

219

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2202-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 11.03.2025

YOONUS

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Nafees Ahmad Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG Haryana

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case
FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
63	12.02.2024	147, 148, 307, 120-B IPC; 11 of the Prevention of Cruelty of Animals Act, 1960; 5, 13(2), 17 of the Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015	Faridabad Kotwali, District Faridabad

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner
that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He
contends that the petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the alleged
occurrence. He further contends that the petitioner was not named in the



FIR, but allegedly nominated on the disclosure statement of co-accused Mukeem. He submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report submitted by State has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner happens to be the driver of the canter and there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having tried to run over the police party with intent to kill them by speeding up the canter, which was carrying some cows for illegal smuggling. Hence, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

4. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the present case was registered on the basis of secret information received by SI Udaiveer that one Canter bearing No. HR-69B-9166 having 7-8 persons and 5-7 cows tied mercilessly was coming. Accordingly, barricades were installed and the said vehicle was signaled to stop but instead of stopping, the driver of the canter speed up the canter and tried to run-over the police party with intent to kill them, however, the police party saved themselves by jumping to one side. Thereafter the driver rammed the canter into a temple but taking advantage of the darkness the driver along with some persons managed to run away. During the course of investigation, co-accused Mukeem was arrested and the name of the petitioner surfaced in his disclosure statement to be the driver of the canter, who had tried to run over the police party with intent to kill them.

5. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence,



it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

11.03.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No