

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

Cr. Bail App. No. S – 662 of 2025

(Mst. Shabana alias Basheeran Phulpoto v. The State)

Date of hearing : **15.09.2025**

Date of decision : **15.09.2025**

Mr. Atta Hussain Chandio, Advocate for applicant.
Mr. Rafique Ali Kalhoro, Advocate for complainant.
Mr. Shafi Muhammad Mahar, Deputy Prosecutor General.

ORDER

Mahmood A. Khan, J. – Through this application, the present applicant seeks bail in Crime No.180 of 2025, registered at Police Station 'B' Section, Khairpur, for an offence under Section 365-B, PPC, wherein it is alleged in the FIR against her that she accompanied with other persons at the time of abduction of the complainant's wife.

2. Learned Counsel for the complainant through requested for time; however, as strict order was passed earlier when he was not present although having received copy of the bail application on the date before the same, same was not found required and the matter was heard.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant contended that the present applicant has been roped in along with the male accused in order to pressurize the alleged accused. He further contended that one of the other co-accused nominated in the matter has been put in Column II in the challan, to which order has not been passed. Learned Counsel lastly contended that in the 161, Cr.P.C. statement, the alleged abductee had stated that she had made voluntarily appearance, whereas in the 164, Cr.P.C. statement, it is stated that she was recovered by the police.

4. Learned Counsel for the complainant, however, contended that the present applicant was accompanied the other co-accused at the time of the incident.

5. Learned Deputy Prosecutor General states that the present applicant has been nominated in the 164, Cr.P.C. statement.

6. Having heard the learned Counsels and gone through the record, apparently, the version of the incident, as made out, does not describe the utility of the present applicant at the time of the incident. As such, there is apparently a forced entry, for which presence of woman may not be required, and in the said circumstances, apart from being woman, the present applicant has now made a case of further enquiry.

7. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**, and the applicant is **admitted to post-arrest bail** subject to furnishing a solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (*Rupees fifty thousand*) and P.R. bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

8. Needless to mention here that observations as above are tentative in nature and not meant to affect merits of the case before the learned trial Court.

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

J U D G E

Abdul Basit