



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

**CRM-M No.27450 of 2026
Date of decision: 15.05.2026**

Saheed

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Nafees Ahmad Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.44 dated 23.04.2026, registered under Sections 3, 13(1), 8, 13(3) and 17 of the Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015 at Police Station Punhana, District Nuh.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that while the police party was present near village Laharwari for patrolling and crime checking, a secret information was received to the effect that Saheed and others were indulging in illegal cow slaughtering activities in the forest area of village Laharwari. Acting upon the said information, the police party conducted a raid at the indicated spot. On seeing the police party, some persons allegedly fled away from the spot taking advantage of the darkness



and narrow road. At the spot, one motorcycle bearing registration No. HR-93B-8832 was found along with about 200 kilograms of fresh cow meat, blood-stained articles, skins of cows and slaughtering tools including axes and knives. On the basis of the said allegations, the present FIR came to be registered against the accused persons including the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and was not apprehended at the spot, which itself shows that he was not present at the alleged place of occurrence. It is argued that no recovery has been effected from the conscious possession of the petitioner and his implication is based merely upon suspicion and secret information. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and no custodial interrogation is required in the present matter.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the State and opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. Learned State counsel submits that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner regarding illegal cow slaughtering activities. It is contended that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR on the basis of prior secret information received by the police and when the police party reached the spot, the accused persons fled away after noticing the official vehicle. It is further submitted that huge quantity of fresh cow meat along with slaughtering tools was recovered from the spot and the investigation reveals active



involvement of the petitioner in the commission of offence. Learned State counsel has also submitted that as many as four other similar criminal cases are stated to be registered against the present petitioner.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. The allegations levelled in the present case are grave and serious in nature. The prosecution case *prima-facie* reveals organized illegal cow slaughtering activities being carried out in the forest area and substantial quantity of fresh cow meat along with slaughtering instruments was allegedly recovered from the spot. The petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR on the basis of secret information received prior to the raid and the prosecution version further shows that the accused persons escaped from the spot after seeing the police party. At this stage, the plea raised by the petitioner that he was not apprehended at the spot cannot by itself be made a ground to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail, particularly when the investigation is still at a crucial stage. The nature of allegations and the manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed require thorough investigation, including identification of the persons involved, source of transportation, procurement and disposal network and other surrounding circumstances.

8. The fact that four other similar cases are stated to be pending against the petitioner also disentitles him from seeking discretionary relief from this Court. Grant of anticipatory bail in such like offences may adversely affect the investigation and there exists every possibility of the petitioner influencing the witnesses or hampering the ongoing investigation.



9. Considering the gravity and seriousness of the allegations, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

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

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

15.05.2026

neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No