

**THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT, LARKANA**

**1<sup>st</sup> Criminal Bail No.S-210 of 2026**

Applicant: Abdul Sattar son of Ali Akbar Joyo  
through M/s. Ashique Ali Jatui and Naseer  
Ahmed Waggan, Advocates.

Respondent: The State  
Through Mr. Aitbar Ali Bullo, Deputy  
Prosecutor General, Sindh.

Complainant: Saadullah son of Manzoor Ali Joyo  
(present in person)

Date of hearing: 14.09.2026

Date of Order: 14.09.2026

**ORDER**

**RIAZAT ALI SAHAR, J.-** Through instant Criminal Bail Application, applicant/accused Abdul Sattar Joyo seeks pre-arrest bail in Crime No. 98/2025, offence under Sections 302, 337-A(i), 114, 34, PPC of the Police Station Ratodero. Prior to this, he filed such application, but the same was turned down by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Ratodero vide Order dated 02.02.2026; hence he filed the instant Criminal Bail Application.

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

3. Per learned counsel, the applicant/accused is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case by the complainant with *mala fide* intentions and ulterior motives; that

there was previous hostility between the parties; that though the name of the applicant/accused is found in the F.I.R. but no specific role has been assigned to him except mere presence; however, it is yet to be determined by the trial Court whether he has committed any offence or not. Lastly, learned counsel prayed for grant of bail to the applicant/accused.

4. On the other hand, the complainant as well as learned D.P.G have vehemently opposed the grant of bail and submit that the name of the applicant/accused has been appeared in the F.I.R. with specific role, therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

5. Heard and perused. Admittedly, the name of the applicant/accused has appeared in the F.I.R. however, no specific role has been assigned against him and if any role is assigned it is against the co-accused persons, who fired from their respective pistols at the son and nephew of the complainant otherwise mere presence of the applicant/accused has been shown at the place of incident. In the case of ***Qurban Ali vs. The State*** (2017 SCMR 279), wherein Honourable Supreme Court of Pakistan has granted bail to the accused, who had not been attributed any overt act during the occurrence, except to determine after recording pro and contra evidence, whether the applicant was vicariously liable for the act of his co-accused and that case was one of the further enquiry. It is trial Court to see whether they have caused the offence or not at bail stage only tentative assessment could be made. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused submits that there is *mala fide* on the part of the complainant in view of the previous enmity the applicant has been implicated in this case otherwise he is innocent. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused has made out case for grant of bail under

section 497 Cr.P.C. The challan has been submitted and the applicant/accused is no more required for further investigation.

6. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed and the applicant/accused is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.100,000/- (Rupees One Hundred Thousands only) and P.R. Bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court.

7. 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 either party at trial.

**J U D G E**

*Manzoor*