

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI
Cr. Revision. Appl. No.211 of 2026
(Ameer Ali Vs. The State)

Present:
Mr. Justice Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro
Mr. Justice Khalid Hussain Shahani

20.10.2026

Mr. Adil Mustafa Arain, advocate for applicant.
Mr. Rubina Qadir, Deputy Prosecutor General Sindh

ORDER

Muhammad Iqbal Kalhoro, J:- Applicant is facing a trial in Crime No.74/2025 of P.S. CTD Karachi U/s 4,5 Explosive Substances Act, 1908 r/w section 7 ATA, 1997, has impugned an order dated 27.08.2026, whereby his application to recall BDU Expert, a witness, for re-examination has been dismissed by the trial court.

2. The case of the applicant is that he had put certain questions to the said witness, which although were recorded in his presence but when he obtained a certified true copy of his deposition, the same were not reflected therein. Hence, he filed an application for his re-examination which has been dismissed.

3. We have heard learned counsel for applicant as well as learned DPG. The latter has opposed this application and submits that the trial court has passed a detailed order, mentioning the reasons for declining the request. Even otherwise, cross-examination of the witness available on record shows that all necessary questions were put to him by the defence counsel.

4. Apparently there is nothing on record that any objection on a certain question raised/asked by learned defence counsel at the time of recording evidence of the said witness has not been mentioned by the Presiding Officer. The law required the defence counsel to bring any question or objection not allowed by the Court on record through an application for a future reference. Learned counsel has admitted that he did not file such application at the time of recording of evidence.

5. We have also seen evidence of the said witness, the endorsement put down by learned trial court at the end shows that evidence was read over and accepted by the parties to be correct. Only thereafter, it was signed by the learned Judge. Hence, there is no question that either the questions or objections of the defence counsel were omitted by the court deliberately or some extraneous material was introduced in the course.

6. During the arguments, learned defence counsel in fact has said that he has objection over the “note” put down by the trial court in the cross examination and the reply mentioned thereunder. Which according to him was neither asked by him nor at the relevant time was so recorded before him. However, there is nothing in black and white to appreciate this argument; particularly when the reasons given by the trial court in the impugned order show that the evidence of the witness was recorded as per his verbatim under its supervision and all questions asked in the defence were duly mentioned. Therefore, we do not find any merit in this application and accordingly dismiss it.

The Cr. Revision Applications stand disposed of in the above terms along-with pending applications.

JUDGE

JUDGE

AK.