

**ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI**

Cr. Bail Appl.No.1002 of 2026
Cr. Bail Appl.No.1003 of 2026

Date	Order with signature of the Judge
------	-----------------------------------

Present:

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

Aqeel Hussain GopangVs. The State

20.05.2026.

Mr. Sajjad Ahmed Chandio a/w Mohsin Raza Gopang, Advocate for applicant

Mr. Munawar Ali Teevino, advocate for complainant.

Mr. IrshadAli, Assistant Attorney General.

O R D E R

=

MUHAMMAD IQBAL KALHORO J: Applicant seeks post arrest bail in two FIRs bearing Crime No.30 & 31 of 2025 registered among others u/s 409,415,463,467, 468, 471, 477-A, 109, 34 PPC of P.S. FIA CC, Shaheed Benazirabad.

2. FIRs were registered by the FIA after inquiries into the complaints submitted by Muhammad Rafique Ganghro and Qadir Bux Sahito against Branch Manager of MCB Ltd. Kandiaro Branch and other bank officials for commission of financial fraud in their bank accounts. In the investigation, applicant was identified as Cashier/Universal Service Officer (USO) and in such capacity making flying/fake entries in the accounts of complainants inflating figures in their accounts, and withdrawing then such amounts. Hence, he was booked in this case alongwith a number of other accused.

3. Learned counsel for applicant has pleaded for bail on the ground that co-accused Zaheer Ahmed, who has been assigned similar role has been granted bail by the trial court on the ground that his name does not appear in the FIR, however, like applicant his name transpires in the FIR with the identical allegations that he had authorized withdrawal of the amounts of the cheque of Rs.1,43,00,000/- purportedly of Muhammad Rafique Ghanghro and cleared the high value cash debt entry without availability of cheque, has been granted bail; in the inquiry report the doubt over the role of complainant himself has been shown; the applicant is in jail for more than three months; the case against him requires further inquiry; the applicant is not beneficiary of any amount, hence he is entitled to concession of bail. Learned counsel has relied upon 2024 SCMR 1103, 1995 SCMR 170, 2017 P Cr. L J 770 (Sindh), 2012 YLR 565 Sindh, 2000 YLR 289 Karachi,

2017 P Cr. L J Note 12 Lahore, 2002 P Cr. L J 168 (Peshawar), 2022 SCMR 1258, 2012 YLR 2342(Sindh), 2013 P Cr. L J 318 (Sindh), 2022 SCMR 2068.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for complainant and learned Assistant Attorney General have opposed the bail stating that applicant has been assigned specific role; against co-accused Zaheer Ahmed, application for cancellation of bail has been filed; the Supreme Court in an identical case ¹ cancelled the bail granted by the High Court. He has further relied upon 2010 SCMR 1221, PLD 2009 SC 446, 2010 SCMR 855, 2002 SCMR 1886, 2010 SCMR 1735 and 2012 P Cr. L J 1.

5. We have heard the parties and perused material available on record. It appears that complainants in the complaints have not disclosed name of the applicant. His role was spotted only in the investigation that in one case he without actual cheque, presented by the complainant, by making a flying/fake entry allowed withdrawal of an amount of Rs.1,43,00,000/-. His that role, even in the enquiry report submitted in defence, has been highlighted by enquiry officer that he without availability of the cheque had done so. He is also identified with marking of funds on hold (FOH) without any formal written request from the complainants; used the system generated reprinting on the different cash deposit slips, the amount of which was embezzled by the bank officials including the applicant in active connivance of each other. In the departmental inquiry, it appears that he had put up his defence that transaction of amount of Rs.1,43,00,000/- was posted in to the system on the instructions of Branch Manager Mansoor Ali Tanwiri, a co-accused, which implies prima facie that he did so without receiving the actual cheque that is an omission pointing out to his active connivance. In presence of such prima facie evidence, we do not find the applicant entitled to concession of bail. Accordingly, these applications are dismissed. However, learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and examine material witnesses within three months, after which in any case, applicant would be at liberty to repeat his application for the same relief, which if filed, shall be decided on its own merits.

The observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not prejudice case of either party at trial.

The Cr. Bail Application is disposed of.

Office to place a copy of this order in connected Cr. Bail application.

JUDGE

¹ Chief Manager / Attorney, Allied Bank Ltd. (PLD 2009 SC 446)

JUDGE

A.K