



CRM-M-7643-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

243

**CRM-M-7643-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 20.04.2026**

HARSH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Davneet Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.351 dated 06.05.2024 under Sections 13(2) of Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015, Sections 11-59-1960 of Animal Cruelty Act registered at Police Station City Karnal.

2. Brief facts of the case are that a secret information was received by police that cows are being transported in a Canter Bharat Benz bearing registration No.HR-63D-4866 for slaughtering purposes. Accordingly, barricades were set up and the said vehicle was apprehended. Upon checking, cows were found loaded in the said vehicle. During interception, two accused fled from the spot and only one accused was apprehended at the spot.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case; the present petitioner was neither named in the present FIR nor he was apprehended at the spot; the petitioner has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Ravi which is inadmissible in the eyes of law; co-accused Ravi who was apprehended at the spot, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide order dated 17.05.2024 (Annexure P-3); the minimum punishment for the alleged offence(s) as provided under the provisions of law, is 03 years and that of maximum is 10 years; the present petitioner has been in custody for the last more than 08 months; therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars as he is not required for recovery purposes; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and as such, prayed for concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State, and by way of filing of custody certificate dated 17.04.2026, opposed the concession of regular bail to the petitioner and submitted that the present petitioner alongwith co-accused Iqbal is involved in transporting of cows for slaughter purpose, however when intercepted by the police, co-accused Ravi was apprehended at the spot and the present petitioner alongwith



co-accused Iqbal fled away from the spot; the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in 02 more cases; the petitioner has been in custody for a period of 08 months & 24 days and as such, prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

6. Heard.

7. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and the fact that the present petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Ravi who was apprehended at the spot; the co-accused namely, Ravi, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide order dated 17.05.2024 (Annexure P-3); the present petitioner is in custody for last 08 months & 28 days; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the



satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an opinion on the merits of the main case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

20.04.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO