

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1170 OF 2025

**SABRUDDIN HUSSAIN SAYYED
@ SALIM SAYYED**

..... APPLICANT

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

..... RESPONDENT

Mr. Rohan Hogle a/w. Mr. Aadesh Konde-Deshmukh, Mr.Naagesh Kheddkar, Mr.Hrighiked Avhad, Mr.Sainath Garade for the Applicant.

Mr. Amit A. Palkar, A.P.P. for the State.

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATE : 28th APRIL, 2025

P.C. :-

This application is filed for pre-arrest bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Crime No. 238/2025 dated 9th April, 2025 registered with Hill Line Police Station, Thane City for the offences punishable under Section 325 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 5(b) and 5(c) of the Maharashtra Animal Preservation Act, 1976.

2. Based on the complaint, an FIR has been lodged. The role of the present applicants is mentioned in the said FIR.

3. On behalf of the applicant, it is submitted that the applicant is the legitimate owner of the shop, where buffalo meat is sold and he is not selling meat of the cattle which is banned as per the provisions of Maharashtra Animal Preservation Act, 1976. And in any case the servant who was working with the present applicant viz. Ehasan Ali Mobin is arrested and the meat is seized from him. Therefore, there is nothing more to be recovered from the present applicant, who is the owner of the shop. There are no antecedents as far as the present applicant is concerned. Therefore, the custody of the present applicant is not necessary.

4. The learned A.P.P. submits that the meat has been seized from the servant of the present applicant. The said meat is to be sent for testing whether it belongs to the cattle which is banned under the provisions of Maharashtra Animal Preservation Act, 1976. There are no antecedents as far as the present applicant is concerned. Therefore, the custody of the present applicant is not necessary.

5, I have heard learned counsel for both the sides as well as I have perused the documents on record. The servant of the present applicant has been arrested. There is an allegation that the meat of the cattle which is banned as per the provisions of the Maharashtra

Animal Preservation Act, 1976 was found with him. The said meat requires to be tested whether it is of the cattle which is banned by the Act. There are no antecedents as far as the present applicant is concerned and there is nothing to be recovered from the present applicant.

6. In my view considering the facts as of today, the custody of the present applicant will not be necessary. The present anticipatory bail application is allowed. Hence, the following order :-

ORDER

(a) **The anticipatory bail application is allowed.**

(b) In the event of arrest in connection with Crime No. 238/2025 dated 9th April, 2025 registered with Hill Line Police Station, Thane City for the offences punishable under Section 325 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 5(b) and 5(c) of the Maharashtra Animal Preservation Act, 1976, the applicant shall be released on bail, on furnishing P.R. bonds to the extent of Rs.30,000/- with one or more sureties of the like amount.

(c) The applicant shall co-operate with the investigation and attend and meet the Investigating

Officer of the concerned Police Station on every week on Wednesday between 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. till filing of the charge-sheet.

(d) The applicant shall not venture into any business regarding sale of flesh of cattle.

(e) The applicant should not directly or indirectly contact the first informant in any form whatsoever.

(f) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with facts of case so as to dissuade him from disclosing the facts to Court or any Police Officer and further, the applicants shall not tamper with the evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(g) The applicant shall furnish details of his residential addresses, contact numbers and e-mail addresses to the Investigating Officer.

7. Needless to say, violation of any of the aforesaid conditions would make the applicant liable to face proceedings for cancellation of anticipatory bail. It is clarified that the observations made in this order are limited to the question of grant of anticipatory bail to the

applicant in the present application, and that the trial Court shall proceed further, without being influenced by the observations made in this order.

8. **The anticipatory bail application is disposed of.**

[RAJESH S. PATIL, J.]