

SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S  2026:UHC:3006
			<u>BA1 No. 645 of 2026</u> Tasleem alias Arif Applicant Vs. State of Uttarakhand Respondent <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Mr. Faizan Ali, learned counsel holding brief of Mr. Mohd. Safdar, learned counsel for the Applicant. 2. Mr. Vikash Uniyal, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. The present Bail Application has been moved by the Applicant—Tasleem alias Arif, S/o Yakoob, R/o Mohalla Kila Manglaur, P.S. Kotwali Manglaur, District Haridwar. The Applicant is in judicial custody in connection with Case Crime No. 30 of 2026, registered at Police Station Kotwali Manglaur, District Haridwar, for the offences punishable under Sections 3, 5 read with Section 11 of the Uttarakhand Protection of Cow Progeny Act, 2007. 4. Heard Mr. Faizan Ali, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant, and Mr. Vikash Uniyal, learned Brief Holder for the State. Perused the record. 5. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no concern with the alleged recovery. It is argued that there is no independent witness to support the prosecution version and even the place of alleged recovery does not belong to the Applicant. It is further submitted that the entire prosecution story is founded upon secret information, which was neither reduced into writing nor independently verified, thereby rendering the very basis of the FIR doubtful. Learned counsel further submits that no cow slaughter was witnessed by any independent person and there is no direct evidence

		to show that the Applicant slaughtered any cow as alleged. It is also contended that no scientific or forensic report is on record at this stage to conclusively establish that the recovered meat was of cow progeny, which is a mandatory requirement to attract the provisions of the Act. It is further submitted that co-accused Shakeel, who was allegedly arrested on the spot, has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 11.02.2026 and the case of the present Applicant stands on parity with the said co-accused. On such grounds, prayer has been made to enlarge the Applicant on bail. 6. Per contra, learned State Counsel has opposed the Bail Application, but does not dispute the fact that co-accused Shakeel has already been granted bail. 7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court finds that the prosecution case rests substantially on recovery allegedly made pursuant to secret information, without support of any independent witness. At this stage, no scientific or forensic material has been brought on record to conclusively establish that the recovered meat was of cow progeny. Further, co-accused Shakeel, who is stated to have been arrested on the spot, has already been enlarged on bail and the case of the present Applicant stands on parity with the said co-accused. Considering the nature of accusations, period of incarceration undergone, parity with the co-accused and the attending facts and circumstances of the case, but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter, this Court is of the view that the Applicant has made out a fit case for grant of bail at this stage. 8. Accordingly, the Bail Application is allowed. 9. Let the Applicant be released on bail upon executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Court concerned.
--	--	---

			10. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of. (Ashish Naithani, J.) 23.04.2026 Shiksha
--	--	--	---