SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010200802026 **ABA/461/2026** Irshad Alias Bala --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.** Mr. Faizan Ali, learned counsel for the applicant. 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.222 of 2026, under Sections 3, 5 and 11(1) of Uttarakhand Protection for Cow Progeny Act, 2007 and 3/11(1) of Prevention of Cruelty upon Animals Act, Police Station Piran Kaliyar, 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. 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 Taukir, who was arrested at the spot. The said statement of the co-accused cannot be read as evidence against the

			applicant and same is not admissible as evidence under Indian Evidence Act. 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 15.10.2026 passed by the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Roorkee, District Haridwar, rejecting the applicant's anticipatory bail application. He would further submit that there are two other cases registered against the applicant out of which one is similar in nature. 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