

JUDGMENT SHEET

**IN THE PESHAWAR HIGH COURT,**  
**PESHAWAR**

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

**Cr. A. No. 43-P/2025.**

**Liaqat Ali & others**  
Vs  
**The State & others**

Date of hearing: **22.10.2025.**

Barrister Aamir Khan Chamkani, for  
the appellant.

Mr. Ayub Zaman, AAG for the State.

M/s Ashfaq Ahmad Daudzai & Adnan  
Yousafzai, Advocates for the  
respondents.

**JUDGMENT**

**SAHIBZADA ASADULLAH, J.-** Through  
single judgment we intend to decide the instant  
criminal appeal as well as the connected  
**Criminal Revision No.36-P/2025 “Sami Ullah**  
**etc Vs Liaqat Ali etc”** as all these cases are  
arising out of one and the same FIR No. 59  
dated 13.04.2021, registered under Sections  
302/34, P.P.C registered at Police Station Upper  
Mohmand District Mohmand. The appellants  
have questioned the judgment dated 10.01.2025

rendered by learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Mohmand, as by virtue of the same impugned judgment, accused Liaqat for the murder of Muhammad Uzair under section 302-B (2) r/w 34-PPC and he was sentenced to undergo life imprisonment. He shall also pay a sum of Rs. 50000/- as fine, failing which he shall undergo six months SI. He shall also pay a sum of Rs. one Million as compensation which shall be paid to the LRs of deceased Muhammad Uzair U/S 544 A Cr.P.C. Convict accused Imtiaz and Shaukat sons of Mumtaz under section 302-B (2) r/w 34-PPC for the murder of deceased Zia Ullah to undergo life imprisonment. They each were also fine to the tune of Rs. 50000/- failing which, individually, shall undergo six months SI. They both shall pay a sum of Rs. one Million in equal shares to the LRs of deceased Zia Ullah which shall be paid to them U/S 544 A Cr.P.C. Benefit of section 382-C Cr.P.C was extended to all of them.

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on the report of the

complainant, which was incorporated in the form of *murasila* drafted at 2250 hours on 13.04.2021 at the casualty ward of Ghallanai Hospital. The complainant, who later succumbed to his injuries, reported that at about 2235 hours, he along with Muhammad Uzair son of Sami Ullah (deceased), Abdul Khaliq son of Qari Fazal Khaliq, Atta Ullah son of Sultan Ullah, Shoaib son of Faiz-ul-Rehman, and Rasheed son of Faiz-ul-Rehman, were playing volleyball under electric bulbs/lights.

Meanwhile, the accused persons facing trial, namely Liaqat, Shaukat, and Imtiaz, armed with firearms and daggers, arrived at the spot and, in furtherance of their common intention, launched an assault with daggers. According to the report, Muhammad Uzair sustained a dagger blow to his chest at the hands of Liaqat and succumbed to his injuries while being shifted to the hospital.

The complainant himself received dagger blows on his abdomen inflicted by Imtiaz and Shaukat.

The motive behind the occurrence, as disclosed in the report, was a dispute pertaining to a

mosque and a thoroughfare. Accordingly, the instant FIR was registered.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation was set in motion, and upon its completion, a complete challan was submitted against the accused. The requirements of Section 265-C, Cr.P.C. were duly complied with. Thereafter, charge was framed against the accused on 15.06.2021, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial. In order to substantiate the charge, the prosecution examined as many as seventeen (17) witnesses. It is pertinent to mention that during the course of trial, an appeal was preferred by the appellants before this Court, which was allowed vide order dated 05.09.2023. Through the said order, the impugned judgment of the learned trial Court dated 20.12.2022 was set aside, and the case was remanded to the trial Court with specific directions to examine all essential witnesses in connection with DD dated 04.04.2021 under Sections 337-F(ii), 148, and 149 PPC, registered at Police Station Ghallanai, District Mohmand.

The trial Court was further directed to bring on record and duly exhibit the medico-legal report of appellant Imtiaz along with other relevant documents deemed essential for a just decision of the case. It was also directed that such evidence be brought through the authors of the respective documents, including the Medical Officer, Investigating Officer, and any other witness the trial Court considered necessary, who were to be examined as Court witnesses. Both parties were afforded the right to cross-examine the said witnesses. It was further ordered that, thereafter, the accused be examined under Section 342, Cr.P.C. and that the entire exercise be completed within four months. In compliance with the remand directions, the learned trial Court recorded the statements of the aforesaid witnesses as Court Witnesses (CW-1 to CW-6). The statements of the accused were then recorded, wherein they denied the allegations and professed innocence. However, they neither opted to be examined on oath under Section 340(2), Cr.P.C., nor chose to produce evidence in their defence. Upon

conclusion of the full-fledged trial, the learned trial Court convicted and sentenced the appellants as detailed in the opening paragraph of this judgment, hence, the present appeal.

4. Heard. Record perused.

5. The unfortunate incident claimed the lives of two young persons. Immediately after the occurrence, the injured were collected from the spot and shifted to DHQ Hospital, Ghalanai, where the complainant later deceased, Ziaullah reported the matter. The medical officer prepared his injury sheet as well as that of the deceased Uzair, who was received in a gasping condition. Uzair, however, succumbed to his injuries at the hospital, while Ziaullah was medically examined, and his medico-legal certificate was prepared. Subsequently, he was referred to Peshawar for further treatment, but unfortunately, he too could not survive and expired on the next day. Consequently, Section 302, PPC, was added to the case. Meanwhile, one Shoukat Khan, ASI, upon receiving information regarding the occurrence, reached

to the spot. During spot inspection, he recovered two daggers and one knife lying at different places, which he handed over to Mir Afzal Khan, S.I. The same were taken into possession and later handed over to the Investigating Officer (IO). After receiving copy of the FIR, the investigating officer visited the scene of occurrence and, on the pointation of eyewitnesses, prepared the site plan. During inspection, he collected blood-stained earth from the places where the deceased had fallen, and also took into possession a volleyball net with its poles and electric bulbs that were illuminated at the time of the incident.

6. It is pertinent to mention that early the next morning, ASI Sher Zameen Khan arrested the accused persons, from whose possession various weapons were recovered. It was further reported by Imtiaz, that he too had sustained injuries in the same occurrence, which was entered into Daily Diary (DD) No.09. His injury sheet was prepared accordingly. Later, the Investigating Officer also investigated this

counter version. The accused were committed to trial and, upon conclusion of the proceedings, were convicted and sentenced vide judgment dated 10.01.2025. An appeal was preferred before this Court, and vide judgment dated 05.09.2023, this Court was pleased to remand the matter to the learned Trial Court with directions to record the statements of all those witnesses who had participated in the counter-case DD No. 09 dated 14.04.2021. In compliance, the learned trial Court recorded the evidence of those witnesses as Court Witnesses and afforded opportunity to both the prosecution and defence to cross-examine them, if they so desired. The case was again resulted in conviction and sentence by the learned Trial Court, from which the present appeal has arisen.

7. The learned Trial Court, while handing down the impugned judgment, duly considered the evidence available on record, and it was after application of its judicial mind that it reached the conclusion regarding the involvement of the appellants in the unfortunate

incident. This Court is inclined to examine the approach adopted by the learned Trial Court to assess whether its conclusion was justified on the basis of the material available before it. It is also imperative to take into consideration the counter-version advanced by appellant Imtiaz, who himself had sustained an injury during the same occurrence which fact supported by the Dr. Asif Kamal as (CW-1), who examined him.

The question before this Court, therefore, is whether the acquittal of the accused persons charged with causing injuries to Imtiaz has any bearing upon the case of the appellants, and to what extent the learned Trial Court was justified in its appreciation of certain aspects of the case.

Undoubtedly, the tragic incident resulted in the loss of two young lives; however, it is equally true that as many as three real brothers stand charged with the commission of the offense. In these circumstances, this Court finds it appropriate to re-appraise the evidence and re-examine the statements of the witnesses to ensure that no miscarriage of justice occurs.

8. The points for determination before this Court are that; as to whether the incident occurred in the mode, manner and at the time alleged; as to whether the deceased was capable of making a statement and himself reported the matter to the police; as to whether the eyewitness was indeed present at the spot and personally witnessed the occurrence; as to whether the medical evidence supports the prosecution version and as to whether the counter-version presented by the appellant Imtiaz carries weight sufficient to extend any benefit to the appellants.

9. Having regard to the peculiar circumstances of this case, this Court deems it essential to carefully examine the record, particularly the statements of the medical officer who examined the injured Zia Ullah and conducted the postmortem examination of the deceased, Mohammad Uzair. Equally relevant is the testimony of the same doctor who medically examined the injured Imtiaz-ul-Rehman, and the credibility of his statement shall be assessed

accordingly. It is not in dispute that the unfortunate incident took place in front of the house of the accused, at a time when the deceased and others were engaged in a game of volleyball. The place of occurrence stands admitted, as the Investigating Officer during spot inspection collected blood samples from the respective positions of the deceased, seized the volleyball net along with its poles and the electric lights used during the game. On the same day, two police officials, namely Shaukat Khan, SI, and Mir Afzal, SI, arrived at the spot; Shaukat Khan seized two daggers and a knife, which were handed over to Mir Afzal, and subsequently delivered to the Investigating Officer. These articles were later sent to the forensic laboratory to ascertain the presence of human blood.

10. The circumstances thus confirm that the occurrence took place at the stated time, and that the deceased sustained injuries in the same episode as reported to the local police. However, this Court must now determine how the incident

occurred, and whether, apart from the stated eyewitness, other persons were present at the spot and if so, why the Investigating Officer failed to record their statements. To properly appreciate these aspects, reference must be made to the testimony of the eyewitness namely Abdul Khaliq, examined as PW-16, who narrated the sequence of events, explaining how the accused, armed with daggers and pistols, reached the spot, how the deceased were attacked, and how the injured were taken to the hospital, where one succumbed to his injuries the same day while the complainant, Zia Ullah, expired the following day. This witness was cross-examined extensively on all material aspects of the case in an attempt to extract something favorable to the defense. Nevertheless, despite strenuous efforts, the defense failed to elicit any substantial contradiction or material inconsistency in his statement which could reasonably create doubt or afford benefit of acquittal to the appellants.

11. True that the eyewitness did not accompany the injured to the hospital; rather, the father of the deceased Muhammad Uzair and the father of the deceased Zia Ullah accompanied the injured persons to the hospital, where the father of Zia Ullah verified the report of his son. This Court considers whether the failure of the eyewitness to accompany the injured to the hospital is detrimental to the prosecution case. When the father of the complainant was present with his injured son in the hospital and yet did not pose himself as an eyewitness to the occurrence, this circumstance, in fact, lends credence to the bona fides of the prosecution case. Had there been any intention to falsely implicate the accused in collusion with the eyewitness, the father of either deceased could easily have claimed to be an eyewitness himself. However, neither, the father of one deceased Mohammad Uzair, nor the father of Zia Ullah opted to do so. The fact that the eyewitness did not accompany the injured to the hospital does not, by itself, weaken the prosecution version, particularly when soon

after the injured were removed from the spot, the police arrived and commenced investigation. His presence at the place of occurrence at the relevant time is neither disputed nor denied. The defence, during cross-examination, did not put any specific question to the witness as to why he did not accompany the injured to the hospital, nor did it suggest that he was not present on the spot at the time of occurrence. In the absence of such suggestions, and when no material was brought on record to establish any malafide or ulterior motive on part of the eyewitness, this Court finds no reason to doubt his presence or credibility.

12. The Investigating Officer visited the scene of occurrence and, on the pointation of the complainant, prepared the site plan. During spot inspection, he took into possession electric bulbs, bloodstained earth, and the volleyball net along with its poles. These recoveries corroborate the prosecution version regarding the place and time of occurrence. It is further noteworthy that the house of the accused is

situated adjacent to the place where the deceased and others were playing volleyball, and the unfortunate incident is alleged to have arisen from a dispute concerning a thoroughfare passing in front of the accused's house.

Although other persons named in the FIR were present at the time of occurrence, they were not cited as witnesses. Considering that the parties are related and that the incident involved close relations, it appears plausible that the other witnesses chose not to depose, possibly out of fear of enmity or to avoid becoming embroiled in the dispute. The prosecution also examined independent witnesses besides the Investigating Officer. Shaukat Khan (PW-9) stated that he collected two daggers and a knife from the spot, which he handed over to Mir Afzal Khan (PW-5), the scribe of the report. Both witnesses explained how they reached the spot and how these weapons were taken into possession and later delivered to the Investigating Officer. The Investigating Officer corroborated their presence and confirmed that the seized weapons were subsequently transmitted for forensic

examination. The marginal witnesses also supported the prosecution version, thereby maintaining consistency across material particulars.

13. It is true that the eyewitness is related to the deceased; however, mere relationship cannot be a ground to discard his testimony. The law is well settled that the evidence of a related witness, if found consistent, confidence-inspiring, and free from mala fides, cannot be excluded from consideration merely on the ground of relationship. In the present case, the defence neither demonstrated any motive for false implication nor elicited any contradiction or material inconsistency in the statement of the eyewitness. When the testimony of a related witness inspires confidence, it can safely be relied upon, and the present case is no exception. It does not appeal to reason that the eyewitness would exonerate the actual culprits and falsely implicate innocent persons, particularly when his account finds support from the dying declaration of the deceased, who was

conscious and able to speak before succumbing to his injuries on the following day of the occurrence. The injured were immediately shifted to the hospital, where the matter was reported by the deceased then injured, Zia Ullah, and the same was duly verified by his father, Samiullah. The report was received by Mir Afzal, A.S.I., who prepared the injury sheet of the injured and also conducted the inquest proceedings of the deceased, Mohammad Uzair, who had succumbed to his injuries in the hospital. The dead body was thereafter sent for post-mortem examination, while the injured Zia Ullah was referred to the medical officer for examination, who, after conducting his medical assessment, referred him onward to Peshawar for further treatment. The scribe of the report, PW-5, deposed that upon receiving information about the arrival of the injured at the hospital, he rushed there, where the injured Zia Ullah narrated the occurrence to him. He stated that he prepared the injury sheet and subsequently the inquest report of the deceased Mohammad Uzair. The witness further confirmed that the

report so recorded was verified by Samiullah, the father of the deceased Mohammad Uzair.

14. Apart from this witness, the doctor who examined the injured Zia Ullah and Dr. Asif Kamal (PW-12) was also examined. Both witnesses were cross-examined on the essential aspects of the case. The scribe was specifically questioned regarding the capability of the deceased and injured to speak, and he categorically stated that when the injured was brought before him, he was conscious, oriented, and capable of making a statement. It was on account of his clear orientation that his statement was recorded in the form of murasila. The witness further confirmed that the murasila bore the endorsement of the attending doctor, certifying that the injured was conscious, oriented in time and space, and capable of giving a statement. The medical officer, PW-12, though admitting that the initial pulse and blood pressure readings were not recorded in the hospital file, explained that at the time of admission the injured was alert and oriented.

The subsequent record from the hospital at Peshawar indicated his blood pressure to be 60/40, signifying that his condition had deteriorated during the course of his transfer from Ghalanai to Peshawar a considerable distance. Thus, it can reasonably be inferred that when the injured was first brought to the District Headquarters Hospital, Ghalanai, he was conscious and in full possession of his senses.

When these witnesses were not cross-examined on material particulars and their testimonies remained consistent, coupled with the doctor's categorical endorsement on the murasila that the injured was conscious and oriented, no ambiguity is left that at the relevant time the deceased and injured was capable of speaking and narrating the occurrence.

15. True that a dying declaration is generally regarded as a weak type of evidence, and conviction cannot ordinarily rest upon it alone; however, where the prosecution successfully establishes that the declarant was conscious, oriented, and capable of making a rational

statement, such declaration attains significant probative value, particularly when it stands corroborated by other reliable evidence. In the present case, it is not merely the dying declaration that has been relied upon by the learned Trial Court while handing down the impugned judgment. The occurrence was also witnessed by an independent eyewitness, PW-16, who was cross-examined at length remained consistent regarding his presence and the manner of the incident. When the eyewitness account supports the prosecution version and when the deceased and injured is proved to have been conscious and oriented while reporting the matter, no ambiguity remains regarding the credibility of such evidence. Accordingly, this Court finds that the medical and ocular evidence mutually support each other, and we are confident in holding that the incident occurred in the stated manner, at the stated time, and was duly reported by the deceased then injured in a fit state of mind. In case of "**Hasnat Ahmad vs. The State and another**" (2023 YLR 585), the Court held that a dying declaration can validly

form the basis of conviction if it is genuine and made voluntarily by the deceased. Such a statement must be free from any influence, prompting, or tutoring. The authenticity of the declaration must be clearly established. The Court emphasized that a dying person is presumed to speak the truth. This presumption gives the statement strong evidentiary value. Hence, a reliable dying declaration can alone sustain a conviction.

16. It is pertinent to mention that the accused were arrested early in the morning on the following day, at about 03:30 a.m., and from their respective possession, certain arms and ammunition were recovered. At the time of his arrest, appellant Imtiaz-ur-Rehman was found to be in an injured condition. He reported that the injuries had been caused to him by one of the deceased, and he further nominated several other persons as responsible for causing him harm. Consequently, he was medically examined, and his injury sheet was prepared. However, during investigation, the Investigating Officer came to the conclusion that the injuries

sustained by Imtiaz-ur-Rehman were self-inflicted. On that basis, the Investigating Officer placed the accused in column No. 2 of the challan, signifying that he found no sufficient evidence to proceed against them in the counter case, more particularly, when one of the deceased namely Mohammad Uzair named in the counter-version had already expired.

17. The learned counsel for the appellant sought to persuade this Court that since appellant Imtiaz-ur-Rehman had sustained injuries in the same episode, and had promptly reported the matter, the Investigating Officer's opinion declaring those injuries as self-inflicted reflected mala fide on his part and demonstrated a bias in favour of the prosecution. It was argued that if due consideration were given to the injuries of Imtiaz-ur-Rehman, the same would cast serious doubt on the prosecution version and would entitle the appellants to the benefit of doubt. This Court has carefully considered the said argument. Even if it is assumed that the injuries received by Imtiaz-ur-

Rehman were caused in the same transaction, the question remains whether those injuries are of such nature as to materially affect the prosecution case or to justify acquittal. The record shows that the injuries sustained by Imtiaz-ur-Rehman were declared as minor, attracting an offence under Section 337-F(iii), P.P.C. The case in that regard was investigated, but the Investigating Officer, being unsatisfied with the genuineness of the version, placed the accused in column No. 2.

18. Subsequently, when the matter was brought before this Court in appeal, it was remanded to the learned Trial Court for affording both parties an opportunity to produce relevant evidence regarding the injuries sustained by Imtiaz-ur-Rehman. In compliance with the remand order, the learned Trial Court examined the concerned doctor, hospital officials, a representative from the Rescue Department, and the Investigating Officer, Inspector Sardar Hussain SHO Police Station Ghallanai, as Court Witnesses. Both the

prosecution and the defence were afforded full opportunity to cross-examine them, and they were duly cross-examined on all essential aspects of the case. If this Court comes to the conclusion that the injuries sustained by Imtiaz-ur-Rehman were indeed received during the same transaction, his presence at the scene would stand established beyond doubt.

However, even with that acknowledgment, the role attributed to him and the other accused by the deceased and injured remains consistent throughout the record. The deceased and injured, while reporting the occurrence, assigned a specific role to Imtiaz-ur-Rehman for causing injuries to him, to Liaqat for causing injuries to the deceased, and to other co-accused for their respective acts. Thus, while the possibility that Imtiaz-ur-Rehman sustained injuries during the occurrence cannot be entirely ruled out, the nature of those injuries, the evidence on record, and the consistent testimony of the prosecution witnesses do not materially undermine the prosecution case. Rather, the overall circumstances suggest that the counter-version

was advanced as an afterthought to dilute the gravity of the accusation and to create confusion regarding the true genesis of the occurrence.

19. It is evident from the record that the medical evidence fully supports the case of the prosecution. Three persons were charged in the incident, and both the deceased cumulatively sustained three stab wounds. The weapons of offence, namely two daggers and a knife, were recovered from the spot. The ocular account of the prosecution witnesses remained consistent and corroborated by the medical evidence. Both the deceased and the injured, while reporting the matter, specifically attributed distinct and definite roles to each of the accused person, in these circumstances, the accused are liable both vicariously as well as individually for the commission of the offence. The medical evidence confirms that the injuries were caused by sharp-edged weapons, which fully aligns with the ocular testimony that the accused arrived at the scene armed with daggers and a knife. This consistency between the medical and

ocular accounts leaves no room for doubt regarding the occurrence or the manner in which the offence was committed. The learned Trial Court, therefore, rightly placed reliance upon this harmony between the two sets of evidence.

Although medical evidence is confirmatory in nature, once it inspires confidence and is found to be in conformity with reliable eyewitness testimony, it may legitimately be used to reinforce the prosecution's version. As in this particular case both the medical and ocular account is in harmony, so nothing is left for this Court to determine otherwise. In case of

**“Sharfuddin alias Sharfu and another vs. The State” (2022 YLR 324)**, the Court held that minor discrepancies in the witnesses' statements were natural and did not affect the prosecution case. The incident occurred in broad daylight, and as both parties were known to each other, there was no chance of mistaken identity. In the absence of any prior enmity, false implication was ruled out. The accused alone was found responsible for the murder. The evidence of the two eyewitnesses was found consistent and

trustworthy. The medical evidence also fully corroborated the ocular account regarding the injuries and the time of death.

20. The prosecution also established the motive, which was a dispute regarding a thoroughfare between the parties. In this regard, a document was produced on record showing that a Jirga had been convened and a decision rendered concerning the property in question. Once the motive stood proved and the cause of occurrence was shown to have arisen from the same, this Court finds no reason to disbelieve the investigative process or the witnesses who testified to that effect. Even otherwise, weakness or absence of motive alone would not be a ground for acquittal where the prosecution succeeds in otherwise proving its case beyond reasonable doubt. In the present case, the bonafide of the complainant party are further strengthened by the fact that the report of the injured was duly verified by father of deceased Mohammad Uzair i.e. Samiullah. Thus, the motive as well as the medical evidence stand

established, lending further assurance to the prosecution version. While motive may be considered in the matter of sentencing, its absence would not undermine the otherwise cogent prosecution evidence. Accordingly, the lesser sentence awarded to the accused has rightly taken this factor into account. In case of **“Imran Mehmood vs. The State and another”** (2023 SCMR 795), the Hon’ble Supreme Court held that the prosecution had successfully established the motive. The ocular witnesses appeared and supported the prosecution version regarding motive. The defence neither seriously challenged this aspect nor cross-examined the witnesses on it. The Court observed that the record showed no denial or contradiction from the defence. Consequently, the motive stood proved through unchallenged evidence. Hence, the Court affirmed the prosecution’s stance on this point.

21. The cumulative effect of what has been stated above, leads this Court to an irresistible conclusion that the prosecution has successfully

brought home guilt against the appellants. The learned Trial Court was fully justified in appreciating the evidence in its true perspective. The impugned judgment is well reasoned and based on proper appraisal of the record, leaving no ground for interference by this Court. The instant criminal appeal is lacking substance, the same is dismissed as such.

22. Now diverting to the connected Criminal Revision bearing No.36-P/2025 Sami Ullah etc Vs The State etc" the petitioner/complainant feeling aggrieved from the quantum of the sentence awarded to the respondents/accused, has sought enhancement thereof. The pivotal question before this Court is whether the learned Trial Court was justified in awarding the sentence which it did, and whether, once the accused were found responsible for the killing of the deceased, the normal penalty of death ought not to have been imposed. In order to appreciate this aspect of the matter in its proper perspective, the entire record has been re-examined, with particular reference to the ocular

account furnished by the prosecution witnesses, the motive which led to the unfortunate occurrence, and the medical evidence relating to the injuries sustained by the deceased. It stands admitted that the deceased persons had received three stab wounds in total, one on the person of one deceased and two on the other. The deceased who sustained two injuries received, one on a vital part of his body and the other on a non-vital part. These circumstances, when read conjointly, indicate that although the prosecution succeeded in establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt, yet there remains an element of uncertainty as to which of the accused caused which specific injury, and this is a circumstance which the Court cannot lightly brush aside.

23. Even otherwise, the record reveals that although the accused were in control of the situation, none of them repeated the stab blow. This factor diminishes the element of cruelty and suggests absence of premeditation. The motive, being a dispute over a thoroughfare and

not a vendetta or blood feud, is also a mitigating circumstance, calling for leniency in the matter of sentence. The inter se relationship between the parties, and the manner in which the injuries were inflicted, further negate the inference that the accused were hardened or desperate criminals. In this view of the matter, this Court is persuaded to hold that the learned Trial Court committed no error in the exercise of its discretion while awarding the sentence. The punishment awarded appears to be just, proportionate, and commensurate with the attending circumstances of the case, and therefore does not warrant any interference by this Court in its revisional jurisdiction.

**Announced.**  
**22.10.2025**

\*Ihsan\*

**J U D G E**

**J U D G E**