

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT,  
MIRPURKHAS**

**Crl. Bail Application No.S-271 of 2025**

**Applicant:** Ali Ahmed S/o Abdul Jabbar,  
Through Mr. Mujeeb-ur-Rehman Shar, Advocate.

**Respondent:** The State.  
Through Mr. Mazhar Ali Sial, A.P.G.

**Date of hearing:** 06.11.2025

**Date of Order:** 06.11.2025

**ORDER**

**Shamsuddin Abbasi, J:** Through this Bail Application, the applicant/accused seeks post arrest bail in Crime No.84/2025 for offence under section 24 of Sindh Arms Act, 2013 of PS Perumal, after his bail plea has been declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Sanghar, vide order dated 03.10.2025.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 17-09-2025, the complainant SIP Muhammad Iqbal Khanzada of PS Perumal took accused Ali Ahmed and Sawan, who were already on police remand in FIR No.79/2025 under Sections 395 and 397 P.P.C, out of the lock-up for further investigation. During investigation, the accused allegedly agreed to produce the crime weapon and the amount received from the robbery. The police party then proceeded to the houses of the accused, where accused Sawan allegedly produced an iron rod, while accused Ali Ahmed allegedly produced unlicensed 3 bore TT pistol with magazine and 04 live bullets, along with alleged recovery of Rs.700,000/- said to be part of the robbed amount.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is not nominated in the F.I.R; he was shown arrested in the said F.I.R; that recovery of cash of Rs.7,00,000/- is foisted upon the applicant Ali Ahmed and recovery of crime weapon has been foisted on applicant in order to strengthen the main case; that the alleged offence does not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497 Cr.P.C. In support of his contentions, he relied upon the case law reported in **2004 P.Cr.L.J 1431 [Karachi]**. Lastly, he prayed for grant of bail.

4. Learned A.P.G submits that during investigation, the applicant was arrested and recovery of huge amount was effected as well as crime weapons which connect the applicant with the alleged offence which is against the society.

5. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.P.G for the State and perused the record.

6. No doubt, the F.I.R was registered against unknown accused persons but later on, further statement was recorded by the I.O of the complainant on 04.09.2025 whereby he has implicated the applicants alongwith their role. During investigation, police arrested the applicants and robbed cash amount of Rs.7,00,000/- has been recovered from the possession of applicant Ali Ahmed as well as crime weapon was recovered from his possession which connect him with the alleged offence. Sufficient material is available on record which connect the applicants with the commission alleged offence.

7. In view of the foregoing, learned counsel for the applicant/accused has failed to make out a case warranting the grant of bail. Accordingly, the bail application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused is **dismissed**. However, trial court is directed to expedite the matter and conclude the same preferably within 03 months and submit such compliance report through Additional Registrar of this Court. The case law relied upon by the learned counsel for the applicant is distinguishable from the facts of present case.

8. The observations made in this decision are of a tentative nature and will not influence the merits of the case.

**JUDGE**

**\*Faisal\***