

# IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

## Criminal Bail Application No. 173 of 2025

### Present Before:

Justice Zafar Ahmed Rajput

Justice Tasneem Sultana

**Applicant** : Qasim Liaquat Ali s/o Liaquat Ali  
through M/s. Saathi M. Ishaque & S.K. Lodhi,  
advocates.

**Respondent** : The State, through Mr. Abrar Ali Khichi,  
Additional Prosecutor General, Sindh along  
with PI Haji Liaquat Ali of P.S Boat Basin & PI  
Hizbullah of AVCC, Karachi.

**Date of hearing** : 25.03.2025  
**Date of Order** : 25.03.2025

### ORDER

**TASNEEM SULTANA, J.** Through this Crl. Bail Application, applicant Qasim Liaquat Ali s/o Liaquat Ali seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No. 621 of 2024, registered at P.S Boat Basin, Karachi, under section 365-A, P.P.C. His earlier application for the same relief being Crl. Bail Application No. 226 of 2024 was declined by the Anti-Terrorism Court-VIII, Karachi, vide order dated 07.01.2025.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that, on 16.09.2024, at 11.00 hrs., complainant Mst. Parbhat Burhan, her husband Burhan Ahmed and children reached parking of KFC, Boat Basin in their car, where her husband attended a call of her brother-in-law, Zeeshan Ahmed, by stopping the car and walking some steps ahead. She saw that some persons were squabbled with him, on that she being scared felt that he was asking to leave from there at once; she then drove the car and came back to home. Thereafter, she received a call from her husband's phone of some unknown person for arranging the car and Rs.350,000/-; then her husband called her continuously for arrangement of said demand. Hence, she lodged the F.I.R.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused has contended that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case for ulterior motives; that no direct role in the commission of the alleged offence has been assigned to the applicant; hence, his guilt requires further inquiry.

4. On the other hand, learned Addl. PG has maintained that the applicant, along with absconding accused, abducted the husband of the complainant for ransom; that the prosecution has sufficient evidence against the applicant to connect him with the commission of the alleged offence; hence, he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

5. Heard. Record perused.

6. The applicant was arrested on 23.09.2024 and since then he is confined in judicial custody. The prosecution has submitted challan; hence the physical custody of the applicant is no more required for further investigation.

7. It appears from the perusal of the record that the complainant had lodged the FIR regarding the abduction of her husband and receiving calls for payment of ransom from unknown persons. As per I.O., after lodging of the F.I.R., the abductee and the complainant themselves appeared at police station on 19.09.2024 and disclosed that they had paid Rs.130,000/- as ransom amount for his release. He disclosed the names of culprits as (i) Shan alias Shani son of Mohammad Alam (2) Gulab Chandio son of unknown (3) Hassan son of unknown (4) Asif son of unknown (5) Kamran son of unknown, however, he did not disclose the name of the present applicant to the I.O as accused, whose name he disclosed first time in his 164, Cr. P.C. statement recorded on 20.01.2025, as a person on whose mobile phone account the main accused Shani had got the part ransom amount i.e. Rs.20,000/- transferred. Such unexplained delay on the part of abductee to disclose the name and role of present applicant makes it a case of further inquiry. Besides,

such 164, Cr. P.C. statement, no other material is available with the prosecution to connect the applicant with commission of alleged offence. It is an admitted position that the I.O. has not obtained any record of money transaction made on the mobile phone of the applicant.

8. For the foregoing facts and discussion, we admit the applicant to post-arrest bail, subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (*Rupees one Hundred Thousand only*) and P.R. Bond in like amount to the satisfaction of the Nazir of this Court.

9. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the Trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits. However, in case the applicant misuses the concession of bail in any manner, the Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the same after giving him notice, in accordance with law.

10. Above are the reasons of our short order dated 25.03.2025.

J U D G E

J U D G E