



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO. 584 OF 2025

Abdul Sajeed Abdul Quadar and another Vs State of Maharashtra

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. Z.Z. Haq, counsel for applicants.

Mrs. Sneha Dhote, APP for non-applicant/State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 14/08/2025.

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.212/2025 registered at Police Station Ural, Tq. Balapur, District Akola for the offence punishable under Sections 132, 112, 351(2), 352 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023; Sections 5A, 5B, 9A of the Maharashtra Animal Preservation Act, 1976; and Sections 11(1)(k) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, applicants approached this Court for grant of anticipatory bail.

2. The crime was registered based on a report lodged by a police official, who stated that on 15/7/2025, at around 8:00 a.m., he received secret information that the accused persons were involved in selling cow meat at Gram Hatrun. Accordingly, the informant along with staff went to the spot and seized approximately 20 kg of cow meat. On the basis of said report, police have registered the offence and the

present applicants are apprehending the arrest at the hands of police.

3. Heard learned counsel for the applicants, who submitted that as far as the applicants are concerned, they were not found at the spot of incidence. He submitted that even if the meat is cow meat or not yet to be ascertained. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the present applicants is not required, as nothing is to be seized from them. In view of that, they be protected by granting anticipatory bail. Additionally, it was submitted that even if the meat is confirmed to be cow meat, custodial interrogation of the applicants is unwarranted since nothing remains to be seized from them.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that applicant No. 1 is already externed by the externment order. There is a similar type of offence against the applicant No. 1. If he is released on bail, he will indulge in similar types of activities. Therefore, his custodial interrogation is required, in view of that, the application deserves to be rejected.

5. After hearing both sides and on perusal of the investigation papers, as far as applicant No. 2 is concerned, against whom there are criminal antecedents but not of a similar nature. A general allegation is levelled against him. As far as the applicant

No. 1 is concerned, against whom the externment proceedings have already been initiated, by passing an order, he is already externed. Moreover, similar types of the offences are registered against him. Considering the criminal antecedents and the preventive action taken against the applicant No. 1, the application for a grant of anticipatory bail deserves to be rejected. Whereas, the applicant No. 2 has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, I proceed to pass the following order.

ORDER

- a] Criminal application is **partly allowed**.
- b] The prayer of the applicant No.1 – ***Abdul Sajeed Abdul Quadar*** for grant of anticipatory bail is **rejected**.
- c] The applicant No.2 – ***Abdul Razeeque Abdul Quadar*** shall be released on anticipatory bail in connection with Crime No.212/2025 registered at Police Station Ural, Tq. Balapur, District Akola for the offence punishable under Sections 132, 112, 351(2), 352 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023; Sections 5A, 5B, 9A of the Maharashtra Animal Preservation Act, 1976; and Sections 11(1)(k) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960,

on executing PR. Bond of Rs. 50,000/- with on surety of like amount.

- d] The applicant No.2 shall attend the concerned police station once in a week on Monday between 10.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m. and shall cooperate with the investigating agency.
- e] The applicant No.2 shall not indulge in similar type of the activities and single registration of the offence would lead to the cancellation of bail.
- f] The applicant no.2 shall not induce, threat or promise any witnesses who are acquainted with the facts of the case.

The criminal application is **disposed of**.

[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]