no previous crime record, the learned Additional Prosecutor General conceded that the sentence already undergone by the appellant would be an appropriate punishment. While considering the request made by the appellant, we have also considered that the appellant, remorseful and repentant for what he had done, wish to spend the rest of his life as law-abiding citizens. His admission has saved the time and money of the State. The jail authorities have reported that his conduct in jail has been satisfactory. We have also considered that the learned Additional Prosecutor General, on behalf of the State, very correctly and wisely, does not object to a reasonable reduction in sentence.

8. Given the above, the appeal No.133 of 2024 is allowed only to the extent of the conviction with respect to section 7 of the ATA 1997. The convictions and sentences awarded to the appellant for the offenses under the Penal Code and the Sindh Arms Act, 2013 are upheld; however, the sentences awarded to the appellant are reduced to the period he has already undergone. This will also include imprisonment instead of a fine. The appellant may be released if not required in any other custody case.

9. Both the appeals stand disposed of in the above terms.

JUDGE

JUDGE