

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Criminal Bail Application No.564 of 2026

Applicant : Muhammad Bilal son of Muhammad Hanif, through Mr. Muhammad Rehman Ghous, Advocate

Complainant : Mr. Muhammad Imran son of Suleman, through mr. Adnan Ali, Advocate

Respondent : The State
Through Mr. Zahoor Shah, Addl. Prosecutor General, Sindh

Date of hearing : 09.03.2026

Date of order : 09.03.2026

ORDER

AMJAD ALI SAHITO, J -- Through this Bail Application, the applicant/accused seek post-arrest bail in Crime No.292 of 2024 registered under Sections 489-F, 420 PPC at Police Station Arambagh, South, Karachi, after his bail plea has been declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Karachi South, vide order dated 13.02.2026.

2. The details and particulars of the FIR are already available in the bail application and FIR, same could be gathered from the copy of FIR attached with such application, hence, needs not to reproduce the same hereunder.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused submits that, in fact, the outstanding liability against the present applicant/accused amounts to only Rs.8,900,000/- (Rupees Eighty-Nine Lac Only), whereas the allegation levelled against him is that he issued a cheque in the sum of Rs.19,200,000/- (Rupees One Crore Ninety-Two Lac Only). Learned counsel further submits that the applicant/accused had previously filed Criminal Bail Application No.259 of 2025 before this Court, which was dismissed vide order dated 10.03.2025. Thereafter, the applicant/accused surrendered before the learned trial Court on 13.03.2025 and has remained in

judicial custody for the last one year; however, during this period only one complainant has been examined. It is further contended that the maximum punishment provided for the alleged offence is up to three (03) years' imprisonment and the applicant/accused has already undergone incarceration for the past one year. Moreover, in the event of conviction, the applicant/accused would also be entitled to remission in accordance with law. Learned counsel therefore submits that the applicant/accused is ready and willing to furnish security equivalent to the disputed amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court and prays for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, along with the complainant, filed a Vakalatnama as well as an application under Section 493 Cr.P.C., which was allowed. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that, in fact, the outstanding amount is Rs.19,200,000/- (Rupees One Crore Ninety-Two Lac Only). He further submits that the applicant/accused has also issued cheques to other persons. However, he concurs with the proposal advanced by learned counsel for the applicant/accused that, upon release on bail, the applicant/accused shall make his best efforts to settle the outstanding account with the complainant. In these circumstances, the complainant present in Court raises no objection to the grant of bail. Learned Additional Prosecutor General, Sindh, also raises no objection.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the present applicant/accused purchased paper goods from the complainant during the years 2023 and 2024 for a total amount of Rs.350,000,000/- (Rupees Thirty-Five Crore Only), out of which a sum of Rs.113,604,000/- (Rupees Eleven Crore Thirty-Six Lac and Four Thousand Only) allegedly remained outstanding against the applicant/accused. In discharge of the said liability, the applicant/accused issued

ten (10) cheques in favour of the complainant, which upon presentation were dishonoured.

7. From the perusal of the record, it transpires that the applicant/accused had previously filed Criminal Bail Application No.259 of 2025 before this Court, which was dismissed vide order dated 10.03.2025. After dismissal of the said bail application, the applicant/accused surrendered before the learned trial Court on 13.03.2025. It further appears that after framing of the charge, only one witness has been examined so far. The applicant/accused has remained in custody for the past one year and only one witness has been examined, while no substantial progress has been made in the trial before the learned trial Court. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused submits that the applicant is ready and willing to furnish security equivalent to the amount of the disputed cheques. The said proposal has not been opposed by learned counsel for the complainant, nor by the complainant present in Court, who has also raised no objection if the applicant/accused is granted bail subject to furnishing security of the same amount.

8. In view of the above circumstances, and by consent of the parties, the instant bail application is allowed subject to the applicant/accused furnishing solvent security in the sum of Rs.10,000,000/- (Rupees One Crore Only) along with a P.R. bond to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

9. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the learned trial Court while deciding the case of the applicants on merits.

JUDGE

Hyder/PS