IN THE NAME OF ALLAH ALMIGHTY

IN THE COURT OF NUSRAT ALI SIDDIQUI MALIK
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, LAHORE

Sessions Case No.196/23
Sessions Trial No.602/23
CMS No.184130422

The State

Versus

1. **Tayyab Bin Arif s/o Arif Mehmood Sheikh r/o 12 Peco Road, Mohallah Alhmad Park, Phase-III, Margazar Colony, Block-R, Lahore (since PO)**
2. **Arslan s/o Muhammad Akram r/o House No.9, Street No.2/1, Iqbal Block, Farooq Gunj, Misri Shah, Lahore**
3. **Hassan Raza s/o Allah Rakha r/o Ali Pur Chatha, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala**
4. **Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar s/o Sarwar Mehmood Hussain r/o Near Bashir Karyana Store, Bhagowal Awan, Sialkot**
5. **Saqib Ali s/o Ashiq Ali r/o House No.666-E-Z, Dhok Ratta, Babu Laal Hussain Road, Rawalpindi**
6. **Fatima Jahangir d/o Jahangir Hussain r/o House No.1/2, Asif Block, Mohallah Iqbal Town, Lahore (since died)**

Case FIR No.C-104/22
Offence u/s 11 PECA 2016 r/w sections 295-A/295-B/295-C/298-A/120-B/34 PPC
Police Station: FIA/CCRC, Lahore

Date of Decision: 17.10.2026

Present: Accused Arslan, Hassan Raza, Muhammad Shoaib, Saqib Ali in police custody with Mr. Usman Bhatti & Rana Abdul hameed Advocates.
Accused Fatima Jahangir is died.
Accused Tayyab Bin Arif is PO.
Mr. Yasir Hussain Advocate for complainant.
Mr. Asif Javed, learned AD Legal for FIA.

17/10

JUDGMENT:

The present cybercrime and sacrilege case was set into motion upon a written complaint (Ex.PE) submitted on 19.05.2022 by the complainant, Muhammad Irfan (PW-2), before the Deputy Director, Federal Investigation Agency (FIA), Cyber Crime Reporting Center (CCRC), Lahore. The complainant stated that extremely blasphemous, highly offensive, and sacrilegious material including videos and pictures depicting grave desecration of the Holy Quran and outrageously derogatory content targeting Islamic sanctities, Toheen-e-Risalat, Toheen-e-Quran-e-Majeed,

CamScanner

Toheen-e-Ahl-e-Bait, and Toheen-e-Mazhab was being circulated across multiple WhatsApp groups by unknown users operating mobile numbers 0341-5891421, 0309-2248525, and 0323-0932043. The complainant appended 13 pages of evidentiary screenshots (Ex.PE/2-14).

2. During the initial inquiry (Enquiry No. 1633/22), the complainant handed over his Samsung Galaxy A10 mobile phone (P-12) as evidence, which was seized vide recovery memo (Ex.PF). Technical analysis of the complainant's device by Musaddaq Azeem SI (PW-7) yielded technical report (Ex.PU), linking WhatsApp number 0309-2248525 to the absconding co-accused, Tayyab Bin Arif.

3. Pursuant to spy information and search warrants, accused Tayyab Bin Arif was arrested leading to the formal registration of FIR No.104/22. During investigation, on his disclosure, remaining accused were arrested on different dates by raiding team headed by Mudassar Shah, Deputy Director/IO (PW-16) and from their custody, the digital devices such as mobile phones, laptop and Quran Pak were recovered. On-spot technical analysis revealed a logged-in Facebook accounts, WhatsApps etc propagating pervasive blasphemous content across multiple messenger groups.

INVESTIGATION, ARRESTS, AND RECOVERIES

4. The tentacles of the criminal conspiracy unraveled further upon the disclosures made during custodial interrogations and subsequent technical forensics:

- **Accused Tayyab Bin Arif (since PO vide order dated 21.11.2025)**
- **Co-accused Fatima Jahangir (since died)**
- **Accused Arslan:** Apprehended on 28.05.2022 from a printing press near Kot Lakhpat Jail, Lahore. From his Oppo F3 mobile phone (P-5), WhatsApp numbers 0306-8864606 and 0323-4479836 were active, establishing direct chat coordination with Tayyab Bin Arif and Fatima Jahangir. A Facebook account, "سدرة المنتهیٰ", and an authored PDF book titled *Farameen Ajnabi Jild 1* (Ex.PBW/1-16) containing profound blasphemous text were recovered. Pursuant to his disclosure, a golden-colored desecrated Holy Quran (P-7) was recovered from his residential almirah on 29.05.2022 (Ex.PAU). Concurrently, co-accused Tayyab Bin Arif led the police to the recovery of a desecrated copy of the Holy Quran along with the 30th Para (P-6) taken into possession through recovery memo (Ex.PAT).

CamScanner

- **Accused Hassan Raza:** Arrested on 30.05.2022 from Ali Pur Chatha, Wazirabad, via mobile OnePlus Nord N10 5G (P-8) and Facebook account **"Syeda Fatima Ali Shah"** (previously *Bint-e-Muhammad SAW*). Forensic extraction uncovered active video recordings of the accused offering prayers in a state of nudity on a prayer mat and committing sacrilege against copies of the Holy Quran inside a washroom. Two desecrated copies of the Holy Quran (P-9 & P-10) were recovered on his pointing from his residence (Ex.PAW).
- **Accused Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar:** Arrested on 01.06.2022 from Bhagwal Awan, Sialkot, utilizing mobile phone Oppo F3 (P-11), WhatsApp number 0308-1512120, and Facebook account **"Malik Ali (Saira Hijabi Lisbo)"**, through which he actively disseminated sacrilegious files and administered radical blasphemous chat groups.
- **Accused Saqib Ali:** Apprehended on 24.09.2022 from Tarnol, Islamabad, by the subsequent Investigating Officer Muhammad Iqbal, Deputy Director (PW-15), from whose possession, Samsung Galaxy A20S mobile phone (P-12) and active SIMs, Facebook accounts **"كشف حورين (حرائق الغابات)"**, **"Arham Ali"**, and **"Stephen John (Ahmadi)"** were recovered, establishing a synchronized inter-provincial network of blasphemous content generation and dissemination.

SUMMARY OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

5. The accused appeared before the court under custody and copies of statements of witnesses u/s 161 Cr.P.C, FIR, site plan etc. required u/s 265-C Cr.P.C were distributed to the accused and after observing legal formalities, charge was framed against them on 10.08.2022 and again on 03.10.2022 u/s 295-A/295-B/295-C/298-A/120-B PPC and u/s 11 of PECA 2016 was framed to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed for trial, whereupon, the prosecution was directed to adduce its evidence.

6. To substantiate the charge, the prosecution examined 16 witnesses, notably including:

- **PW-1: Huzaifa Munir, Sub-Inspector, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He prepared the technical report (Ex.PA) of the mobile phone OPPO F3 recovered from accused Arslan and the technical report (Ex.PC) of the Facebook account 'سدرة المنتہیٰ' recovered from the same accused.
- **PW-2: Muhammad Irfan, Complainant**
  He submitted the written application (Ex.PE) alongwith 13 pages of screenshots of alleging blasphemous content on WhatsApp and handed over his mobile phone Samsung Galaxy A10 to the Enquiry Officer through Seizer Memo (Ex.PF).

CamScanner

- **PW-3: Muhammad Imran, Cyber Crime Analyst, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He obtained the subscriber record of mobile No.0331-5206522 through email from FIA Headquarters and handed over the printout (Ex.DC) to the Investigating Officer.
- **PW-4: Muhammad Farhan, Zong RSO (SIM Issuer)**
  He reissued the broken SIM No.0309-2248525 belonging to accused Tayyab Bin Arif and handed it over to the IO through Seizer Memo (Ex.PH).
- **PW-5: Muhammad Tanvir, Head Constable, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He was a member of the raiding team that arrested accused Tayyab Bin Arif and is a witness to Seizer Memo (Ex.PK), the recovery of mobile phones from Fatima Jahangir (Ex.PN), and her Facebook account (Ex.PO).
- **PW-6: Zeeshan Hameed, Assistant Director Forensic, FIA/CCW, Lahore**
  He prepared the consolidated forensic report (Ex.PQ/1-429) of seven mobile phones and six Facebook accounts, and the forensic report (Ex.PS/1-141) of the mobile phone and Facebook accounts of accused Saqib Ali.
- **PW-7: Mussadaq Azeem, Sub-Inspector, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He prepared the technical report (Ex.PU) of the complainant's mobile phone, the technical report (Ex.PV) of Facebook account 'Tera Ex Hun Yaar', and is a witness to the arrest of Tayyab Bin Arif and Seizer Memos (Ex.PK & Ex.PL).
- **PW-8: Mohsin Razzaq, Sub-Inspector, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He is a witness to the recovery of Facebook IDs from accused Arslan (Ex.PX), Shoaib Sarwar (Ex.PY), and Tayyab Bin Arif (Ex.PZ). He also prepared the technical report (Ex.PAA) of Hassan Raza's mobile phone and registered the FIR as Duty Officer.
- **PW-9: Tahir Mahmood, Head Constable/Moharrar, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He is the Moharrar Mall Khana who received the sealed mobile phone of accused Saqib Ali through Chain of Custody (Ex.PAC) and returned it to the IO on 22.12.2022.
- **PW-10: Zafar Iqbal, Assistant Sub-Inspector/Moharrar Mall Khana, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He is the Moharrar Mall Khana who received the sealed Quran-e-Paks and mobile phones of various accused persons through separate Chain of Custody forms (Ex.PAD, Ex.PAE, etc.).
- **PW-11: Nabeel Hussain, Sub-Inspector, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He prepared the technical report (Ex.PAK) of the mobile phone of accused Shoaib Sarwar and the technical report (Ex.PAM) of the Facebook ID 'AlimTayyab' of accused Tayyab Bin Arif.
- **PW-12: Ume Salma, Sub-Inspector, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  She was a member of the raiding team that arrested accused Fatima Jahangir, is a witness to Seizer Memo (Ex.PN), and

CamScanner

prepared the technical reports (Ex.PAO and Ex.PAQ) of her mobile phones and Facebook account.

- **PW-13: Naveed Aslam, Sub-Inspector, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He was a member of various raiding teams and a witness to the recoveries from accused Arslan, Tayyab Bin Arif, Hassan Raza, and Shoaib Sarwar. He also prepared the technical reports (Ex.PAZ, Ex.PBA, Ex.PBD, Ex.PBH) of various devices and accounts.
- **PW-14: Shehroz, Assistant Sub-Inspector, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He is the Moharrar Mall Khana who received sealed mobile phones of various accused persons from Muhammad Iqbal, Deputy Director, through separate Chain of Custody forms on 08.05.2023 and 26.05.2023.
- **PW-15: Muhammad Iqbal, Deputy Director, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He is the second Investigating Officer who took over the investigation on 13.09.2022, arrested accused Saqib Ali, recovered his mobile phone and Facebook accounts, and prepared the incomplete challan under section 173 Cr.P.C.
- **PW-16: Mudassar Shah, Deputy Director, FIA/CCRC, Lahore**
  He is the first Investigating Officer who registered the enquiry and FIR, arrested accused Tayyab Bin Arif, Fatima Jahangir, Arslan, Hassan Raza, and Shoaib Sarwar, and collected the technical and forensic evidence

7. Following the close of the prosecution evidence, mandatory examinations of the active accused persons (**Arslan, Hassan Raza, Saqib Ali, and Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar**) were conducted under Section 342 Cr.P.C. Each accused did not opt to appear as his own witness u/s 340(2) Cr.P.C, however, in defence, they produced certain documents. On question of that why this case was registered against them and why the PWs deposed against them, during statement u/s 342 Cr.P.C, they replied as under:-

Accused **Arslan s/o Muhammad Akram** replied as under:-

Ans: *I am innocent, having no nexus with the alleged crime. I have been made an escape-goat in this case by the IO in connivance with the complainant party, who is active member of anti-blasphemy group. Said group traps innocent people in blasphemy cases. It is in prosecution evidence that complainant produced screenshots (Ex.PX/1-13) alongwith his application (Ex.PE). Screenshots (Ex.PX/7, 8, 9, 10, 12 & 13) show that mobile phone was connected with casting/mirror device. Ex.PX/13 screenshot show the word "system" and "screenshot saved", which clearly indicate that complainant, after connecting mobile phone with computer system, prepared the said blasphemous screenshots to trap innocent people in this case. The navigation button of mobile phone on screenshots (Ex.PX/1-13) are different from navigation button as shown in*

CamScanner

technical report (Ex.PQ) of complainant's mobile and ... same fact was admitted by the IO of the case. Furthermore, the screenshots (Ex.PK/1-3) cannot be verified from technical report (Ex.PQ). The case of prosecution is full of self contradictions, discrepancies, false and fabricated evidence.

It is in prosecution evidence that it was the duty ... was entrusted in commission of blasphemy. At the time of the arrest, I came to know about the fact that said SIM was registered against my name. I was arrested and mobile phone Arslan 13 was recovered whereas the SIM was ... The IO of the case got the above SIM ... and then sent to ... and then put up the data from WhatsApp ... which ... and then planted the same against me to establish the case. The IO never ... and never ... and did not bother to confirm through CDR that the said SIM was in my use or not. Furthermore, the blasphemous pictures were also planted in the mobile phone after factory re-setting the mobile to change date and time of internal system of mobile phone.

It is in prosecution evidence that mobile phone Arslan 13 was recovered as per Ex.PAB, technical report (Ex.PA) show mobile phone Arslan 13 but forensic report (Ex.PQ/19) show mobile as OPPO. This fact alone is sufficient to discard the prosecution case being fabricated.

As per prosecution case, one Facebook Account 'سید مالک' having URL: https://web.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100081467679181 was recovered and the same was taken into possession through seizure memo (Ex.PK). The same Facebook account is shown at Ex.PBH, which is technical report of accused Baqib Ali, having been recovered from him (Baqib Ali). The same Facebook account is mentioned at backside of Ex.PQ/103 i.e. forensic report of accused Bhoaib Sarwar. The facts narrated above clearly shows that the Facebook account 'سید مالک' was planted against three persons in one case. Even the said planted Facebook account does not show any sharing of blasphemous content.

On 08.05.2023, forensic report (Ex.PQ) got prepared by third party "Cellebrite", having its headquarter in Israel and the same is of no value in the eyes of law. The whole case is based on lies, tampering, fabrication and planting false evidence against me. There is no evidence on record which directly or indirectly connects me with the commission of offence.

Complainant is an active member of anti-blasphemy group, who in connivance with NCCIA/CCRC officials prepared a

fabricated case against me and deposed against me on the instructions of the said group.

I am Muslim by faith and grew up in a family, who observes Islamic norms, ethics and practice the religion Islam. Commission of such like offences is impossible for me being a sane person. Only a person of unsound mind can do such act."

Accused **Saqib Ali s/o Ashiq Ali** replied as under:-

Ans. *I am innocent, having no nexus with the alleged crime. I have been made an escape-goat in this case by the IO in connivance with the complainant party, who is active member of anti-blasphemy group. Said group traps innocent people in blasphemy cases. It is in prosecution evidence that complainant produced screenshots (Ex.PX/1-13) alongwith his application (Ex.PE). Screenshots (Ex.PX/7, 8, 9, 10, 12 & 13) show that mobile phone was connected with casting/mirror device. Ex.PX/13 screenshot show the word "system" and "screenshot saved", which clearly indicate that complainant, after connecting mobile phone with computer system, prepared the said blasphemous screenshots to trap innocent people in this case. The navigation button of mobile phone on screenshots (Ex.PX/1-13) are different from navigation button as shown in technical report (Ex.PU) of complainant's mobile and the same fact was admitted by the IO of the case. Furthermore, the screenshots (Ex.PX/7-13) cannot be verified from technical report (Ex.PU). The case of prosecution is full of self contradictions, discrepancies, fake and fabricated evidence.*

It is in prosecution evidence that I was arrested on 24.09.2022 and a mobile phone Samsung Galaxy A20s, having IMEI 1 No.353244116314250 and IMEI 2 No.353245116314257, was recovered from me. As per recovery memo (Ex.PBC), three SIMs bearing Nos.0318-0537042, 0301-5360230 and 0331-5206522 were allegedly recovered. It is pertinent to mention here that SIM No.0331-5206522 was never in my use and the same was unauthorizedly and illegally issued and used by someone else. As per CDR (Ex.DF), available on file, the said SIM was used in mobile having IMEI No.359530108205970. The IO did not bother to arrest the real culprit and after reissuing the said SIM, planted evidence against me. IO also got recovered Facebook account "Stephen John (احمدی)", attached with the SIM and planted it against me on 27.09.2022.

On 26.09.2022, technical report (Ex.PBD) was prepared. As per technical report (Ex.PBD), "Kashaf Hoorain (English)", "Saqib Ali" and "Arham Ali" were found logged-in, however, no blasphemous content was found to be recovered.

CamScanner

On 30.09.2022, (حرائق الغابات) کشف حورین was planted against me by the IO through seizure memo (Ex.PBG). Similarly, Facebook account "Arham Ali" was planted against me. Attached SIM No.0312-5556718 was never recovered from me. As per Ex.PBL/3, the said SIM belonged to one Behram Khan. As per technical report (Ex.PBH), Facebook account "Arham Ali" was analyzed but no blasphemy was found. Facebook account سدرالمنتہیٰ was also planted against me. As per report (Ex.PBH), there is no blasphemous content found, however, as per annexures, there are pictures pertaining to blasphemy. It cannot be determined whether the annexures belong to Facebook accounts "Arham Ali" or سدرالمنتہیٰ as the annexures are tampered and fabricated and the IO of the case alongwith other officials of FIA/CCRC prepared the said evidence against me.

As per Ex.PBG, Facebook account (حرائق الغابات) کشف حورین was registered against mobile No.0301-5360230 whereas as per Ex.PBH, the said Facebook account was registered against Gmail kashafhorain376@gmail.com. This fact alone indicates fabrication and planting of false evidence against me. Similarly, no blasphemous content was found shared through Facebook account "Stephen John (احمدی)".

It is pertinent to mention here that as per Ex.PBH at Para No.6, Facebook account (حرائق الغابات) کشف حورین was sharing blasphemous content with 23 accounts whereas as per forensic report (Ex.PS/9, backside and Ex.PS/10), it shows that Facebook account "Stephen John (احمدی)" was sharing blasphemous content with same 23 Facebook accounts. It is further to be noted that technical report (Ex.PBH/16) and backside of forensic report (Ex.PS/135) of Facebook account (حرائق الغابات) کشف حورین was prepared in Rawalpindi, the whole of prosecution case is full of self contradictions, major discrepancies, fake, fabricated and concocted evidence. Forensic report (Ex.PS) got prepared by third party "Cellebrite", having its headquarter in Israel, which has no value in the eyes of law.

Complainant is an active member of anti-blasphemy group, who in connivance with NCCIA/CCRC officials prepared a fabricated case against me and deposed against me on the instructions of the said group.

I am Muslim by faith and grew up in a family, who observes Islamic norms, ethics and practice the religion Islam. Commission of such like offences is impossible for me being a sane person. Only a person of unsound mind can do such act.

CamScanner

Accused **Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar s/o Sarwar Mehmood Hussain**, replied as under:-

Ans. *I am innocent, having no nexus with the alleged crime. I have been made an escape goat in this case by the IO in connivance with the complainant party, who is active member of anti-blasphemy group. Said group traps innocent people in blasphemy cases. It is in prosecution evidence that complainant produced screenshots (Ex.PX/1-13) alongwith his application (Ex.PE). Screenshots (Ex.PX/7, 8, 9, 10, 12 & 13) show that mobile phone was connected with casting/mirror device. Ex.PX/13 screenshot show the word "system" and "screenshot saved", which clearly indicate that complainant, after connecting mobile phone with computer system, prepared the said blasphemous screenshots to trap innocent people in this case. The navigation button of mobile phone on screenshots (Ex.PX/1-13) are different from navigation button as shown in technical report (Ex.PU) of complainant's mobile and the same fact was admitted by the IO of the case. Furthermore, the screenshots (Ex.PX/7-13) cannot be verified from technical report (Ex.PU). The case of prosecution is full of self contradictions, discrepancies, fake and fabricated evidence.*

It is in prosecution evidence that I was arrested on 01.06.2022 and a mobile phone OPPO F3 was recovered from me. At the time of arrest, I came to know that SIM No.0308-1512120 is registered against my name and the same was not recovered from me. The IO of the case, after reissuing the said SIM, got recovered the attached Facebook account "Malik Ali (Saira Hijabi Lisbo) and then planted the same against me. The IO of the case never obtained CDR of the said No.0308-1512120 to reach at real culprit.

17/10

Technical report was prepared on 06.06.2022 with unexplained delay of five days. As per technical report (Ex.PAK), no blasphemous content was found shared. Screenshots with the technical report (Ex.PAK) were tampered and after fabrication, the same were planted against me. It is pertinent to mention here that as per Ex.PAK, no blasphemy has been committed through Facebook account, however, out of blue, as per technical report (Ex.PCC), blasphemy has been committed. Ex.PCC and annexures show Facebook account "Syed Fatima Ali Shah", which clearly shows that the said report (Ex.PCC) is fabricated and tampered.

Forensic report (Ex.PQ) got prepared by third party "Cellebrite", having its headquarter in Israel. The forensic report (Ex.PQ/8-9) shows the pictures which does not even match with the technical report (Ex.PAK). This fact shows fabrication, tampering and planting of false evidence

CamScanner

against me. The forensic report (Ex.PQ) is of no value in the eyes of law. Even forensic report (Ex.PQ) is self contradictory as at the backside of Ex.PQ/103, Facebook account 'سید ذوالعنتری' is mentioned, which clearly shows that tampered and fabricated evidence was prepared and then planted against me. At the time of arrest, no incriminating material was recovered from me. IO of the case factory re-setting the mobile to change the internal system date and time of the phone and then planted fake, fabricated and tampered evidence against me.

Complainant is an active member of anti-blasphemy group, who in connivance with NCCIA/CCRC officials prepared a fabricated case against me and deposed against me on the instructions of the said group.

I am Muslim by faith and grew up in a family, who observes Islamic norms, ethics and practice the religion Islam. Commission of such like offences is impossible for me being a sane person. Only a person of unsound mind can do such act.

Accused **Hassan Raza s/o Allah Rakha,** replied as under:-

Ans: *I am innocent having no nexus with the alleged offence. I have been made an escape goat in this case by the complainant's group in connivance with cyber crime Lahore officials. It is in prosecution case that I was arrested on 30.05.2022 and one mobile phone was recovered from me however no SIM was recovered from me. At the time of arrest, I came to know that SIM No.0349-5066791 was in my name however someone else was using the same after illegally and unauthorizedly issuing the said SIM. The IO of the case got the said SIM re-issued and planted the same against me. As per technical report Ex.PAA no sharing of blasphemous material was found. Similarly ExPAA alongwith annexures does not show any blasphemous material shared from my mobile phone nor I created any blasphemous content. Technical report ExPAA and annexures contradict with forensic report ExPQ113 to 211. As annexures of technical report ExPAA shows WhatsApp internal sent folder however, forensic report Ex.PQ shows whatasapp internal private folder which is sufficient to declare fabrication of false evidence against me.*

As per technical report Ex.PAA facebook account Sayeda Zainab was recovered from me whereas as per technical report ExPBA it shows Sayeda Fatima Ali Shah facebook account was recovered from me. Similarly the said facebook account Sayeda Fatima Ali Shah is shown in Ex.PQ forensic report. The forensic report Ex.PQ was got prepared by third party "cellebrite" having no value in the eye of law.

The complainant is an active member of anti blasphemy business group who trap innocent people in blasphemy cases and the official witnesses of cyber crime on the asking of said group deposed against me. The prosecution evidence is full of self contradictions major discrepancies false, fake and fabricated

evidence and the same fact is evident from the prosecution case. I am true muslim by faith groun up in a muslim family. I observe Islamic norms ethics and observe Islamic laws and rules in letter and spirit. I believe in Allah Almighty, Quran-e-Pak, the last book of Allah and Hazrat Muhammad (PBUH) last prophet of Allah. I also believe Sahaba-e-Karam RA, Umahat-up-Momineen and sacred personalities of Islam and I can never think commit any blasphemous acts as alleged against me in the prosecution story and I am innocent. I also submitted an application for forensic analysis of the complaint of the complainant as the same is false and fabricated and now written by the complainant and my application is on record of the file which has not been properly adjudicated and no tentative assessment has been made by this hon'ble court during the proceedings.

8. In short, they categorically denied the allegations, pleaded complete innocence, claimed that digital evidence, SIM cards, and social media handles were engineered, planted, or reissued unlawfully through third-party manipulation, and asserted that they were scapegoated by anti-blasphemy advocacy groups in collusion with FIA officials. None of the accused opted to depose on oath under Section 340(2) Cr.P.C., though accused Saqib Ali tendered partial CDR documentation (Ex.DF) in defense.

COURT DETERMINATION, ANALYSIS, AND RATIONALE

9. I have heard the learned Special Prosecutor for FIA as well as the learned defense counsel for the respective accused, and have meticulously scrutinized the voluminous judicial record, technical reports, chain of custody logs, and forensic extractions (Ex.PA, (through Ex.PBL, Ex.PQ, Ex.PS etc.). After hearing the arguments of both sides, the following points for determination are framed to thrash the prosecution evidence:

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION:

i. *Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the mobile phones, Whatsapp and Facebook accounts relied upon were reliably connected with the accused and that the relevant electronic material was transmitted/ shared?*
ii. *Whether the prosecution evidence against the accused persons is full of doubts?*

POINT NO.1

Whether the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the mobile phones, Whatsapp and Facebook accounts relied upon were reliably connected with the accused and that the relevant electronic material was transmitted/shared?

10. I have heard the learned Special Prosecutor for FIA as well as the learned defense counsel for the respective accused and have meticulously scrutinized the voluminous judicial record, technical reports,

CamScanner

chain of custody logs, and forensic extractions (Ex.PA through Ex.PBL). At the outset, it is necessary to discuss the legal framework governing the appreciation of evidence in cases involving blasphemy and cybercrime. The offences under sections 295-A, 295-B, and 295-C PPC are of a serious nature, and the standard of proof required is that of beyond a reasonable doubt. However, the gravity of the offence cannot be used as a substitute for proof. The prosecution must establish its case through cogent, reliable, and legally admissible evidence.

11. The principles of appreciation of forensic evidence in such cases have been laid down by the superior courts. In the case of **Muhammad Ramzan v. Khizar Hayat (2024 SCMR 1085)**, the Supreme Court held that *scientific evidence can help to establish a direct link between the accused and the crime demonstrating not only prosecution but also involvement in the commission of the offence. The Court further held that forensic evidence can serve as a strong corroborative element to oral testimonies and that courts should rely on scientific evidence to ensure justice.* Similarly, in the case of **Ali Haider alias Papu v. Jameel Hussain (PLD 2021 SC 362)**, the Supreme Court emphasized the importance of forensic evidence in criminal cases holding that *modern forensic techniques are essential for establishing the identity of the accused and linking them to crime scene and stated that scientific evidence not only aids in convicting the guilty but also plays an exonerating the innocent.*

12. The learned defense counsel maintained that they were not nominated in the FIR and nominated on the basis of statement of their co-accused Tayyab Bin Arif which is inadmissible in evidence. Now it is to be seen as to whether this alleged admission/confession of co-accused is admissible in evidence or not? In this respect, this Court is guided by the provision of Article 40 of the Qanun-e-Shahadat Order, 1984, according to which, if information from accused relates distinctly to the fact which is discovered it can be proved against them. Now it is to be seen as to whether from present accused anything was recovered which affirms the statement of co-accused. In this respect, statements of PWs are relevant. According to them, Tayyab Bin Arif accused disclosed before them about present accused persons while supplying numbers and relevant Facebook accounts etc. on which they were arrested and their digital devices were sent for forensic and the forensic reports were received relating to using of said digital media by them, which confirm their involvement in commission of offence, so statement of co-accused Tayyab Bin Arif is relevant.

CamScanner

13. So far as the contention of learned defence counsel that the complainant has also acted as a complainant in other cases of similar nature is concerned, there is no legal bar to a person lodging complaints in more than one case. Any person may bring an occurrence or information relating to an alleged offence to the notice of the competent authorities, who are then required to proceed in accordance with law. It is not essential that the complainant must be an eye witness to the occurrence, as his role may merely be of whistle blower i.e. a person who brings the matter to the notice of the authorities. It is then the duty of said agency to probe further, so this objection has no legal footings in the eye of law.

14. In the present case, the forensic evidence, is the most reliable piece of evidence available. The oral testimonies of the prosecution witnesses, including the complainant, are not entirely reliable. The Investigating Officers have admitted some procedural lapses. In such circumstances, the court must rely on the forensic evidence, which is objective and scientific in nature. The forensic reports clearly link the accused persons to the alleged offences. The reports show that the accused persons were in possession of the devices from which blasphemous content was recovered and that they were using social media accounts to share such content. I am going to discuss the role of each accused as under:

A. Case of Accused Hassan Raza

15. The prosecution alleges that a OnePlus Nord N10 5G mobile phone was recovered from Hassan Raza through seizure memo Ex.PAV. His mobile-phone technical report is Ex.PAA, while the Facebook technical report is Ex.PBA. The prosecution has also relied upon the relevant portion of consolidated forensic report Ex.PQ, particularly the extraction material attributed to Hassan Raza.

16. The prosecution witnesses attributed to Hassan Raza not merely membership of online groups, but the alleged dissemination of writings, pictures, and videos through Facebook Messenger, together with material allegedly located in the sent folder of WhatsApp. The Facebook account "Syeda Fatima Ali Shah" was stated by the investigating officer to be registered against Hassan's mobile number, who shared blasphemous material to at least 24 Facebook groups as per forensic report (Ex.PBA/1).

17. During cross-examination,- the investigating officer acknowledged that Hassan's name did not appear on several individual pages of the technical reports. However, he explained that the reports

CamScanner

contained the relevant mobile number, IMEI information, profile material, and screenshots. The existence of these omissions does not automatically nullify the reports; their effect depends upon whether the device and account attribution can be verified from the original exhibits and the complete extraction record. The forensic witness also explained that the findings at pages 10–13 of Ex.PQ related to Hassan Raza and that the fuller extraction material concerning his phone and Facebook account appeared at Ex.PQ/113–280. The fact that the report is consolidated, or that certain particulars are not repeated on every page, does not by itself make its contents inadmissible or unreliable. The material must, however, be read as a whole and its connection with Hassan must be established.

18. In his statement under section 342 Cr.P.C., Hassan Raza denied the allegations and pleaded innocence. He claimed that he had been falsely involved in this case and that the digital evidence was engineered, planted, or reissued unlawfully through third-party manipulation. He asserted that he was scapegoated by anti-blasphemy advocacy groups in collusion with FIA officials. He did not opt to appear as a witness on oath under section 340(2) Cr.P.C.

19. If the original exhibits confirm that the recovered device and account were reliably linked to Hassan, and that the identified material was actually disseminated through the relevant accounts, the omissions regarding CDRs and formal SIM ownership would not, standing alone, create reasonable doubt. The WhatsApp account or Facebook can be created without using the SIM in the same mobile phone, so ownership of SIM is not a valid defense in presence of forensic evidence. On that evidentiary basis, the prosecution case against Hassan is the strongest of the cases presently under consideration. The forensic report (Ex.PQ) shows that the Facebook account "Syeda Fatima Ali Shah" was found logged in on the mobile phone of accused Hassan Raza, and blasphemous videos were found in the sent folder of WhatsApp. The nude video of accused by offering prayer and committing sacrilege against copies of Holy Quran inside a washroom, found available in sent folder of WhatsApp and also shared through Facebook Messenger. Two books of Holy Quran (P-9 & P-10) were also recovered from his possession through recovery memo (Ex.PAW). The I.O. as PW-16 stated that both books of Holy Quran are in dilapidated condition and both were present in derogatory videos recorded from mobile phone of accused, prepared by him in washroom, on which, no cross examination was conducted, so deemed to be admitted by accused side. These findings, if

CamScanner

believed, would be sufficient to convict the accused under the relevant provisions of the law. The exact contents of the offending material and the manner in which it was transmitted have been established from the exhibits themselves. Therefore, the prosecution has been able to prove the charges against Hassan Raza beyond a reasonable doubt.

B. Case of Accused Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar

20. The prosecution case against Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar is that he was involved in the preparation and dissemination of blasphemous material through his mobile phone Oppo F3 (P-11) and Facebook account "Malik Ali (Saira Hijabi Lisbo)." The prosecution relies upon the technical report Ex.PAK and the forensic report Ex.PQ.

21. The digital extraction of his Oppo F3 mobile phone and Facebook handle "Malik Ali (Saira Hijabi Lisbo)" confirmed his active administration of radical messenger groups and dissemination of vitriolic blasphemous material attacking Islamic sanctities in chat through account "Malik Ali" (Ex.PCC/1-6), having remarks on Holy Quran of blasphemy in nature. The subscriber record confirmed that the Facebook account was registered against mobile number 0308-1512120, which was in the name of the accused.

22. In his statement under section 342 Cr.P.C., Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar denied the allegations and pleaded innocence. He claimed that he had been falsely involved in this case and that the digital evidence was fabricated, tampered with, and planted against him. He pointed out that SIM No. 0308-1512120 was registered against his name but was not recovered from him. The IO, after reissuing the said SIM, got recovered the attached Facebook account and then planted the same against him. He further stated that the technical report was prepared with an unexplained delay of five days, and as per the technical report (Ex.PAK), no blasphemous content was found shared. He also alleged that the forensic report (Ex.PQ) was prepared by a third party "Cellebrite," which is of no value in the eyes of law. He did not opt to appear as a witness on oath under section 340(2) Cr.P.C.

17/10

23. The forensic report (Ex.PQ) shows that the Facebook account "Malik Ali (SairaHijabiLisbo)" was found logged in on the mobile phone of accused Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar. The report also shows that blasphemous content was found in the sent folder of WhatsApp on his mobile phone. These findings, if believed, would be sufficient to convict the accused under the relevant provisions of the law. The procedural defects

CamScanner

and discrepancies pointed out by the defence are upto the some extent are serious, but they do not completely negate the prosecution case. The forensic reports, though not perfect, do provide some credible evidence of the accused's involvement in the alleged offences. The stance of accused that I.O. re-issued his SIM and got recovered the said account also amounts to admit the creation of said account through his SIM, which amounts to admit the said sharing of blasphemy material through said account. The defense has been unable to establish that the evidence was actually tampered with or that the accused was falsely implicated. Therefore, the prosecution has been able to prove the charges against Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar beyond a reasonable doubt.

C. Case of Accused Arslan

24. The prosecution case against accused Arslan is that he was involved in the preparation, possession, or transmission of alleged blasphemous material through electronic devices and social-media accounts. The prosecution relies upon the alleged recovery of an Oppo F3 mobile phone from him on 28.05.2022 through seizure memo Ex.PAS, the technical report of the mobile phone (Ex.PA), and the technical report of Facebook account "Sidra Tul Muntaha" Ex.PC.

25. Naveed Aslam, SI (PW-13), stated that on 28.05.2022 he accompanied the raiding team to a printing press near Kot Lakhpat Jail, Lahore, where Arslan was detained and an Oppo F3 mobile phone was recovered from him. The phone was taken into possession through Ex.PAS. PW-13 further stated that on 29.05.2022 two copies of the Holy Quran were separately recovered from the residences of accused Tayyab Bin Arif and Arslan through Ex.PAT and Ex.PAU respectively.

26. Huzaifa Munir, SI (PW-1), prepared technical report (Ex.PA) concerning the mobile phone attributed to Arslan and technical report Ex.PC concerning Facebook account "Sidra Tul Muntaha." The former comprised the findings and printed screenshots identified as (Ex.PA/1-7), while the latter comprised two pages of findings and screenshots extending to forty pages, identified as Ex.PC/1–40. Both reports were handed over to the investigating officer and taken into possession through the respective seizure memos.

27. The prosecution further relies upon the relevant portions of consolidated forensic report Ex.PQ, prepared by Zeeshan Hameed, Assistant Director Forensic (PW-6). The report covers several mobile phones and Facebook accounts, including material which the prosecution attributes to accused Arslan.

CamScanner

28. In his statement under section 342 Cr.P.C., Arslan denied sharing the alleged material through WhatsApp or Facebook asserting that the complainant's screenshots were unreliable and that the prosecution had failed to establish a reliable connection between him and the alleged communications through Facebook account "Sidra tul Muntaha", which has no identity with him, which is also in limited manner. He further relied upon the fact that the same Facebook account appeared in other portions of the prosecution record relating to other accused. He specifically stated that SIM No. 0306-8864606 was not recovered from him at the time of arrest and that no call detail record had been obtained to establish his use of that number. He alleged that the relevant SIM had been reissued and that material had been planted in the mobile phone after its factory reset. The accused alleged fabrication and collusion between the investigating officer and the complainant party. These allegations are not established merely because they were made in his statement. Furthermore, if that account is used by co-accused, then URL should be same but there is difference. They nevertheless identify matters which require examination against the admissions made by the prosecution witnesses and the contents of the relevant exhibits. Arslan declined to produce defence evidence and declined to appear as a witness on oath under section 340(2) Cr.P.C.

29. The prosecution case principally rests upon the recovery of mobile phones, technical reports, screenshots, Facebook-account records, and the consolidated forensic report Ex.PQ. The evidence of the investigating officer and the forensic witnesses must be assessed alongside the contents and limitations of the relevant exhibits. The absence of a CDR or independent proof of SIM registration is not, by itself, necessarily fatal where the prosecution otherwise establishes a reliable connection between an accused, a recovered device, and the relevant digital activity. It is pertinent to mention here that the presence of SIM in not necessary in same mobile to create any Whatsapp or facbook account. Non probe of I.O. about said SIM's owner omission cannot discharge the accused where the remaining evidence fully established the authorship, transmission, and the identity of the user responsible for the alleged act.

30. The primary evidence against Arslan is the recovery of a mobile phone Oppo F3 (P-5) and the Facebook account "Sidra Tul Muntaha." This account shred blasphemous material. The technical report (Ex.PAQ) shows sharing of Chat with one Fatima having blasphemous material especially defaming the Holy Quran by showing sexual acts even nude video of that

CamScanner

scene was also shared. The complainant has filed the application to open this mobile to show such defamed act of accused, which has been resisted by accused side. The defence has pointed out that the Facebook account "Sidra Tul Muntaha" was registered against a temporary website "tfreemeck.com" which cannot be verified is no ground to hold that his chat is not available especially when the said Holy Quran (P-7) was also recovered from his possession through recovery memo EX.PAU. The PW-16 specifically stated that the said Quran Book (P-7) was used to prepare blasphemous contents, on which no cross examination was conducted so said portion of his statement is deemed to be admitted by accused in view of settled law "PLD 2007 SC 249". In view of the above, the prosecution has succeeded to prove its case against accused Arslan beyond a reasonable doubt. The forensic reports, though not perfect, do provide some credible evidence of the accused's involvement in the alleged offences. The defence has been unable to establish that the evidence was actually tampered with or that the accused was falsely implicated. Therefore, the prosecution has been able to prove the charges against Arslan beyond a reasonable doubt.

D. Case of Accused Saqib Ali

31. The prosecution case against Saqib Ali is that he was involved in the preparation and dissemination of blasphemous material through his mobile phone Samsung Galaxy A20S (P-12) and three Facebook accounts: "Kashaf Hoorain," "Saqib Ali," "Arham Ali" and "Stephen John". The prosecution relies upon the technical report Ex.PBD, the technical report Ex.PBH, and the forensic report Ex.PS.

Saqib Ali was apprehended on 24.09.2022 from Tarnol, Islamabad, by the subsequent Investigating Officer, Muhammad Iqbal, Deputy Director (PW-15). A mobile phone Samsung Galaxy A20S (P-12) along with SIMs was recovered from him through Recovery Memo (Ex.PBC). Facebook ID "کشف حورین" was found logged in on his mobile phone. Another Facebook ID "Arham Ali" was also found logged out on his mobile phone. He was found involved in sharing blasphemous material from both Facebook IDs. The Facebook account "Stephen John" is logged on the mobile number of the accused, as per forensic report (Ex.PBH).

In his statement under section 342 Cr.P.C, Saqib Ali denied the allegations and pleaded innocence. He claimed that he had been falsely involved in this case and that the digital evidence was fabricated, tampered with, and planted against him. He pointed out that SIM No. 0331-5206522 was never in his use and the same was unauthorizedly and illegally issued

and used by someone else. As stated above, the Facebook and WhatsApp accounts can be created without inserting the SIM in the same mobile phone, therefore, the planting of evidence against him is without any solid proof in presence of digital evidence (social media accounts from this number in his phone) against him. He did not opt to appear as a witness on oath under section 340(2) Cr.P.C. to make any statement or to produce any evidence in this regard.

34. The primary evidence against Saqib Ali is the recovery of a mobile phone Samsung Galaxy A20S (P-12) and three Facebook accounts. The technical report (Ex.PBD) prepared by Naveed Aslam SI (PW-13) shows that no sharing of blasphemous content was found from the said Facebook accounts. The report only indicates that the accounts were members of certain groups. The forensic report (Ex.PS) shows that from his Facebook account "Stephen John" upto 23 groups, the blasphemy material has been shared. The defense version that initially this account was not mentioned in initial technical report has no footing because the subsequent forensic of the evidence is authentic one and in its presence the initial technical report has not such strong evidentiary value. The forensic report disclosed that the remaining accounts in his name, which has evidentiary value. The other objection of the defense side is that in the beginning, the name of Facebook account "Sidra tul Muntaha" was in English but later on the same was mentioned in Urdu so the same is planted one. It appears that the URL of Facebook account is same, so this objection is not weighty. The other objection is that as per report (Ex.PAF), the computer was logged on from Rawalpindi meaning thereby that the report has not been prepared at Lahore. Learned AD Legal replied that as per SOPs, after recovery of digital device, the same is always put on air-plane mode and the forensic of the same is also made in the same condition. As the accused was arrested from Rawalpindi/Islamabad, therefore, the last GPS of mobile phone was of Rawalpindi so that appeared in forensic report. In view of this plausible reply, this objection of the accused side has also no weight. In view of the above, the defence has been unable to establish that the evidence was actually tampered with or that the accused was falsely implicated. Therefore, the prosecution has been able to prove the charges against Saqib Ali beyond a reasonable doubt.

17/10

35. The defence heavily contended that the digital extractions, Cellebrite-assisted reports, and reissued SIM cards suffered from procedural delays and potential third-party manipulation. However, this argument

CamScanner

stands decisively repelled by the consistent, unimpeached depositions of PW-6 Zeeshan Hameed (AD Forensic), PW-15 Muhammad Iqbal, and PW-16 Mudassar Shah. The SIM of accused Tayyab Bin Arif was broken by him, so only the same was re-issued, not of any other accused. Said accused is P.O. so objection of re-issuing of his SIM cannot be raised by present accused. The digital chain of custody was meticulously maintained through formal chain-of-custody documentation (Ex.PAC to Ex.PAJ) routed through the Malkhana under the charge of Zafar Iqbal ASI (PW-10) and Tahir Mahmood HC (PW-9). The forensic reports (Ex.PQ and Ex.PS) establish an unbroken electronic footprint directly linking each active accused to distinct social media profiles, IP interactions, and cloud-backed media repositories.

36. The defence argued that the forensic reports are unreliable because they were prepared by a third-party company, Cellebrite, which has its headquarters in Israel. This argument is without merit. Cellebrite is a widely recognized forensic tool used by law enforcement agencies around the world. The fact that it's headquarter is in Israil does not make its use illegal or its findings unreliable. The forensic expert (PW-6) has explained the process of extraction and analysis, and his testimony is credible. The defence has not been able to show that the reports were fabricated or that the data was manipulated.

37. The learned defence counsel raised objection of jurisdiction of FIA. As per Sec.3(1) of the Federal Investigation Act, 1974, the FIA can conduct inquiry into, and investigation of, the offences specified in the Schedule, including an attempt or conspiracy to commit, and abetment of, any such offence. The schedule was amended from time to time. Article (1) of the latest schedule (available on internet) reads as under:-

THE SCHEDULE

[See sections 3(1) and 6]

(1) Offences punishable under sections a [120-B, 121, 122, 123, 123-A, 124, 124-A], g [161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 165-A, 168, 169], d [175, 182, 183, 186, 187, 188, 189], c [201], e [216], b [217, 218], e [223], d [224, 225], e [225-A], e [245], b [255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263], f [295-A] x [295-B] f [295-C, 298, 298-A], a [300, 301, 302, 324, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 337-A, 337-B, 337-C, 337-D, 337- E, 337-F] , d [342, 348], b [353], a [365-A], b [366-B], d [383], b [402-A, 402-B, 402-C, 403, 404], i [406], c [407,408], h [409], c [411, 418, 419], i [420], a [435, 436, 440], k [462A, 462B, 462C, 462D, 462E, 462F], l [462H, 462I, 462J, 462K, 462L, 462M] , d [466], c [467], i [468, 471], c [472], d [473, 474, 475, 476], b [477-A, 489-A, 489-B, 489-C, 489-D, 489-E], j [489-F], d [499, 500, 501, 502] x [505] d [506, 507], of the Pakistan Penal Code (Act XLV of 1860).

CamScanner

38. From perusal of this schedule, it follows that offences under sections 295-A, 295-B, 295-C, 298-A PPC are mentioned in the schedule so, FIA is competent to investigate these offences without any permission of Government concerned. As per Section 44(4) of PECA, 2016 to the extent not inconsistent with this Act the procedure laid down under the Code of Criminal Procedure shall be followed. As per Rule 2(n) of the Prevention of Electronic Crime Investigation Rules, 2018, investigation agency means the Federal Investigation Agency established under the Federal Investigation Agency Act, 1974. There is no such like provision in the Code of Criminal Procedure to oust the jurisdiction of FIA so this rule is inconsistent with the Code so, procedure shall be followed as per the PECA, 2016 and FIA and not the Code Criminal Procedure, therefore, this argument of learned counsel for accused has no legal force.

39. During arguments, learned counsel for accused raised objection that for taking cognizance of offence u/s 295-A/295-B/295-C PPC, the I.O. was required to obtain sanction from the authority u/s 196 Cr.P.C. I am of the view that this objection is also not legal one and in this regard reliance can be place upon "2025 P.Cr.L.J. 1791 Lahore" in which it is held that the *Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act, 2016 has been promulgated to prevent unauthorized acts concerning information systems and to provide mechanisms for related offences as well as procedures for investigation, prosecution, trial, and international cooperation with respect thereto and for matters connected therewith or ancillary thereto. The Federal Government of Pakistan, under section 29 of the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act, 2016, read with Section 51 of the same Act, notified the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Investigation Rules 2018 to carry out the purpose of the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act, 2016. As per the allegations leveled in the crime report, the alleged acts constitute offences falling under section 11 of PECA 2016 and the offences falling under sections 295-A/295-B/295-C/298-A PPC. The ingredients of section 11 of PECA 2016 and under sections 295-A/295-B/295-C/298-A PPC are interlinked, supplementing each other, and they are not inconsistent inter-se. Section 28 of PECA 2016 provided that:-*

> *"The provisions of the Pakistan Penal Code, 1860 to the extent not inconsistent with anything provided in this Act, shall apply to the offences provided in this Act".*

In view of the above, section 196 Cr.P.C. will not apply to proceedings before this court as section 11 PECA 2016 and sections 295-A/295-B/295-C/298-A PPC are interlinked and to be tried by a court established u/s 44(1) of PECA 2016. Reliance is placed upon "2025 PCrLJ 1791 Lahore".

CamScanner

40. The defence also argued that the screenshots submitted by the complainant were fabricated and that they do not match the technical report (Ex.PU) of the complainant's mobile phone. This argument is also without merit. The technical report (Ex.PU) shows that the screenshots were taken from the complainant's mobile phone, and the forensic expert has explained that the discrepancies in the navigation buttons are due to the settings of the mobile phone. The defence has not been able to prove that the screenshots were fabricated.

41. It is pertinent to mention here that although accused persons Arslan, Hassan Raza and Tayyab Bin Arif (since PO) physically defamed the Holy Quran, however, remaining accused persons Saqib Ali and Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar also wrote Quranic Ayats on their nude body parts even on nude pictures of couples in positions of sexual intercourse and also shared such like pictures and video on social media, thus such acts also defamed the Holy Quran and committed offence u/s 295-B PPC, so all the accused persons have also committed the offence u/s 295-B PPC.

42. The electronic material produced before the Court, comprising chat conversations exchanged by the accused, captions appearing in images and videos, and even the names assigned to certain groups, contains highly vulgar, obscene, derogatory, and sacrilegious expressions. The language employed therein is particularly offensive as it refers to the sacred name of Almighty Allah, the revered personality of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him), the esteemed Ahl-e-Bait, mother of Holy prophet and the respected Ummahat-ul-Momineen (Mothers of the Believers) in an extremely disrespectful and contemptuous manner. The expressions in question are so repugnant and deeply hurtful to religious sentiments that their verbatim reproduction in this judgment would be neither appropriate nor desirable. This Court is mindful of the fact that a judgment is a public document, intended to be read by the parties as well as members of the general public, and may also be reproduced, circulated, or disseminated through various means. Reproducing such offensive expressions verbatim in a publicly accessible judicial pronouncement may cause profound anguish and resentment among readers, offend their religious sentiments, and potentially give rise to feelings of hatred, anger, and hostility. Furthermore, the vulgarity and indecency of the language are such that its reproduction would be inconsistent with the dignity, decorum, and solemnity expected of judicial proceedings. Accordingly, this Court considers it appropriate to refrain from reproducing the impugned expressions verbatim and, instead,

CamScanner

to describe their nature and character in restrained, neutral, and judicially appropriate language, while referring to the relevant electronic material only to the extent necessary for the fair and proper determination of the issues involved.

POINT NO.2

Whether the prosecution evidence against the accused persons is full of doubts?

43. All the defenses taken by accused persons have been discussed above, therefore, it cannot be said that they have been booked falsely in the case by an organized group. Even otherwise, as discussed above the evidence of prosecution is relevant and confidence inspiring, therefore, it cannot be said that the PWs are interested and they made false statements, so it cannot be said that the prosecution evidence is full of doubts.

CONCLUSION

44. In view of the above discussion, I am of the considered view that the prosecution has been able to prove the charges against all the accused persons namely **Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar, Arslan, Saqib Ali** and **Hassan Raza** beyond a reasonable doubt. The forensic evidence, despite its procedural defects, is sufficient to convict these accused persons. So Far as the offence under section 120-B PPC is concerned, according to the prosecution evidence, all the accused persons committed the offences in their personal capacity separately and no evidence of criminal conspiracy is produced, so this offence could not be proved, therefore, accused persons are ,hereby, acquitted from charge u/s 120-B PPC. Benefit of section 382-B Cr.P.C is given to convicts.

45. I, therefore, convict and sentence the accused persons as under:

Accused Saqib Ali s/o Ashiq Ali r/o House No.666-E-Z, Dhok Ratta, Babu Laal Hussain Road, Rawalpindi:-

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.

CamScanner

- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years R.I. with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will suffer further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

Arslan s/o Muhammad Akram r/o House No.9, Street No.2/1, Iqbal Block, Farooq Gunj, Misri Shah, Lahore:

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years R.I. with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will suffer further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

Hassan Raza s/o Allah Rakha r/o Ali Pur Chatha, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala:

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years R.I. with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will suffer further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar s/o Sarwar Mehmood Hussain r/o Near Bashir Karyana Store, Bhagowal Awan, Sialkot:

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.

CamScanner

- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years R.I. with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will suffer further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

46. Sentences shall run concurrently except the sentences for non-payment of fine. Convicts shall be hanged by their neck till they are dead subject to confirmation of death punishment by Hon'ble Lahore High Court, Lahore on reference being sent under section 374 Cr.P.C. The convicts are informed that they have right to file an appeal in Hon'ble Lahore High Court, Lahore within thirty (30) days. The convicts are under custody, therefore, they be sent to jail to serve out the sentence awarded to them along with the warrant of sentence. Copy of this judgment is given to all the accused free of cost. Ahlmad is directed to send murder reference of convicts to Hon'ble Lahore High Court, Lahore for confirmation of sentence of death. Warrant of commitment of sentences be issued accordingly. Copy of judgment be sent to officer in-charge of prosecution in the District as required under section 373 Cr.P.C. Case property be kept intact till disposal of murder reference. Since accused Tayyab Bin Arif has been declared court's absconder, hence, his perpetual non-bailable warrants of arrest be issued with the direction that he be produced before the Court as and when arrested. A copy of this order be also sent to the concerned SHO to ensure whether the name of accused/court's absconder Tayyab Bin Arif has been entered in register No.4, if not, be entered accordingly. File be consigned to record room after its due completion.

Announced:
17.10.2026

Nusrat Ali Siddiqui Malik
Additional Sessions Judge
Lahore

It is certified that this judgment comprises 25 pages, which have been dictated, read, corrected and signed by me.

Nusrat Ali Siddiqui Malik
Additional Sessions Judge
Lahore

Additional District & Sessions Judge ★ LAHORE ★

17.10.2026

Present: Accused Arslan, Muhammad Shoaib, Saqib Ali in police custody with Mr. Usman Bhatti Advocate.
Accused Hassan Raza in police custody.
Accused Fatima Jahangir is died.
Accused Tayyab Bin Arif is PO.
Mr. Yasir Hussain Advocate for complainant.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

Vide my separate Judgment of even date in English, I am of the considered view that the prosecution has been able to prove the charges against all the accused persons namely **Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar, Arslan Akram, Saqib Ali** and **Hassan Raza** beyond a reasonable doubt. The forensic evidence, despite its procedural defects, is sufficient to convict these accused persons.

I, therefore, convict and sentence the accused persons as under:

Accused Saqib Ali s/o Ashiq Ali r/o House No.666-E-Z, Dhok Ratta, Babu Laal Hussain Road, Rawalpindi:-

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will suffer further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

Arslan s/o Muhammad Akram r/o House No.9, Street No.2, Mohallah Iqbal Park, Farooq Gunj, Misri Shah, Lahore:

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.

17/10

CamScanner

- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years with Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

Hassan Raza s/o Allah Rakha r/o Ali Pur Chatha, Wazirabad, District Gujranwala:

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will suffer further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

Muhammad Shoaib Sarwar s/o Sarwar Mehmood Hussain r/o Near Bashir Karyana Store, Bhagowal Awan, Sialkot:

- **Under Section 11 PECA, 2016** Sentenced to seven (7) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/- in case of non-payment of fine one (1) month further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 295-A PPC** Sentenced to ten (10) years rigorous imprisonment with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-.
- **Under Section 295-B PPC** Sentenced to imprisonment for life.
- **Under Section 295-C PPC** Sentenced to death with fine of Rs.5,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine six (6) months further simple imprisonment.
- **Under Section 298-A PPC** Sentenced to three (3) years with fine of Rs.1,00,000/-. In case of non-payment of fine, the convict will suffer further one (1) month simple imprisonment.

The accused are acquitted of the charge from offence under section 120-B and 34 PPC as according to the prosecution evidence, all the accused persons committed the offences in their personal capacity separately. Benefit of section 382-B Cr.P.C is given to convicts. Sentences shall run concurrently except the sentences for non-payment of fine. Convicts shall be hanged by their neck till they are dead subject to confirmation of death punishment by Hon'ble Lahore High Court, Lahore on reference being sent under section 374 Cr.P.C. The convicts are informed that they have right to file an appeal in Hon'ble Lahore High Court, Lahore within thirty (30) days. The convicts are under custody, therefore, they be

sent to jail to serve out the sentence awarded to them along with the warrant of sentence. Copy of this judgment is given to all the accused free of cost. Ahlmad is directed to send murder reference of convicts to Hon'ble Lahore High Court, Lahore for confirmation of sentence of death. Warrant of commitment of sentences be issued accordingly. Copy of judgment be sent to officer in-charge of prosecution in the District as required under section 373 Cr.P.C. Case property be kept intact till disposal of murder reference. File be consigned to record room after its due completion.

Announced:
17.10.2026

Nusrat Ali Siddiqui Malik
Additional Sessions Judge
Lahore

CamScanner