

Form No: HCJD/C-121  
**ORDER SHEET.**  
**ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD.**  
**JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.**

**Criminal Misc. No. 1501-B of 2022**

Sajid Sohail

Versus

The State

S.No. of order/ proceeding	Date of order/ proceeding	Order with signature of Judge and that of parties or counsel where necessary.
	02.12.2022	M/s Dileep Kumar Doshi & M. Shahzad Qureshi, Advocates for the Petitioner. . Mr. Fahad Ali, learned State Counsel. Basharat Usman, A.S.I

Through the instant petition, the petitioner, Sajid Sohail seeks bail after arrest in a case F.I.R. No. 888, dated 24.09.2022, offence under sections 3/4 Prohibition (Enforcement of Hadd), Order, 1979 registered at police station Khanna, Islamabad.

02. It is alleged that during investigation of case F.I.R. No.887/2022, dated 24.09.2022, offence under sections 3/4 P.E.O.H, 1979 registered at Police Station Khanna, Islamabad on the disclosure and pointation of accused Asif Masih, raid was conducted by the Police at the house of present petitioner / accused and 336

bottles of liquor were recovered from his possession, hence the instant F.I.R was registered.

03. Learned Counsel for the petitioner / accused contends that the petitioner / accused is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case; offence under section 3 P.E.H.O is not made out, whereas offence u/s 4 P.E.H.O is bailable; investigation in the case has been completed and he is no more required by the police for investigation, hence is entitled for grant of bail after arrest. Learned counsel has placed reliance on a case reported as **PLD 1995 SC 34.**

04. Conversely, learned state counsel has vehemently controverted the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and stated that the petitioner / accused has committed a heinous crime; he is involved in other cases of similar nature; hence is not entitled for grant of bail.

05. I have heard the arguments advanced by

learned counsel for the petitioner / accused, learned State Counsel and perused the record with their able assistance.

06. The offence U/s 3/4 Prohibition (Enforcement of Hadd), Order, 1979 does not fall under the prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C; investigation in the case has been completed and the petitioner / accused is no more required for the purpose of investigation; he is behind the bars; challan/ report U/s 173 Cr.P.C has not been submitted in the Court; and there is no chance of early conclusion of trial.

07. As far as contention of learned State Counsel, that the petitioner is involved in other criminal cases of similar nature is concerned, it would suffice that mere involvement in other cases would not disentitle him from the relief of bail if he otherwise succeeds in bringing his case within the meaning of further inquiry. Needful to add that liberty of a person is a precious right that has been guaranteed by the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan,

1973. Hence in cases, where there is slight tilt towards grant of bail, the same needs to be preferred over letting one to confine in jail for an indefinite period in name of trial when conclusion thereof can competently impose due punishment for such released person. Further, learned State Counsel has not brought on record any material that petitioner / accused has been convicted in any other case, hence, mere involvement in criminal cases cannot be a ground to withhold the concession of bail in given circumstance. Reliance is placed upon the cases titled as **"Moundar and others V. The State" (PLD 1990 SC 934), "Babar Hussain V. State" (2020 SCMR 871), "Muhammad Rafique V. State" (1997 SCMR 412) "Muhammad Abid Farooq V. The State and another" (2015 P Cr. LJ 224) and "Jamal-ud-din alias Zubair Khan V. The State" (2012 SCMR 573).**

08. In this regard law has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan in a judgment reported as **"PLD 1995 Supreme**

**Court 34 titled as "Tariq Bashir and others VS. The State"**, wherein, it is held that:

*"In non-bailable offences the grant of bail is not a right but concession/grace. Section 497, Cr.P.C. divided non-bailable offences into two categories i.e. (i) offences punishable with death, imprisonment for life or imprisonment for ten years; and (ii) offences punishable with imprisonment for less than ten years. The principle to be deduced from this provision of law is that in non-bailable offences falling in the second category (punishable with imprisonment for less than ten years) the grant of bail is a rule and refusal an exception. So the bail will be declined only in extraordinary and exceptional cases, for example:-*

- (a) where there is likelihood of abscondance of the accused;*
- (b) where there is apprehension of the accused tampering with the prosecution evidence;*
- (c) where there is danger of the offence being repeated if the accused is released on bail; and*
- (d) where the accused is a previous convict".*

09. The same principle has been laid down in a case reported as "**PLD 2017 Supreme Court 733** titled as **Muhammad Tanveer VS. The State and another"**, wherein it is held that:

*"once this Court has held in categorical terms that grant of bail in offences not falling within the prohibitory limb of Section 497 Cr.P.C. shall be a rule and refusal shall be an exception then, the Courts of the country should follow this principle in its letter and spirit because principles of law enunciated by this Court are constitutionally binding on all Courts throughout the country including the Special Tribunals and Special Courts".*

It has further been held that:

*"We are shocked and disturbed to observe that in cases of this nature, not falling within the prohibition contained in Section 497, Cr.P.C., invariably grant of bail is refused on flimsy grounds. This practice should come to an end because the public, particularly accused persons charged for such offences are unnecessarily burdened with extra expenditure and this Court is heavily taxed because leave petitions in hundreds are piling up in this Court and the diary of the Court is congested with such like petitions."*  
*(Emphasis added).*

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of Pakistan in cases reported as **2011 SCMR 1708, 2016 SCMR 1439, 2020 SCMR 1258 and 2020 SCMR 717**, has held that:

*"where a case fell within non-prohibitory clause of section 497 Cr.P.C. the concession of granting bail must be favorably considered and should only denied in the exceptional circumstances".*

10. It is well settled principle of law that while deciding the bail application, before recording of evidence in the trial Court, only tentative assessment is to be made by the Court and it is not permissible to go into details of evidence in one way or the other that might prejudice the case of either party. In this regard reliance is placed upon **PLD 94 Supreme Court 65, PLD 94 Supreme Court 88, 2021 SCMR 111 and 2020 SCMR 937.**

11. I do not find this to be a case where bail should be refused as an exception. Ultimate conviction can repair the wrong caused by mistaken relief of bail after arrest but no satisfactory reparation can be offered to the accused for his unjustified incarceration if he is acquitted ultimately.

12. A tentative assessment of record shows that present petitioner has made out a case of further inquiry as envisaged under Section 497(2) Cr.P.C.

13. In view of above, instant petition is **accepted** and the petitioner is admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bonds in the sum of **Rs.100,000/- (One Hundred Thousand only)** with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

14. The concession of bail may be cancelled by the competent Court under Section 497(5) Cr.P.C, if the petitioner misuses it in any manner, including causing delay in the expeditious conclusion of the trial.

15. Needless to mention that, this is a tentative assessment which shall not affect the trial of case in any manner.

**(TARIQ MEHMOOD JAHANGIRI)**  
**JUDGE**