

CRM-M-2581-2022

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

**CRM-M-2581-2022 (O & M)
Date of decision:22.04.2022**

Farun

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Khalid Tauru, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.226 dated 08.12.2021, registered at Police Station Dhauj, District Faridabad, under Sections 429 and 34 IPC, Section 13(1) of the Haryana Gauthansh Sanrakshan and Gauthamvardhan Act, 2015 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner was not arrested at the spot; that the wife of the petitioner has been declared innocent whereas his son, who was arrested at the spot, stands released on bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the petitioner has never been declared a proclaimed offender, and that there is no other case registered or pending against him under the above-mentioned

CRM-M-2581-2022

offences. So far as other cases registered against the petitioner are concerned, he stands acquitted in one case whereas has already undergone the sentence in other cases. On this premise, the learned counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the aforesaid submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that 60 kg. beef was recovered from the house belonging to the petitioner, and that the petitioner is required for the recovery of skin of cows. Moreover, the petitioner was convicted in FIR No.125 of 2007, under Sections 376, 342, 506 and 120-B IPC, Police Station Mujessar, Faridabad.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As per the case of the prosecution, while acting on a tip-off, the police raided the spot but on seeing the police party, they had fled from the spot. The house from where 60 kg. beef had been recovered, belongs to the petitioner.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court finds that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to recover the skin of cows.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

22.04.2022
parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No