


SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	<p style="text-align: right;">COURT'S OR JUDGES'S</p>  <p style="text-align: right;">2026:UHC:3869</p>
			<p><u>BA1 No 820 of 2026</u> Mohd. ShahjadApplicant Vs. State of UttarakhandRespondent <u>Hon'ble Ashish Naithani, J.</u> Mr. Gaurav Singh, learned counsel for the Applicant.</p> <p>2. Mr. Vikash Uniyal, learned A.G.A. for the State of Uttarakhand.</p> <p>3. The present Bail Application has been moved by the Applicant—Mohd. Shahjad, S/o Mohd. Dilshad, R/o Mohalla Kila Kasba Manglaur, Police Station Kotwali Manglaur, District Haridwar, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 30 of 2026, registered at Police Station Kotwali Manglaur, District Haridwar, for offences punishable under Sections 3/5/11 of the Uttarakhand Protection of Cow Progeny Act, 2007.</p> <p>4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.</p> <p>5. Learned counsel for the Applicant, while pressing the bail application, submitted that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and is in judicial custody since 05.05.2026. It is further submitted that the Applicant was not present at the alleged place of occurrence at the relevant time and has no concern whatsoever with the alleged incident. It is contended that the Applicant neither slaughtered any cow progeny nor participated in any such alleged act and his implication is solely based on a concocted and unsubstantiated story. It is further submitted that the name of the present Applicant surfaced only in the alleged disclosure statement of co-accused Shakeel recorded by the police while in custody, which is inadmissible in evidence and carries no evidentiary value in the eyes of law. Learned counsel further</p>

submitted that no incriminating article has been recovered from the possession or at the instance of the present Applicant and there is no direct evidence against him. It is also contended that no independent public witness was associated at the time of the alleged raid or recovery. Furthermore, co-accused persons, namely Tasleem alias Arif and Shakeel, have already been released on bail.

6. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposed the bail application.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that no recovery has been made from the possession or at the instance of the present Applicant and his name appears to have surfaced only in the disclosure statement of the co-accused. This Court further finds that the co-accused having a similar role have already been enlarged on bail. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the Applicant has been able to make out a fit case for grant of bail.

8. Accordingly, the Bail Application is allowed.

9. Let the Applicant be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond and two reliable sureties, each in the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

10. It is made clear that any observation made hereinabove is only for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

11. All pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Ashish Naithani, J.)

19.05.2026

Shiksha

--	--	--	--