SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010200692026 **ABA/459/2026** Mursaleen --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.** Mr. Mohd. Safdar, learned counsel for the appellant. 2. Mr. Tumul Nainwal, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. By means of the present Anticipatory Bail Application, the applicant is seeking anticipatory bail in Case Crime No.349 of 2026, under Sections 3, 5, 11 of Uttarakhand Protection for Cow Progeny Act, 2007, Police Station Kotwali Ranipur, District Haridwar. 4. Learned counsel for the applicant, while drawing the attention of the Court to the FIR, would submit that the applicant has no concern with the alleged recovery and that no arrest was made at the spot. He would further submit that there is a delay of approximately 5½ hours in lodging the FIR. 5. He would further submit that a perusal of the FIR reveals that the applicant has been named therein solely on the basis of the

			statement of co-accused Waseem. Except for the statement of the co-accused, there is no other evidence against the applicant. 6. Per contra, learned State counsel would submit that the name of the applicant was disclosed by the arrested accused. 7. He has also drawn the attention of the Court to the order dated 03.11.2026 passed by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Haridwar, rejecting the applicant's anticipatory bail application. He would further submit that two other cases of a similar nature (Case Crime Nos. 18 of 2013 and 303 of 2020) are registered against the applicant. 8. On this, learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is already on bail in the aforesaid two cases. 9. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, it is apparent that the applicant has been implicated merely on the basis of the disclosure made by the co-accused. No recovery has been effected from the applicant, nor was he arrested at the spot. Further, the applicant is already on bail in the aforesaid two cases. 10. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, but without expressing any opinion on the final merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application deserves to be allowed. 11. The Anticipatory Bail Application is allowed.

			12. In the eventuality of arrest, the applicant shall be enlarged on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/- with two sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer ("IO"). In addition to it, the applicant shall also comply with the following conditions:- (i) The applicant shall co-operate with the investigation. (ii) The applicant shall not approach any witness/victim in any manner, whatsoever. (iii) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned court. (iv) The applicant shall deposit his passport with the Investigating Officer ("IO"). The passport may only be returned by the order of the court concerned. In case the applicant does not have passport, he shall give an undertaking to that effect to the IO. (v) The applicant shall also give an undertaking on (i), (ii) & (iii) above. **(Siddhartha Sah, J.)** 06-11-2026 Akash