SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			ABA/475/2026 Salman --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Mohd. Safdar, learned counsel for the petitioner. Ms. Sweta Badola Dobhal, learned Brief Holder for the State of Utttarakhand. 2. The applicant, Salman, seeks anticipatory bail in connection with Case Crime No. 1081 of 2026, registered under Sections 3 read with Sections 5 and 11 of the Uttarakhand Protection of Cow Progeny Act, 2007, at Police Station Laksar, District Haridwar. 3. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. 4. According to the prosecution, on 18.10.2026, an F.I.R. was lodged by a Sub-Inspector of Police alleging that, upon receiving information from an informer regarding the slaughtering of cattle in the sugarcane field belonging to Gufran, situated behind Kunjal Imam Academy, the police party conducted a raid at the said place. However, all three accused persons managed to flee from the spot. During the search, approximately 150 kilograms of beef and equipment allegedly used for slaughtering were recovered from the spot. 5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the prosecution story is highly

			improbable. It is submitted that the police party allegedly identified the applicant from a distance of approximately 40 metres. It is further contended that the prosecution has alleged that the applicant fled from the spot immediately after the complainant's mobile phone rang, which makes the prosecution version doubtful. There is also a delay of approximately six hours in lodging the F.I.R. Further, no independent witness was associated with the alleged recovery, thereby casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. No specific weapon, implement or incriminating article is alleged to have been recovered from the personal possession of the applicant. Furthermore, the alleged place of recovery is an open place and does not belong to the applicant. 6. Learned State Counsel has opposed the anticipatory bail application. 7. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court is of the opinion that the applicant has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application deserves to be allowed. 8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is allowed. 9. In the event of arrest, the applicant shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) along with two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions: (i) The applicant shall cooperate with the investigation and shall make himself available for interrogation as and when required by the Investigating Officer.

			(ii) The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any witness or victim acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade such person from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer. (iii) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the competent Court. (iv) The applicant shall surrender his passport before the Investigating Officer. The passport shall be released only pursuant to an order passed by the Court concerned. In case the applicant does not possess a passport, he shall furnish an undertaking to this effect before the Investigating Officer. **(Alok Mahra, J.)** 21-11-2026 SB