

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR.
Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.S-351 of 2026.

DATE OF HEARING	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
-----------------	-------------------------------

Applicant: Muhammad Mashooque S/O Muhammad Bhagiyal by caste Solangi.
Through Mr. Ali Akbar Shar Advocate

The State: Through **Mr.Khalil Ahmed Maitlo**, D.PG.

Respondents: (4). Ishtiaque Hussain S/O Hussain Bux
Through Mr.Sheeraz Fazal Advocate.

Date of hearing & order: **20.10.2026.**

Suresh Kumar J:- Through instant Criminal Miscellaneous Application, the applicant Muhammad Mashooque Solangi has impugned the order dated 20.04.2026 passed by learned Civil Judge & Judicial Magistrate Sobhodero @ Ranipur, whereby he accepted the report under section 173 Cr.P.C submitted by the I/O under B-class after converting into C-class, in FIR bearing Crime No.09/2025 for offences U/Ss 364, 148, 149 PPC registered at PS Sobhodero District Khairpur under c-class.

2. At the very outset, the learned Deputy Public Prosecutor and the learned Advocate for Respondent No. 4 have raised an objection regarding the maintainability of this application, arguing that the applicant is neither a complainant nor an accused; therefore, the present Criminal Miscellaneous Application is not maintainable.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant has admitted that the applicant is neither a complainant nor an accused, but asserts that he is an aggrieved person. Upon inquiry, he has failed to satisfy this Court regarding how the applicant qualifies as an aggrieved person in relation to the impugned order.

4. Upon perusal of the challan submitted at Annexure (c), on page 31, it reveals that Respondent No. 4, Ishtique Hussian, is the complainant in Crime

No. 09/2025, while Azhar Ali, Kashif Ali, ASI Muhammad Chhuttal Behallar, Inspector Ghulam Shabir, HC Samano, and I/O SIP Zahoor Ahmed Phull are listed as witnesses in the challan. This indicates that the applicant is neither a complainant nor an accused. Furthermore, he is not identified as a witness; therefore, he cannot be considered an aggrieved person in relation to the impugned order. The counsel for the applicant has failed to adequately satisfy this Court as to how the applicant qualifies as an aggrieved person. Consequently, the instant Criminal Miscellaneous Application is dismissed.

JUDGE

Hizbullah/PA.

