



\$~3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4188/2025**

NIRANJAN KUMAR CHADHA @ BABALPetitioner

Through: **Mr. Omkar Sharma, Adv.**

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent

Through: **Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State
with SI Layak, PS Crime Branch**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

12.12.2025

%

1. The Applicant seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 135/2025, registered at P.S. Crime Branch for the offences under Section 325 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Section 11L of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and Sections 4/12/8/13 of Delhi Agricultural Cattle Preservation Act, 1994. The Applicant, along with the co-accused, has been implicated for alleged illegal cow slaughter and transportation of beef.

2. Mr. Omkar Sharma, counsel for the Applicant, submits that the Applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated, as the chargesheet does not disclose any incriminating material against him. It is further contended that co-accused Sarfaraz and Mohd. Azam, against whom specific allegations were levelled, have already been granted regular bail by this Court; therefore, the Applicant is entitled to the benefit of parity. He also submits that in compliance with the Court's previous directions, the



Applicant has duly joined and is cooperating in the investigation. It is additionally submitted that the Applicant has a clean antecedental record. In these circumstances, it is urged that the Applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State, opposes the request. He submits that the Applicant remained absconding for a considerable period and if granted pre-arrest bail, may pose a flight risk and impede the course of trial.

4. The Court has considered the submissions advanced by the parties. Pursuant to the directions issued earlier, the Applicant has joined the investigation and is cooperating with the Investigating Officer. It is also noted that other co-accused, who have been charge-sheeted, have already been granted regular bail by the Trial Court.

5. As regards the State's apprehension regarding the possibility of the Applicant's abscondence, the same can be effectively addressed by imposing stringent conditions while granting pre-arrest bail.

6. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that the provision of anticipatory bail, under Section 438 Cr.P.C., is rooted in Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which guarantees personal liberty. Section 438 aims at protecting the personal liberty of an individual, who, at the time of seeking anticipatory bail, has not been convicted of the alleged offence and is entitled to the presumption of innocence.¹ Accordingly, in the totality of the foregoing circumstances, the Court finds it to be a fit case for the grant of anticipatory bail.

¹ Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia and Others v. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra and Others, (2011) 1 SCC 694.



7. In view of the foregoing, the application is allowed. The Applicant, in the event of arrest, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing a bail bond for a sum of INR 25,000/- with two sureties of the like amount subject to the satisfaction of the concerned SHO, on the following conditions:

- a. The Applicant shall join and cooperate with the investigation as and when directed by the IO;
- b. The Applicant shall not leave the boundaries of the country without informing the IO/ SHO concerned;
- c. The Applicant shall not contact the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner;
- d. The Applicant shall give his mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switched on at all times;

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. The application is allowed in the afore-mentioned terms.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

DECEMBER 12, 2025

Pallavi