HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 10827 of 2026

Ahsan @ Bhura

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Ajay Sengar
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.0025 of 2025, under Sections 325 of the B.N.S., 11(1)(d) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and 3/5/8 of the U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955, P.S.- Kadora, District- Jalaun, 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 has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegation in the FIR is that the Forest Inspector along with his driver was patrolling in an official vehicle when he saw five people walking together, one of whom was carrying a plastic sack and on the informant inquiring from the five persons concerned, they supposedly ran away from the spot after throwing the plastic sack on the ground. The said sack supposedly contained 18 to 20 KGs of meat. The police also recovered four motorcycles from the spot, one of whom allegedly belonged to the applicant. Learned counsel for the applicant has contended that initially the FIR was lodged under Section 325 BNS and Section 11(1)(d) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960. Later, allegedly on the basis of some forensic report, the meat in question was found to be that of cow or its progeny and Sections 3/5/8 of the U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter

Act, 1955 were also added. Learned counsel has stated that except the fact that the applicant was the owner of one of the motorcycles supposedly left behind by the fleeing accused, there is no other direct evidence against the applicant. The applicant has no criminal history.

4. Learned AGA has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail but does not dispute the factual submissions made by the Learned counsel for the applicant.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the Learned counsels for the parties.

6. Out of the five people supposedly walking together, only one was carrying the alleged plastic sack in which meat was recovered. The identities of the five persons were not known and the only material that appears against the applicant is of being the owner of one motorcycle bearing Registration No. UP 92 AF 8236. In the *prima facie* opinion of the Court, solely on the basis of this material, it cannot be presumed that the applicant was involved in cow slaughter. The applicant has no criminal antecedents.

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 **Ahsan @ Bhura,** 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.

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)

October 24, 2026
Sachin

Digitally signed by :-
SACHIN TIWARI
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad