



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

**CRM-M-49218-2025
Date of decision: 24.09.2025**

RAVINDER GUPTA

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Balram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Devinder Rajput, Advocate
for the complainant.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this second petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 146 dated 02.07.2025 registered at Police Station City Phagwara, District Kapurthala, under Sections 299, 325, 111 of BNS, 2023 and Section 8 of Punjab Prohibition of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955 & Section 11 of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1960.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

3. In compliance of order dated 04.09.2025, status report by way of an affidavit of Bharat Bhushan, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of



Police, Sub Division, Phagwara, District Kapurthala, filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

4. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Gurpreet Singh with the allegations that he is the National President of the United Cow Raksa Party. He has received information that from Phagwara to Ludhiana side G.T. road, huge quantity of beef was being cut and packed in the godown built behind Jyoti Dhaba, Phagwara. Many people namely Taseem, Bhura, Vijay Kumar, Babbu son of Ram Lal, Arman, Vilas Rana and 8-9 unknown persons are involved in the cutting of beef at Hadda Rori on Hoshiarpur Raod, Phagwara. The beef is packed in a plant and then transported to Delhi and Srinagar and in case a raid is conducted, large quantity of beef can be recovered and the persons involved in committing the crime can be apprehended. On the basis of this information, formal FIR was registered and raid was conducted at the disclosed place from where around 29 quintal, 32 Kg of beef was recovered and some persons were apprehended. Apprehending arrest, petitioner applied for anticipatory bail which has been rejected by the Ld. Trial Court.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He was neither present at the spot nor he has any concern with the premises where the meat was being cut. Learned counsel contended that his name has cropped up in the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Vijay Kumar, wherein he disclosed that he had transferred Rs.1,00,000/- into the petitioner's



account. However, no such amount has been transferred in his bank account. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is also ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that 29 quintal 32 kg beef has been recovered from the spot and as per report of the laboratory, the meat was of cow origin. The co-accused has suffered disclosure statement that present petitioner alongwith other co-accused was running a racket of procuring and selling beef. The rent note in respect of the premises where illegal business was being run was got executed by the petitioner, who is also an attesting witness thereto, as disclosed by accused Vijay Kumar. In these circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. It is well settled that the power to grant anticipatory bail is of extra-ordinary nature and is to be sparingly used with circumspection. This court is fortified by the observations made in case of 2022 (4) RCR (Criminal) 968 titled as "***Sachin @ Sachin Ahuja Vs. State of Punjab***". In case of SLP (Crl.) 7940 2023 titled as "***Shri Kant Upadhay Vs. State of Bihar***", Hon'ble Apex Court has held that grant of interim protection or protection from arrest to an accused in a serious case may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or destruction of evidence. The court is cognizant of the fact that power of anticipatory bail is to be exercised in



exceptional circumstances as it may cause some hindrance to normal flow of investigation which would undermine the case of the prosecution.

8. As per prosecution case, the premises where illegal slaughtering and sale of beef was going on was rented out in favour of one Mohd. Sohrab by Sonu Jaspal Singh and petitioner is an attesting witness to the said rent note. Money has been transferred by main accused namely Vijay Kumar to the petitioner. Huge quantity of beef has been recovered and in these circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential for further investigation of the present case and to elicit the *modus operandi* adopted by the accused in committing the crime and grant of anticipatory bail will rather hamper the investigation. Moreover, petitioner is not likely to answer the questions in the right earnest in case, he is interrogated under the protective umbrella of the order of ad-interim protection that may be passed by this Court. No doubt, nothing is to be recovered from his possession but the gravity of the offence too is an important factor which has to be taken into consideration while granting anticipatory bail.

9. Resultantly, this Court is of the considered opinion that petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and accordingly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

10. Pending misc. application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

24.09.2025
Priyanka Thakur

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

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