

IN THE LAHORE HIGH COURT, LAHORE.

PLJ 1992 Cr.C.(Lahore) 427

1992 PCrLJ2351 (Lahore)

Present: **MIAN NAZIR AKHTAR, J**

Crl. Misc. No.2163-B/1992

NASIR AHMED and another

Versus

THE STATE

POLICE STATION : Nankana Sahib, District Sheikhpura.

OFFENCE : Under Sections 295-A, 295-C & 298-C
of PPC.

PETITION : Under Section 497 Cr.P.C. for grant of Post
arrest Bail.

DECISION : Dismissed on 02.8.1992

(i). Bail--

.....Offence under Section 295-A, 295-C and 298-C of PPC---Bail---Grant
of ---Prayer for ---Contention that Darood () printed on
invitation cards in question was meant for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, has not
been controverted by petitioners' counsel—Held: There are reasonable
grounds for -----

①
1

was not affected due to his prophethood because he was none else but Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) (in Zilli or Broozl form). The Qadianis who believe in the teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad recite "Darood-o-Salam" for him, which according to Muslims is the entitlement of the Holy Prophet, Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ). By sending "Darood" on Mirza Ghulam Ahmad the Qadianis treat him equal to Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) and thereby relegate the Holy Prophet to the position of Mirza Sahib. This act of the Qadianis, *prima facie*, amounts to defiling the sacred and exalted name of the Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) which is punishable under Section 295-C of the PPC. It was vociferously urged by Mr. Nazir Ahmad Ghazi, the learned A.A.G. that the "Darood" in the form of (ﷺ) printed on the disputed invitation cards was meant for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad but the said assertion was not controverted by the petitioners' learned counsel. The offence under Section 295-C of the PPC is punishable with death or imprisonment for life and fine and falls within the prohibition of Section 497 of the Cr.P.C.

10. For the fore-going discussion, Bashir Ahmad, Yousaf and Ijaz Ahmad, petitioners No.4, 5 and 6 respectively are not entitled to the concession of pre-arrest bail. The interim bail order dated 10.6.1992 qua them is, therefore, recalled D and their bail petition dismissed. The petition in respect of the petitioners No.1, 2, 3, 7 and 8 is allowed and the interim bail order qua them is confirmed.

(MBC)

(Approved for reporting)

Orders accordingly.

PLJ 1992 Cr.C.(Lahore) 427.

Present: MIAN NAZIR AKHTAR, J

NASIR AHMAD and another--Petitioners

versus

THE STATE--Respondent

Criminal Misc. No.2163-B of 1992, dismissed on 2.8.1992.

(i) Bail--

---Offence under Sections 295-A, 295-C and 298-C of PPC--Bail--Grant of--Prayer for--Contention that Darood (ﷺ) printed on invitation cards in question was meant for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, has not been controverted by petitioners' counsel--Held: There are reasonable grounds for believing that petitioners have committed an offence under Section 295-C of PPC which falls within prohibitory clause of Section 497 of Cr.P.C.--Held further: Petitioners do not deserve concession of bail--Petition dismissed.
[Pp.434&435]D&E

(ii) Constitution of Pakistan, 1973--

---Art.260(3-B)--Qadianis and other followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad--Whether form a separate community of non-Muslims--Question of--Teachings

1992 Cr.C. 427 (Lahore)

A

497 Cr.P.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad show that he considered only his own followers to be Muslims and declared all other Muslims who did not accept his claim of prophethood, to be *kafirs* and non-Muslims--Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not attend funeral ceremony of his own son who did not believe in him--Ch. Zafarullah Khan, first Foreign Minister of Pakistan, did not participate in funeral prayers of Quaid-e-Azam--Held: There can be no cavil with proposition that followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad belong to a separate community and are otherwise non-Muslims in true religious sense. [P.431]C

(iii) First Information Report--

----Offence under Sections 295-A, 295-C and 298-C of PPC--F.I.R. of--Whether F.I.R. is competent--Question of--Contention that F.I.R. is incompetent as a whole because it includes an offence under Section 295-A of PPC, cognizance whereof is barred under Section 196 Cr.P.C.--F.I.R. includes other offences under Sections 295-C and 298-C as well which require no order from any official authority in matter of taking cognizance by Court--Held: Contention has no force because even if competent authority does not allow Court to take cognizance of offence under Section 295-A, Court would be competent to take cognizance of other offences alone. [P.430]A

(iv) Pakistan Penal Code, 1860 (XLV of 1860)--

----S.298-C--*Qadianis* or other followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad--Use of expressions and *Shi'ir-e-Islam* by--Offence of--No doubt, under Section 298-B of PPC, some specific expressions cannot be used by *Qadianis* or other followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad--Held: Express prohibition *qua* use of said expressions does not give licence to *Qadianis* to use other expressions or *Shi'ir-e-Islam* commonly used by Muslims because by so doing, they would be posing themselves as Muslims which is forbidden by Law. [Pp.430&431]B

Mr. Mubashir Latif Ahmad, Advocate for Petitioners.

Mr. Nazir Ahmad Ghazi, A.A.G. for State.

Mr. Rashid Murtaza Qureshi, Advocate for Complainant.

Date of hearing: 15.7.1992.

JUDGMENT

The petitioners seek bail in a case registered against them and a few other persons for offences under Section 295-A, 295-C and 298-C of the PPC at P.S. Nankana Sahib, District Sheikhupura.

2. According to the allegations made in the F.I.R., Nasir Ahmad, petitioner No.1 is a *Qadiyani* and often propagates *Qadiyani* religion. In this connection a criminal case stands registered against him already. In the present case, invitation cards for marriage ceremony of the daughter of Nasir Ahmad petitioner were got printed and distributed by the accused persons. The cards embody expressions

Shi'ir-e-Islam like

السلام و علیکم انشا اللہ نکاح مسنونہ

بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحیم نحمدہ و نصلی علی رسولہ الکریم

which are used by Muslims. Thus by publishing the invitation cards containing *Shi'ir-e-Islam* the petitioners and their co-accused have posed themselves to be Muslims in violation of the provision of Section 298-C of the PPC.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has raised the following points to claim bail:--

1. The F.I.R. is incompetent as it includes the offence under Section 295-A of the PPC cognizance whereof is barred in the absence of an order under the authority of the Central or Provincial Government or from an officer empowered in this behalf by either of the two Governments as provided under Section 196 of the Cr.P.C.
2. The offence under Section 298-C of the Cr.P.C. does not fall within the prohibition contained under Section 497 of the Cr.P.C. There being no defiling of the sacred name of the Holy Prophet 'Muhammad' (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), the offence under Section 295-C of the PPC was not made out.

3. The mere use of words

السلام و علیکم
انشا اللہ نکاح مسنونہ

بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحیم نحمدہ و نصلی علی رسولہ الکریم

did not constitute any offence and that the *Qadiyanis* had the right to use the same.

4. Law merely prohibits *Qadiyanis* to use the words specified in Section 298-B of the PPC and not the other expressions used in the invitation cards.
5. Invitation cards were got published by Sarfraz Ahmad, co-accused who was not *Qadiyani*.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Nazir Ahmad Ghazi, the learned AAG strenuously opposed the prayer for bail and urged that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers belonging to *Qadiyani* or *Lahori* groups are Non Muslims and constitute a separate community and were not entitled to pose themselves as Muslims in any manner. In this connection he referred to several extracts from the following books/Pamphlets of Mirza Sahib:--

1. Haqq-eqat-ul-Vahi, 2. Roohani Khazain Volume XVIII, (a compilation of Mirza Sahib's writings) 3. Tohfah Golarvia. 4. Taryaq-ul-Qalub, 5. Zamcema Anjaam-e-Athum, 6. Aik Ghalti Ka Azalah, 7. Albushra, 8. Tazkira, 9. Dafi-ul-Bala, 10. Durr-e-Sameen, 11. Kashti-c-Nooh, 12. Tableegh-i-Risalat, 13. Nazool-e-Maseeh.

Also referred to some passages from the book 'Kalama-tul-Fasal' written by Jahibzadan Mirza Bashir Ahmad to urge that the Qadianis treat all other Muslims who do not accept Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to be the promised Maseeh or Prophet, as Kafirs and Non-Muslims. He placed reliance on the case of *Mujeeb-ur-Rehman and others vs. Federal Government of Pakistan* (1985 FSC. 8) *Malik Jehangir M. Joia vs. The State* (PLD 1987 Lahore 458) and *Khiurshid Ahmad vs. The Government of Punjab* (PLD 1992 Lahore 1) to urge that followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad belonging to Qadiani or Lahori groups are Non-Muslims and by virtue of provisions of section 298-C of the PPC, are not entitled to pose themselves as Muslims directly or indirectly. He urged that *Shi'air-e-Islam* embodied in the invitation cards give an impression that the persons who have extended the invitation or lent their names for *Takeed-e-Mazeed* (further reminder to attend) are Muslims. Moreover, the Qadianis send *Darood* on Mirza Ghulam Ahmad treating him equal or even superior to Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) and in this way, defile the sacred name of the Holy Prophet (ﷺ) and commit the offence u/s 295-C of the PPC. Mr. Rashid Murtaza Qureshi, learned counsel for the complainant adopted the arguments of the learned AAG and added that the petitioners had committed the offences mentioned in the F.I.R. and deserved maximum punishment under the law. He pointed out that petitioner No. 1 was a habitual offender against whom another criminal case stood registered. He submitted that the petitioners had falsely posed themselves as Muslims and sent the invitation cards to several Muslims as well and thus injured their feelings. He controverted the assertion of the petitioners' learned counsel that the cards were got printed by a Muslim named Sarfraz Ahmad and has placed on the record a copy of the affidavit of Sagheer Ahmad Sheerazi, proprietor of Sheerazi Printing Point Jaranwala in which he deposed that the cards were got printed by Nasir Ahmad, petitioner No. 1.

5. The first contention raised by the petitioner's learned counsel that the F.I.R. is incompetent as a whole merely because it includes the offence u/s 295-A of the PPC, cognizance whereof is barred in the absence of an order by the Central or Provincial Government or an officer authorised by either of the two, has no substance. The F.I.R. includes other offences u/s 295-C and 298-C of the PPC as well which require no order from any official authority in the matter of taking of cognizance by the court. Moreover, the stage of taking cognizance of the offence by the court has not yet reached so as to attract the provisions of section 196 of the Cr.P.C. The police can conduct investigation into the offences mentioned in the F.I.R. and submit a challan in the court of competent jurisdiction. If the order of the competent authority allowing the court to take cognizance of the offence u/s 295-A of the PPC is not received, then the court would be competent to take cognizance of other offences alone.

6. A bare reading of the invitation cards, *prima-facie*, gives an impression that these have been got published and sent by Muslims. No doubt, u/s 298-B of

the PPC, some specific expressions like *Amir-ul-Momineen*, *Khalifa-tu-Momineen*, *Khaliphatul-Muslimeen*, *Suhabi* or *Ahl-e-Bait* cannot be used by the *Qadianis* or other followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. However, the express prohibition qua use of the said expressions does not give a licence to the *Qadianis* to use other expressions or *Shi'air-e-Islam* commonly used by Muslims because by so doing they would be posing themselves as Muslims which is forbidden by the law.

7. The argument raised by the learned AAG and the complainant's learned counsel that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers are Non-Muslims and belong to a separate community not forming part of the Muslim *Ummah* embodies nothing but the whole truth. The teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad show that he considered only his own followers to be Muslims and declared all other Muslims who did not accept his claim of prophethood to be *Kafirs* and Non-Muslims. In *Kalimat-ul-Fasal*, Mirza Bashir Ahmad had made detailed discussion in Chapters 2, 3 & 6 on the basis of teachings of Mirza Sahib to show that all those who did not believe in the claims and teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad were *Kafirs* and Non-Muslims and that the *Qadianis/Ahmadis* should not attend their marriage or death ceremonies. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad did not attend the funeral ceremony of his own son Fazal Ahmad who did not believe in him. Ch. Zafar-Ullah Khan the first Foreign Minister of Pakistan did not participate in the funeral prayers of Hazrat Qaid-i-Azam, the founder of Pakistan. Thus there can be no cavil with the proposition that followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad belong to a separate community and are otherwise Non-Muslims in the true religious sense. They have been so declared by virtue of the provisions of Sub Article 3-B of Article 260 of the Constitution of Pakistan. C

8. Mr. Nazir Ahmad Ghazi, the learned AAG has referred to a large number of books, pamphlets and writings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to show that he was "planted" by the British Imperialism. He referred to the application of Mirza Sahib (sent to the Lieutenant Governor of Punjab) in which he described himself as a *خودکاش پورا* of the British Government (Tableegh-i-Risalat Vol. VII, page 88). He contended that the basic object of teachings of Mirza Sahib was to persuade Muslims of the Sub-continent to bow their heads in complete obedience to the British Government, to consider obedience to the British Government as a part of Islam, to treat *Jihad* as *Haram* in future, and to break the Muslims' bond of love for Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) through *شرک فی الرسالت* (i.e. sharing of prophethood with Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)). He has also urged that the teachings and beliefs of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad relating to Almighty Allah, the Holy Prophet and finality of his prophethood, the Holy Quran, the Kalima Tayyaba, the traditions of the Holy Prophet, the concept of Eiman, Haj, Jihad, respect for the earlier Prophets including Christ, respect for *Ahl-e-Bait* and the Holy places of Makka and Madeena are diametrically opposed to those of Muslims throughout the world. The above arguments have considerable weight but since I am dealing with a bail matter, I need not enter into an elaborate

mission on the said points. However, I may briefly refer to some of the beliefs and teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad for the limited purpose of disposal of this bail petition and to see whether the *Darood* printed on the disputed invitation cards is meant for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad or not and whether it can directly or indirectly have the effect of defiling the sacred name of Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

9. According to Muslims, Darood-o-Salam is the entitlement of the Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) by virtue of the following verse of the Holy Quran:--

ان الله وملكته يحلون على النبي يا ايها الذين آمنوا صلوا عليه وسلموا تسليما

Darood-o-Salam is the highest act of virtue which fosters the Muslims' bond of love and respect for the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). The question arises whether Mirza Ghulam Ahmad ever claimed that he was a Nabi/Prophet and deserved Darood (صلوة) like the Holy Prophet?

10. Muslims throughout the world uphold the cherished belief of absolute and unqualified finality of prophethood of Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). They firmly and contemptuously reject the idea of arrival of any new Prophet after Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). According to the Holy Quran the Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) is "خاتم النبيين" (last of the prophets) who himself declared in unambiguous words that there could be no Prophet after him. However, Mirza Sahib claimed to be a Prophet and advanced the idea that Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) was not the final seal on Prophethood but was the holder of seal for approving Prophets in future (Haqueqat-ul-Vahi pages 27-28). He advanced the novel idea of second appearance (بعثت ثانياً) of Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and claimed that in him Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) had again appeared in the world in *Bruzi* form and added that in his first appearance in Arabia he was like "هلال" (moon of the first night) and that in his second appearance through him (Mirza Sahib) he was like "دور كمال" (full moon). In this way, he not only claimed equality with but superiority over the Holy Prophet (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم).

11. Following the teachings of his father, Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mehmood declared that any person can progress and achieve the highest status and can even excel Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم), (Alfazal 17th July, 1972), (نور بالہ من زک).

12. It is the firm belief of Muslims that after Allah, the highest position in the universe is enjoyed by Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم) and that no Muslim can imagine to be equal to him. What to speak of the Holy Prophet, no Muslim can claim to be equal to a companion (صحابي) of the Holy Prophet. However, Mirza Sahib has ventured to claim complete equality and identity with Hazrat Muhammad (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم). He asserted (in Khutba Ilhamia) that any person who differentiated between him and Mustafa (i.e. Hazrat Muhammad, (صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم)) neither saw nor recognized him (Mirza Sahib) نور بالہ من زک. He claimed that he got

the name of Muhammad (ﷺ) and Ahmad (ﷺ) along-with the status of prophethood because he was lost in the love of the Holy Prophet. In his Pamphlet captioned as 'Aik Ghalti Ka Azala' he wrote as under:--

نبوت کی تمام کھڑکیاں بند کی گئیں مگر ایک کھڑکی سیرت صدیقی کی کھلی رہی یعنی نبی کریم ﷺ کی

Strangely enough, Hazrat Abu Bakar Siddique whose love for the Holy Prophet was exemplary and matchless did not acquire the status of a Prophet. The reason is obvious. The door of new prophethood was closed for ever. Hence, any degree of love for the Holy Prophet cannot fructify into prophethood. However, other spiritual positions short of prophethood can be attained by Muslims. The companions of the Holy Prophet who had profound love for the Holy Prophet were warned by Allah not to raise their voice above that of the Holy Prophet failing which their good deeds were to be lost imperceptibly. Allah's warning was meant to keep Muslims within certain limits so that they should not show equality with the Holy Prophet even in respect of the volume of their voice. Due to love for the Holy Prophet Muslims love the Ahl-e-Bait and even the places where he lived and moved about. They love the sand, dust, dates and even streets of Makka and Madeena. The burial place of the Holy Prophet (Roza-i-Rasool) is loved and respected by Muslims as a part of Jannat in view of the tradition of the Holy Prophet (ﷺ) (Siraj-ul-Munir, Sharrah Jame-al Sagheer, page 246). However, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has ventured to show disrespect to Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) by claiming equality and identity with him. He also showed disrespect to the Holy places of Makka and Madeena by declaring Qadian as Haram like Makka and Madeena and by saying that a visit to Qadian was superior to and better than Nafli Haj. He went to the extent of using derogatory language about burial place of the Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ). Apparently in his zeal to show superiority of the Holy Prophet over Christ and to repudiate the idea of ascendance of Christ from heavens, Mirza Sahib, wrote as under:--

”ہم بارہا لکھ چکے ہیں کہ حضرت مسیح کو اتنی بڑی خصوصیت آسمان پر زندہ چڑھنے اور اتنی مدت تک زندہ رہنے اور پھر دوبارہ اترنے کی جو دی گئی ہے اس کے ہر پہلو سے ہمارے نبی کی توہین ہوتی ہے اور خدا تعالیٰ کا ایک بڑا تعلق جس کا کچھ حد و حساب نہیں حضرت مسیح سے بھی ثابت ہوتا ہے مثلاً ”آنحضرت کی سو برس تک بھی عمر نہ پہنچی مگر مسیح اب تقریباً دو ہزار برس سے زندہ موجود ہیں اور خدا تعالیٰ نے آنحضرت کے چھپانے کے لئے ایک ایسی ذلیل جگہ تجویز کی جو نہایت متعفن اور تنگ اور تاریک اور حشرات الارض کی نجات کی جگہ تھی۔ مگر حضرت مسیح کو آسمان پر جو بشت کی جگہ اور فرشتوں کی ہمسائیگی کا مکان ہے بلا لیا۔ اب بتاؤ محبت کس سے زیادہ عزت کس کی زیادہ کی۔ قرب کا مقام کس کو دیا اور پھر دوبارہ آنے کا شرف کس کو بخشا“

(تخفہ گولڈیہ صفحہ 112)

Whatever the worth or value of the argument qua the comparative status of Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) and Hazrat Eisa/Christ (عليه السلام) one thing is clear that Mirza Sahib made highly disparaging remarks about the burial place of the Holy Prophet which a Muslim shudders to imagine. Mirza Sahib claimed that he was superior to Hazrat Imam Hasan and Imam Hussain (عليه السلام) and slighted them in his books Dafi-ul-Bala, Nazool-ul-Maseeh and Dur-e-Samin (Some relevant extracts are reproduced in Appendix-A, attached to the order). The traditions of the Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) embody profound love for Hazrat Imam Hassan and Imam Hussain but Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (who proclaimed himself to be 'Muhammad') has shown contempt and disrespect for Hasnain (عليه السلام).

13. After expressing the above referred views which shock the minds and injure the feelings of Muslims, Mirza Sahib has claimed that he deserved Darood-o-Salam. According to him Allah sends *Darood* on him. The book Tazakirah containing revelations of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad contains following revelation at page 777:--

”صلی اللہ علیک وعلیٰ محمد“

In his book Arbacen No. 2 Mirza Ghulam Ahmad said as under:--

بعض بے خبریہ اعتراض بھی میرے پر کرتے ہیں کہ اس شخص کی جماعت اس پر فقرہ ”علیہ الصلوٰۃ والسلام“ اطلاق کرتے ہیں اور ایسا کرنا حرام ہے۔ اس کا جواب یہ ہے کہ میں سچ موعود ہوں اور دوسرے کا صلوٰۃ یا سلام کہنا تو ایک طرف خود آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم نے فرمایا کہ جو شخص اس کو پاوے میرا سلام اس کو کہے اور احادیث اور تمام شروع احادیث میں سچ موعود کی نسبت صدمہ جگہ صلوٰۃ السلام کا لفظ لکھا ہوا موجود ہے پھر جب کہ میری نسبت نبی علیہ السلام نے یہ لفظ کہا صحابہ نے کہا بلکہ خدا نے کہا تو میری جماعت کا میری نسبت یہ فقرہ بولنا کیوں حرام ہو گیا

(اربعین نمبر 2 صفحہ نمبر 6)

Again the book Haqeeqat-ul-Vahi (by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) contains the following revelation in Chapter 4 page 75:--

اصحاب الصفۃ وادارک ما اصحاب الفضلۃ تریٰ ا مینم تخیف من الریح سلون علیک

The same revelation is also found at pages 242 and 631-32 of the book Tazkirah. Meaning thereby that Ashaab-i-Suffa (persons sitting on the platform) recite Darood for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. Thus it is evident that the Qadianis recite Darood-o-Salam for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and thereby equate him with Hazrat

Muhammad (ﷺ). This, *prima facie*, amounts to defiling the sacred and exalted name of the Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (ﷺ) because in this manner his position is lowered to that of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who, on his own showing was, خود کاشته پوره of the British Government, who considered faithfulness and obedience to the British Government as a part of Islam, declared 'Jehad' to be *Haram* who slighted Imam Hussain (علیه السلام) and who declared all Muslims (who did not believe in him) to be *Kafirs*. During the course of arguments it was firmly asserted by the learned A.A.G that the Darood "ﷺ" printed on the invitation cards in question was meant for Mirza Ghulam Ahmad but this assertion was not controverted by the petitioners' learned counsel. Hence, there are reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioners have committed an offence u/s 295-C of the PPC which falls within the prohibitory clause of section 497 of the Cr.P.C.

14. For the foregoing discussion, the petitioners do not deserve the concession of bail. Resultantly, their bail petition is dismissed. E

(MPC)

(Approved for reporting)

Bail refused.