



CRM-M-47707-2025

1

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

226

**CRM-M-47707-2025
Decided on :03.09.2025**

Habbu @ Ayyub

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner-Habbu @ Ayyub has been filed under Section 483 BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.377 dated 30.09.2024, under Sections 3/13(1), 8/13(3) of Haryana Gauvash Sanrakshan Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Nuh, District Nuh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only allegation against the petitioner is the recovery of 20 kilograms of cow meat from his house. It is further submitted that the petitioner has never been involved in any other case of a similar nature. Counsel states that the petitioner is in custody for approximately four months (three months and twenty-six days).



Counsel contends that since the recovery has already been effected and the investigation qua the petitioner is complete, there is no justification for keeping the petitioner in jail any longer, as continued detention would serve no purpose.

It is further submitted that a co-accused, whose name was also mentioned in the information provided by a secret informant and recorded in the FIR, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 20.05.2025 (P-2) passed in CRM-M-62261-2024. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel, however, opposes the prayer for bail and submits that recovery of 20 kilograms of cow meat from the petitioner's house is a serious offence under the relevant provisions of law. It is contended that such illegal possession and slaughter of cow meat is a matter of grave concern and has potential to disturb public order and sentiments.

Further, learned State counsel submits that petitioner's role in the offence cannot be minimized merely on the ground that the investigation is complete, as the evidence on record indicates the petitioner's direct involvement in the commission of the offence. Learned State counsel also submits that the grant of anticipatory bail to the co-accused is not a binding precedent for the petitioner's case, as facts and circumstances may differ.

It is further argued that the petitioner, if released on bail, may influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence, thereby

**CRM-M-47707-2025****3**

prejudicing the trial. Considering the nature of the offence and the potential impact on society, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court noticed that the only allegation against the petitioner is the recovery of 20 kilograms of cow meat from his house. Petitioner is in custody for approximately four months, and investigation against him has been completed. It is further noticed that co-accused, whose name also appears in the FIR based on information from a secret informant, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

In the absence of any direct allegation of petitioner's involvement in other offences of a similar nature and considering the progress of the trial, this Court finds that the continued detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Balancing the liberty of the individual with the interests of justice, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is entitled to the concession of bail. Accordingly, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

5. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



CRM-M-47707-2025

4

independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

6. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

03.09.2025

Rashmi

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