



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

215

CRM-M-45425-2025
Date of decision: 26.08.2025

GURMAIL SINGH ALIAS BABUPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No. 63 dated 04.04.2025 under Sections 111(3), 298, 325, 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 3, 4, 8 of the Punjab Prohibition of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955 and Sections 11 and 12 of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 registered at Police Station Sadar Faridkot, District Faridkot.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present FIR has been registered against him on the statement of Mahant Garib Dass alongwith other similarly placed accused persons. He contends that the petitioner was never arrested at the spot and the only allegation made out against the petitioner is that he is indulging in the trading of cows. He contends that other co-accused of the petitioner who

**CRM-M-45425-2025**

-2-

were arrested at the spot, have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court in CRM-M-29384 of 2025; CRM-M-34700 of 2025; CRM-M-38373-2025 and CRM-M-40090 of 2025 vide order dated 06.08.2025 after noticing that the trial has yet not commenced and the petitioner having undergone a custody of nearly 04 months and noticing that as many as 30 witnesses have been cited by the respondent-prosecution.

3. Learned State Counsel has not been able to indicate as to why parity treatment may not be extended to the petitioner. He although makes an attempt that the petitioner is arraigned in multiple FIRs of similar nature, however, the same by itself may not be a sufficient ground to deny the bail to the petitioner when similarly placed co-accused in the said FIR have already been granted concession of bail vide order dated 06.08.2025.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

5. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the criminal antecedents of the petitioner and the absence of recovery from the petitioner, I am of the opinion that further incarceration of the petitioner in a case where the trial is not likely to conclude soon would not be warranted. I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.



CRM-M-45425-2025

-3-

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

AUGUST 26, 2025

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No