

**203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No.71 of 2017
Date of Decision: 08.05.2017**

Aabid

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Arjun Atri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.614, dated 15.11.2016, registered under Section 13 (2) of the Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015, Sections 11, 59, 60 of Animals Cruelty Act and Sections 279, 336, 429 IPC, at Police Station Nuh, District Mewat, Haryana.

Vide order of this Court dated 17.01.2017, this Court had ordered that in the event of arrest of the petitioner, he shall be admitted to bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting officer subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

The case of the prosecution is that a secret information was received by the police that the petitioner along with his co-accused was indulging in business of slaughtering of cows and on the day of

receipt of the above information, they had brought some cows and an ox in a truck. Acting on the said information, the police had set up a naka and on seeing a truck, signalled it to stop but the driver of the vehicle did not stop the same and fled. The truck ultimately fell into a pond in the village and when the police reached there, they found the petitioner along with his co-accused fleeing from the spot.

Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Mahender Singh, admits that under interim orders of this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and has fully cooperated with the investigating agency; he is not required for further questioning and that there is no other criminal case in which the petitioner is involved.

In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 17.01.2017 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions prescribed under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

If the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal activity/misusing the concession of bail granted to him, it will be open to the State to move an appropriate application before the Competent Court/this Court for cancellation of the bail granted to the petitioner through this order.

May 08, 2017

rittu

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No