



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

**CRM-M No.24557 of 2026
Date of decision: 04.05.2026**

Maksood and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Nafees Ahmad Khan
for the petitioners.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.234 dated 15.10.2025, registered under Sections 3, 13(1), 13(3) and 8 of the Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015, at Police Station Sadar Tauru, District Nuh.
2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 15.10.2025, on the basis of secret information received by the complainant Rohit Yadav, he along with his team of Gau Raksha Dal proceeded towards Chilla forest (Beed), where the accused persons were allegedly found engaged in the act of cow slaughter. As per the allegations, accused Aakub alias Yakoob was armed with an axe and was cutting the legs of the cow, while petitioner Aasif was holding the legs of the cow. Accused Nadim and Saheed were stated to be cutting the skin of the cow and butchering its meat into pieces, whereas accused Abid was weighing the meat using a



scale. Petitioner Maksood (alias Mota) along with other co-accused was present at the spot and participating in the said act. Upon noticing the complainant party, all the accused persons allegedly fled from the spot, leaving behind the slaughtered cow, meat, axe, weighing scale and other incriminating articles.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the present case is based solely upon the version of the complainant, who claims himself to be a member of the Gau Raksha Dal and alleges that he inspected the spot and witnessed the occurrence. It is submitted that the complainant himself attributed specific roles to all the accused persons and further stated that they fled away from the spot leaving behind the slaughtered cow, meat, an iron axe and an iron weighing scale. It is contended that nothing has been recovered by the police or the investigating agency from the petitioners. It is further argued that co-accused Nadim and Aakub alias Yakoob have already been granted regular bail. Not only this, co-accused Saheed has also been granted anticipatory bail. It is thus contended that the case of the present petitioners is at parity with the said co-accused, particularly Saheed, and therefore, they are also entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and submitted that serious allegations have been levelled against both the petitioners and specific roles have been attributed to them in the FIR. It is submitted that petitioner Aasif was holding the legs of the cow, whereas petitioner Maksood, along with other co-accused, was involved in skinning the cow and cutting it into pieces. It is further argued that co-accused Nadim and Aakub alias Yakoob were granted regular bail on



account of their custody period and, therefore, their case is not comparable to that of the present petitioners who are seeking anticipatory bail. As regards co-accused Saheed, it is submitted that he was granted anticipatory bail primarily on the ground that co-accused Nadim and Aakub had already been granted regular bail. Learned State counsel has also submitted that two other similar cases are pending against the present petitioners and, therefore, they are not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

6. A perusal of the FIR would show that specific and active roles have been attributed to both the petitioners. Petitioner Aasif is alleged to have held the legs of the cow, thereby facilitating the act, whereas petitioner Maksood is stated to have actively participated in skinning and cutting the cow into pieces along with other co-accused. The allegations, thus, disclose their direct and active involvement in the commission of the offence.

7. The plea of parity raised on behalf of the petitioners is also not tenable. Co-accused Nadim and Aakub alias Yakoob were granted regular bail on account of their custody period, whereas the present petitioners are seeking anticipatory bail. Similarly, co-accused Saheed was granted anticipatory bail on the basis of the bail granted to the said co-accused. Thus, the case of the present petitioners stands on a different footing and cannot be equated with the aforesaid co-accused.

8. Moreover, the recoveries of the weapons and other incriminating articles are yet to be effected and custodial interrogation of the petitioners cannot be ruled out at this stage. The allegations against the



petitioners are serious in nature and two other similar cases are also stated to be pending against them.

9. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

11. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

04.05.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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