

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPURMisc. Criminal Case No.791 of 2016

Mumtaj Ansari, S/o Nimaji Ansari, aged about 28 years, R/o  
Kotam, Police Station Meral, District Gadhwa (Jharkhand)  
---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, Through Station House Officer, Police  
Station Trikunda, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)  
---- Non-applicant

ANDMisc. Criminal Case No.919 of 2016

Nabir Ansari, S/o Marhum Janab Ansari, aged about 35 years,  
R/o Kotam, Police Station Meral, District Gadhwa (Jharkhand)  
---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, Through Station House Officer, Police  
Station Trikunda, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)  
---- Non-applicant

---

|                    |                                  |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| For Applicants:    | Mr. Suryakant Mishra, Advocate.  |
| For Non-applicant: | Mr. Aditya Sharma, Panel Lawyer. |

---

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

14/03/2016

1. Since both the applications are arising out of the same crime number, they are being disposed of by this common order.
2. The accused/applicants have moved these bail applications under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for releasing them on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No.69/2015, registered at Police Station Trikunda, Distt. Balrampur-Ramanujganj, for the offence punishable under

Sections 4, 6, 10 of the Chhattisgarh Krishak Pashu Parirakshan Adhiniyam and Section 11 of the Cruelty to Animals Act.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the applicants were found transporting seven agricultural scheduled animals to other States for the purpose of slaughtering and thereby committed the offence.
4. Learned counsel for the applicants submit that the applicants have not committed any offence and they have been falsely implicated in the case. The applicants have purchased the animals for agricultural purpose. The applicants are in custody since 8-12-2015 and charge-sheet has been filed.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail applications.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of offence, facts and circumstances of the case, role of the applicants, their defence and pretrial detention, I am of the opinion that the applicants should be enlarged on regular bail. Accordingly, the applications are allowed.
8. It is, therefore, directed that the applicants be released on bail on their furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- each with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Court for their appearance as and when directed.

Sd/-  
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)  
Judge