

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

**CRM-M-6441-2022 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 24.05.2022**

Hafij

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl. AG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 22 dated 20.01.2022 registered under Sections 3/13(1), 8/13/(3) and 17 of the Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015, at Police Station Nagina, District Nuh.

Additional affidavit dated 20.05.2022 of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Nuh, District Nuh, already filed in the Registry is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner has no concern with the beef allegedly recovered from his house. He further submits that as per the prosecution, 500 kg. of beef was recovered from the house of the petitioner and the person having the same fled from the spot, but the version of the prosecution is not believable, as at the time of alleged recovery, 04 police officials i.e. 01 Sub-Inspector, 01 Head Constable and 02 Constables

were present and it would be very difficult for any person to escape from the spot.

Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that during investigation, statement of the Sarpanch of the village was recorded, wherein he has stated that the house, from where the recovery of 500 kg of beef was effected, belonged to the petitioner. A number of motorcycles were also recovered from the spot as mentioned in the FIR and out of them one motorcycle belongs to the petitioner. The petitioner is also involved in one more case of a similar nature.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the paper-book.

As per the statement of the Sarpanch of the village, the house from where the recovery of 500 kg of beef was effected belongs to the petitioner and six motor-cycles were also effected from the spot, out of which one motorcycle also belongs to the petitioner. Moreover, as per the disclosure statement of co-accused Jakir @ Suka, he along with the petitioner and other accused have been involved in cow slaughtering for the last 10/12 years.

Keeping in view the nature of allegations against the petitioner; his involvement in one more case of similar nature and the fact that he has been involved in the cow slaughtering for more than a decade, interrogation of the petitioner is a must. Thus, this Court does not find any ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner

In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed.

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

**24.05.2022**  
*Mangal Singh*

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No