2026:AHC:227718

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10121 of 2026

Pravind Kumar Prasad

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ashutosh Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 70

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Heard, Learned counsel for the applicant, the Learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the record.

2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case Crime No. 62 of 2026, under Sections 109(1) of BNS, Section 4/25 of the Arms Act, Sections 3/5-A/5-B/8 of U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955 and Section 11 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, Police Station- Naugarh, District -Chandauli, with a prayer to enlarge him on anticipatory bail as the applicant apprehends his arrest in the above-mentioned case.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that the applicant is named in the FIR, however, is not stated to be the driver of the vehicle in question. It has been alleged that the Bolero Vehicle No. UP 67 C 6861 carrying two animals stated to be cow or its progeny was detained by the police and the driver of the vehicle, in an attempt to escape, caused injuries to two constables, Manoj Kumar and Suresh Kumar. Learned counsel has contended that the cows in question were alive. One chopper and one keypad-based mobile phone were supposedly recovered from the vehicle in question. Other than the fact that the applicant is the registered owner of the vehicle, there is no direct evidence against the applicant. Learned counsel has further submitted that the applicant had already sold the said vehicle to one Bablu Mallah through a notarized sale document on 28.07.2023 and Bablu Mallah has further sold the said vehicle to one Vikas Yadav. The applicant, although had sold the vehicle, but is still recorded as the registered owner of the vehicle, which led to his implication in the present case. Applicant has no criminal history.

4. The Learned A.G.A has filed a compliance affidavit annexing the

outpatient cards of the constables Manoj Kumar and Suresh Kumar and from a perusal of the outpatient cards, no grievous injury or injury which may be considered to be dangerous to life is reflected.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the Learned counsel for the parties and perused the material brought on the record.

6. Other than the fact that the applicant is the registered owner of the vehicle, there is no direct evidence against the applicant. None of the injuries found on the injured can be categorized to be grievous in nature or dangerous to life. The applicant claims that he had sold the vehicle to one Bablu Mallah. No meat or carcass was recovered from the vehicle in question and only live animals stated to be cow or its progeny.

7. Taking into account all the facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I deem it fit to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail.

8. In view of the above, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant is **allowed**.

9. In the event of the arrest of the applicant -**Pravind Kumar Prasad**, he shall be released forthwith in the aforesaid case crime on anticipatory bail on furnishing a personal bond and surety each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Station House Officer of the police station/Court concerned with the following conditions:-

i. the applicant shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

ii. that the applicant shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii. that the applicant shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

iv. that the applicant shall not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness;

10. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the Court concerned shall be at liberty to cancel the bail.

11. It is made clear that observations made hereinabove are exclusively for deciding the instant anticipatory bail application and are not to be considered to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

November 2, 2026
Sartaj

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
SARTAJ AHMAD
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad