

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI  
Cr. Bail Application Nos. 1098 & 1099 of 2026

Present:  
Mr. Justice Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro  
Mr. Justice Miran Muhammad Shah

Applicant:- Noor ul Haq through Mr. Abdul Jalil Khan Marwat,  
advocate.

Respondent:- The State through Rana Khalid, Special Prosecutor  
Pakistan Rangers.

Mr. Abrar Ali Khichi, Additional Prosecutor General.

Date of hearing:- 19.05.2026

=====

**MUHAMMAD IQBAL KALHORO J:** Allegedly, on 04.02.2026 at 06:30 pm complainant and PW Akhtar Hussain, who belong to Rangers, were on intelligence duty, when they received information about sale of narcotics and illegal weapons. In order to confirm the same, when they reached near Kari Bacha, Pathan Colony, Karachi, they were picked up by six armed persons on gunpoint on three motorcycles and taken to some unknown place and confined, wherefrom they managed to make their escape good during night hours and informed the superiors. Hence, FIR was registered.

2. Applicant was arrested on 06.02.2026 and allegedly from him a 9mm pistol was recovered, which was sent along with empties recovered from the spot for forensic examination and the report came in positive. On 14.02.2026 applicant was put to identification parade before the relevant Magistrate where he was picked up by complainant and PW Akhtar Hussain to be the main culprit who had also caused a butt blow on the head of the complainant.

3. Learned defence counsel has argued that the complainant and PW Akhtar Hussain were in civvies, hence unidentifiable; the father of the applicant had moved an application to DG Rangers on 06.02.2026 alleging that these two officials had come to his hotel and had quarrelled with his son, hence people available there had held them and handed over to the police picket. Per learned counsel, the IO was also apprised of such facts but he did not investigate the same; applicant has

been falsely implicated in this case; the case even otherwise does not fall within the provisions of ATC Act; applicant is in jail for more than three and half months; the application filed by the father of applicant makes his case to be one of further inquiry; complainant and other officials had ransacked house of the applicant which is visible from the photos filed along with the bail applications.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for Rangers and APG have opposed bail stating that applicant was identified by the complainant and PW Akhtar Hussain, who were on intelligence duty in the area; the complainant was maltreated which is evident from the medico-legal certificate; a pistol was recovered from the applicant which has matched with empties recovered from the spot.

5. We have considered submissions of the parties and perused material available on record and are of the view that applicant is *prima facie* involved in this offence. Applicant's name was inserted in the FIR only on the statements of eye witnesses namely Bilal Ahmed and Muhammad Feroz who are residents of local area otherwise the applicant was unknown to complainant party. Applicant was later on arrested on 06.02.2026 and from him a 9mm pistol from which he had made aerial firing along with other accused was also recovered. The forensic report shows matching of the pistol with empties found at the spot. Applicant was put to identification parade before the learned Magistrate where he was identified by the complainant party which *prima facie* confirms his involvement.

6. As far as the ground of the applicant that the case does not fall within the provisions of ATC Act, this question cannot be decided at bail stage, the applicant has the remedy to file an application u/s 23 of ATC Act before the trial Court. Injury to the person of the complainant *prima facie* reinforces the incident which further gets support from the application moved by father of the applicant. The photos filed with the bail application, unless identified to be genuine and taken from the spot on the date of incident, as alleged by defence, cannot be taken into consideration at this stage.

7. Therefore, in presence of above *prima facie* evidence we are of the view that the applicant is not entitled to concession of bail. The bail applications are accordingly dismissed. The trial Court is directed to examine complainant and PW Akhtar Hussain within two months and

then the applicant would be at liberty to move a fresh application before the trial Court which if filed shall be decided on its own merits.

The bail applications are accordingly disposed of in above terms.

JUDGE

JUDGE

HANIF