



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

\*\*\*\*

104

CRM-M-72360-2025

Date of Decision : 19.01.2026

NOOR MOHAMMAD

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF U.T CHANDIGARH

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present: Mr. Jasbir Singh Dadwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Arora, Additional Public Prosecutor  
for the respondent-UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. Devinder Rajput, Advocate and  
Mr. Sushant Gupta, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 BNSS, has been filed by petitioner, an accused in case bearing FIR No.106 dated 19.07.2025, registered against him at Police Station Sector 34, Chandigarh, for the commission of offences punishable u/s 299 BNS (Section 8 of Punjab Prohibition of Cow Slaughter Act, 155 added later on).

2. Relevant facts as can be inferred from the documents on record are noticed hereinbelow:-

*Amit Sharma, son of Rajinder Sharma, President of Gau Raksha Dal, set the criminal law in motion by filing a complaint pointing therein that he along with other persons, who are residents of Village Burail, Chandigarh received an*



information that Noor Mohammad (present petitioner), son of Mohmood, r/o House No.673, Sector 45-C, Burial, Chandigarh is supplying 'Beef' on Aactiva bearing registration No. CH01-CK-1142. Immediately thereafter, he (C) along with others rushed to the disclosed site where they noticed petitioner standing in front of shop of Sahib Traders. Aactiva, as disclosed by secret informant, was also parked near the petitioner. It is the case of prosecution that 50 kgs of Beef was found in the said vehicle. Complainant further pointed out that 'Cow' is a sacred animal of Hindu Community, their religious sentiments are attached to it and that this misdeed on the part of petitioner has hurt their feelings. Immediately, after the police received the information they arrived at the spot. The person, who was found standing next to 'Aactiva' introduced himself as Noor Mohammad (petitioner), son of Mohmood. When questioned, petitioner came up with the plea that it was a Buffalo meat and that he had purchased the same against two bills allegedly issued by CML, Buffalo Calf Meat (Regd. Govt. of India) B-10/772, Ward No.10, Kamal Cinema Raod, Malerkotla, District Sangrur (Punjab) and Shop No.2, Meat Market, Saharanpur (U.P.).

Initially, a case u/s 299 BNS was registered vide FIR No.106 dated 19.07.2025 against the petitioner, who was granted the concession of bail. Sample of the meat was taken into possession by the police authorities, which was sent to National Meat Research Institute Chengicherla, Hyderabad. As per report, the meat was identified as "Bos indicus (Bull/Ox)". Thereafter, Section 8 of the Punjab Prohibition of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955, was added. Petitioner was again served with a notice but he did not join the investigations.

3. Apprehending his arrest, present petitioner had moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail. The same was dismissed by the learned Additional



Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, in terms of order dated 15.12.2025. Aggrieved of which, the present petition has been filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner, aged about 62 years, has been falsely implicated in the present case. He (P) was under the genuine impression that the meat purchased by him (vide two receipts referred above) was that of 'Buffalo'. The sellers did not disclose that it was Beef. Relying totally upon their assurance, he had purchased the same.

The next leg of submission raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the incident did not occur as portrayed by prosecution. In fact, one Noni, resident of Sector 45-C, Chandigarh and his companion are habitual of collecting money from street vendors. These two persons demanded money from petitioner, when he refused, he was falsely implicated in the present case by levelling baseless allegations.

Learned counsel further submits that since nothing is to recovered from petitioner, his custodial interrogation is not needed. But being a law abiding citizen, he is nonetheless ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called for by the Investigating Officer. Prayer for allowing the petition has been made.

5. *Per contra*, while opposing the request for grant of anticipatory bail, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent-U.T., Chandigarh accompanied by learned counsel for the complainant contend that the plea taken by petitioner that he had purchased the meat under the genuine impression that it was not Beef, deserves not to be taken note of, for it cannot be presumed that both the sellers from Malerkotla and Saharanpur would mislead petitioner. This plea is



nothing but a last-minute effort on the part of the petitioner to wriggle-out of the embarrassing position in which he has placed.

Learned counsels next contend that ‘Cow’ holds a sacred and revered place in the Hindu religion and Indian culture. Petitioner by indulging in these acts has hurt the religious sentiments of the Hindu community. It is further the submission of learned counsel that petitioner in fact belongs to a gang of persons, who are habitual of selling Beef. Thus, the custodial interrogation of petitioner is needed to find out as to who all are involved in this racket, who are the suppliers, how the Beef is being sold despite statutory prohibition. If not checked, the misdeeds on the part of the petitioner can pose a threat to public order and communal harmony. With these submissions, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.

7. Before expressing any opinion on the submissions raised by learned counsel of the parties, it would be appropriate to refer to the judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court in “***Nikita Jagganath Shetty @ Nikita Vishwajeet Jadhav vs. The State of Maharashtra and another***” (2025 AIR SC 3375), wherein it has been held that *Anticipatory bail is an exceptional remedy and ought not to be granted in a routine manner.*”

Factual aspects leading to the lodging of the FIR have already been noticed in para 2 of this order. Initially, when petitioner was caught, he produced two bills issued by (CML, Buffalo Calf Meat (Regd. Govt. of India) B-10/772, Ward No.10, Kamal Cinema Raod, Malerkotla, District Sangrur, Punjab and Shop No.2, Meat Market, Saharanpur, U.P.), taking the plea that he had obtained



Buffalo meat. However, when the sample was sent to National Meat Research Institute Chengicherla, Hyderabad, it was opined by the experts that the meat was that of ‘*Bull/Ox*’. The plea now taken by petitioner is that he was misled by the sellers, who had allegedly disclosed him that the meat was not Beef is clever ploy and an afterthought, which does not deserve to be taken note of. Resultantly, the Court is of the opinion that the custodial interrogation of petitioner is needed to find out, who all are involved in this incident, where are the Cows slaughtered, how their meat is sold, who all are the purchasers etc., hence, the petitioner has not been able to make out a case of exceptional depravity/hardship in his favour, entitling him for the grant of this extra ordinary relief of pre-arrest bail.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)  
JUDGE

19.01.2026  
Nisha Yadav

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |