



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

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.731/2025
(Shahrukh Khan S/o Ramzan Khan Vs. State of Maharashtra)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. F.S. Chowdhary, Advocate for the applicant.
Mr. Ashish Kadukar, A.P.P. for the non-applicant/State.

CORAM: MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.
DATED: 13.11.2025.

Heard.

2. The applicant is apprehending arrest in Crime No.313/2025 for the offence punishable under Sections 5, 5(c), 9, 9(a) of the Maharashtra Animal Preservation Act, 1976 and Section 325 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. On the secret information, the raid was conducted at the applicant's place and beef and chopped 4 legs of cattle were found along with weighing machine, 2 refrigerators, 2 wooden logs and some black coloured plastic bags were seized. From the spot raiding party had also seized 3 big knives and one axe, however, no one was found on the spot. On the spot, Adhar Card of the applicant was found. When enquired with the neighbours, they informed that it is the house of the applicant and he is staying there with his family.
4. The learned Advocate for the applicant has stated that only on the basis of said Adhar Card, crime is registered against the applicant. He has denied that he owns that house. He has stated that he is not resident of said area. He is staying somewhere else i.e. Pili Nadi,

Uppalwadi and the applicant has not committed any offence. Hence, prayed to protect the applicant by granting anticipatory bail.

5. The learned A.P.P. opposed the application stating that nobody was present on the spot. The applicant is absconding. His Adhar Card is found on the spot, witnesses have stated his name and as the offence is serious in nature, his custodial interrogation is necessary. Hence, prayed to reject the application.

6. Heard both sides and perused record.

7. One Adhar card is found on the spot which is of the applicant. Though the applicant has denied that he is the owner of said house and has stated that he is staying elsewhere, the statement of witnesses shows that he is staying there. Considering the allegations made and as at the time of raid nobody was found and the fact that the applicant is staying there, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary. Hence, the application is rejected.

(MRS.VRUSHALI V.JOSHI, J.)