



\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3324/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25929/2025**

MOHD AZAM

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Omkar Sharma, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **14.10.2025**

1. The present application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (erstwhile Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²) seeks regular bail in FIR No. 135/2025 under Section 325/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023³, Section 11(L) of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and 4/12/8/13 of Delhi Agricultural Cattle Preservation Act, 1994 registered at P.S. Crime Branch.
2. As per the prosecution, on the intervening night of 2nd–3rd June, 2025, on receipt of secret information regarding illegal cow slaughtering at Nilothe Extension, Delhi, and transportation of beef in a car, a trap was laid near the bridge over Ganda Nala, Vikas Puri. Based on identification by the informer, a speeding vehicle was pursued, and the accused persons, including the Applicant, were apprehended on the spot. A search of the vehicle led to recovery of cattle meat and cattle heads, which were confirmed by veterinary examination to be of cattle origin. Accordingly, the

¹ "BNSS"

² "Cr.P.C."



instant FIR was registered, and subsequently, the Applicant, along with other co-accused, was charge-sheeted under the aforementioned provisions.

3. Counsel for the Applicant states that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. Investigation *qua* the Applicant is complete and the chargesheet has been filed, rendering further custodial detention unnecessary. Other co-accused have already been granted bail, and the Applicant is entitled to the same treatment on the principle of parity. The Applicant undertakes to abide by all terms and conditions that this Court may deem fit to impose while granting regular bail.

4. Conversely, Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for the State, opposes the bail application. He submits that although the chargesheet has been filed, the FSL report is still awaited. He further contends that the Applicant, apprehended at the spot, played a key role in the cow slaughtering racket. The Applicant's prior criminal record raises a risk of reoffending if released. Additionally, there is a possibility that the Applicant may abscond or interfere with the ongoing investigation, as several members of the alleged syndicate/gang are yet to be apprehended.

5. The Court has considered the aforementioned contentions. Investigation *qua* the Applicant stands concluded and chargesheet has been filed. As per the Nominal Roll, the Applicant has been in custody for nearly 4 months.

6. At this stage, the Court is not required to undertake a detailed inquiry into the alleged nature of the offences and the recovery made from the Applicant; these are aspects that will be dealt with during the course of trial.

7. The apprehensions expressed by the State regarding the possibility of the Applicant reoffending, absconding, or interfering with the ongoing

³ "BNS"



investigation, can be adequately safeguarded by imposing strict and appropriate conditions while granting bail.

8. It is well established through catena of judgments by the Supreme Court that the object of granting bail is neither punitive nor preventative. The primary aim sought to be achieved by bail is to secure the attendance of the accused person at the trial.⁴ In view of the facts noted hereinabove and the principles governing grant of bail, this Court finds it appropriate to release the Applicant on bail, subject to conditions.

9. The Applicant is, therefore, directed to be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond for a sum of INR 25,000/- with two sureties of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty MM, on the following conditions:

- a. The Applicant shall cooperate in any further investigation as and when directed by the concerned IO;
- b. The Applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;
- c. The Applicant shall under no circumstance leave the country without the permission of the Trial Court;
- d. The Applicant shall appear before the Trial Court as and when directed;
- e. The Applicant shall provide the address where he would be residing after his release and shall not change the address without informing the concerned IO/ SHO;

⁴ See also: *Sanjay Chandra v. CBI*, (2012) 1 SCC 40; *Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation*, (2022) 10 SCC 51.



f. The Applicant shall, upon his release, give his mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switched on at all times.

g. The Applicant shall report to the concerned P.S. on the first Friday , every three months;

10. In the event of there being any FIR/DD entry/complaint lodged against the Applicant, it would be open to the State to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

11. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and should not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12. The bail application is allowed in the afore-mentioned terms.

13. Pending applications stand disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2025/MK