IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Criminal Bail Application No. 2000 of 2026

Applicant	:	Abdul Rehman son of Abdul Saleem Through Mr. Shafiq Ahmed, advocate
Complainant	:	Muhammad Babul Son of Ghulam Rasool Through: in person.
Respondent	:	The State Through Mr. Muhammad Mohsin, A.P.G Sindh.
Date of hearing	:	10.11.2026.
Date of order	:	10.11.2026.

O R D E R

Khalid Hussain Shahani, J.— Through this application, Abdul Rehman seeks pre-arrest bail in a case bearing Crime No. 557/2026, for offence under sections 324/34 PPC of Police Station Surjani Town, Karachi. His earlier application for the same relief was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VII, Karachi West, on 23.06.2026.

2. The prosecution case, briefly stated, is that on 24.05.2026, the applicant, in concert with co-accused Abdur Rabb and Saddam, allegedly assaulted the complainant's son, Muhammad Yousuf, with iron rods, causing fractures to his skull and both forearms. The applicant is additionally attributed a pistol-butt blow on the injured's head and a firearm shot allegedly discharged with the intention of committing his murder. The occurrence culminated in registration of the subject crime after the injured was shifted to hospital for treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that the latter, being a police official, has been maliciously implicated on account of personal animosity; that the FIR was lodged after an unexplained delay of about six days; and that the injuries described therein are materially at variance with the medico-legal evidence. It is further argued that neither the requisite intention to commit qatl-i-amd nor the allegation of firearm use finds adequate support in the available material. Learned counsel additionally submits that the parties have amicably resolved their dispute and intend to

place their compromise before the trial Court. More significantly, the Investigating Officer, upon completion of investigation, has recommended disposal of the case under Class-C, which report awaits consideration by the competent Magistrate. He maintains that these circumstances render the applicant's involvement a matter requiring further inquiry.

4. The complainant, Muhammad Babul, and the injured, Muhammad Yousuf, appearing in person, have unequivocally expressed their no-objection to the grant of bail. Learned Assistant Prosecutor General, Sindh, has likewise not opposed the application.

5. Heard. The material available on record, examined tentatively and without embarking upon a deeper appraisal of evidence, discloses circumstances which cannot be overlooked. Apart from the complainant's and injured's voluntary no-objection, the investigating agency itself has recommended disposal of the case under Class-C, albeit subject to the determination of the competent Magistrate. This circumstance, though neither conclusive nor binding upon the Court, assumes relevance when considered alongside the defence plea regarding the delayed FIR, the alleged discrepancies between the ocular account and medical evidence, and the disputed attribution of a firearm shot to the applicant. The cumulative effect of these features renders the applicant's precise role and criminal liability matters calling for further judicial scrutiny rather than a definitive determination at this stage.

6. It is equally pertinent that the complainant and the injured have personally appeared and disclaimed opposition to the applicant's release, a position also not contested by the learned A.P.G. Such no-objection, by itself, neither extinguishes criminal liability nor confers an indefeasible entitlement to bail; nevertheless, when viewed in conjunction with the outcome of investigation and the other attending circumstances, it lends further support to the applicant's plea. The proposed compromise and its legal consequences shall, however, be independently examined by the competent Court in accordance with law. No opinion on its validity or effect is being expressed herein.

7. The record further reflects that the instant application was instituted on 02.07.2026, when, instead of extending interim protection, notice was issued to the learned Prosecutor General. The absence of an earlier interim bail order, however, does not preclude consideration of the substantive prayer on its own merits. In the peculiar circumstances

obtaining here, particularly the investigating agency's recommendation, the stance of the injured and complainant, and the tentative infirmities pointed out in the prosecution case, sufficient grounds exist for extending the extraordinary concession of pre-arrest bail.

8. Consequently, this application is allowed. The applicant, Abdul Rehman son of Abdul Saleem, is admitted to pre-arrest bail, subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.30,000/- (Rupees Thirty Thousand only) and a personal recognizance bond in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Nazir of this Court.

9. The foregoing observations are purely tentative, confined to the disposal of this bail application, and shall neither prejudice the prosecution or defence nor influence the competent Court in determining the merits of the case or the pending Class-C report.

J U D G E