

# IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

**Cr. Bail App. No. S – 660 of 2025**

*(Kashif Shaikh v. The State)*

Date of hearing : **04.11.2025**

Date of decision : **04.11.2025**

M/s Israr Ahmed Shah and Mujeeb-ur-Rehman Malano, Advocates for applicant.

Mr. Abdul Raheem Mahar, Advocate along with complainant.

Mr. Asadullah Rajper, Assistant Attorney General along with SIP Mir, FIA Cyber Crime, Sukkur.

## **ORDER**

**Mahmood A. Khan, J.** – Applicant is facing proceedings under Crime No.18 of 2025, registered at Police Station National Cyber Crime Investigation Agency Circle, Sukkur, under Sections 16, 20, 24 of the Prevention of Electronic Crimes (Amendment) Act, 2025, read with Section 109, PPC.

2. Learned Counsel for the applicant was heard on the earlier date, wherein he contended that the offence alleged against the present applicant does not fall within the prohibitory element; as such, the applicant is entitled as of right for grant of bail, wherein the complainant present stated that the applicant party has caused FIR against the complainant in the present matter in order to pressurize her to withdraw from present proceedings. Today, a photocopy has been brought before this Court; though illegible, complainant contends that FIR No.273 of 2025 has been lodged under Section 506/2, PPC, by Muhammad Ali, who is father of co-accused Sharjeel. It is also stated by the complainant that even today the applicant's father has had hot words with her husband who is a vegetable vendor and she was as such earlier not much inclined to come to the Court today also.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant in the matter contends that the allegations against the present applicant made in the matter cannot

restrict him from being entertained for bail as the same understanding has been so held by the repeated authorities of the higher Courts.

4. Having heard the learned Counsels and gone through the record, on the arguments advances by the learned Counsel for the applicant on the last date of hearing, I was inclined to grant him bail on that very basis of the crime not having prohibitory element when the complainant present stated that she is being pressurized for which the matter was kept for today enabling her to support her claim which has been done. However, the same is not found entertainable today, as it seems that the applicant has acquired a mindset of treating himself above the law duly supported by his family.

5. The offence itself by abuse of mobile, wherein the victim is a young girl and the family being affected, whereafter acts are being done to force them from even standing at for a proper prosecution, requires that even the concession otherwise available may not be granted as of right. As such, it is not found possible to entertain the applicant in the present circumstances.

6. Investigating Officer present in the Court was called upon as to the number of witnesses, so that a direction be issued for an early conclusion, to which he stated that inadvertently the forensic report in original was submitted before this Court, which shall be obtained today, and accordingly, challan within two (02) weeks shall be submitted before the trial Court.

7. Though bail application is being **refused** for entertainment, the trial Court is directed to ensure an early conclusion in the matter.

The bail application stands **disposed of** in the above terms.

J U D G E