IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.5488 of 2026
------

1. Md. Masoom @ Masoom Quraishi, S/o – Md. Anwar Quraishi @ Mati Quraishi @ Mohammad Anwar Kuraishi, Age – 24 years, R/o Quraishi Mohalla, Doranda, P.O. + P.S. – Doranda, Dist.- Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. Md. Anwar Quraishi @ Mati Quraishi @ Mohammad Anwar Kuraishi, Aged about 52 years, S/o – Late Bangali Quraishi @ Mohammad Amirullah Kuraishi, R/o – Kuraishi Mohalla, P.O. + P.S. – Doranda, Dist. – Ranchi, Jharkhand.

.... …. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners : Mr. Rahul Pandey, Advocate
Mr. Dilip Kr. Saw, Advocate
For the State : Md. Fahad Allam, Addl.P.P.

Order No:-02 Dated:-30-09-2026

Heard the parties.

Apprehending their arrest in connection with Doranda P.S. Case No.162 of 2026 registered under Sections 317(5), 3(5) of the B.N.S. 2023 and 11(1)(d)(e) of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and Sections 12(1)(3), 13 of the Jharkhand Bovine Animals (Prohibition of Slaughter) Act, 2005, the petitioners have moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners were escorting the Xylo Car in which the bovine animals were being taken for their illegal slaughter. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioners is false. It is then submitted that except the confessional statement of the co-accused, there is no other material in the record to

implicate the petitioners in this case. It is also submitted that the petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-15 of the instant Anticipatory Bail Application. It is further submitted that the petitioners are ready and willing to co-operate with the investigation of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the State on the other hand opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioners of being the owner of the bovine animals which were being transported for their illegal slaughter, hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required during the investigation of the case to find out the details of the case. It is lastly submitted that the petitioners ought not to be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioners and the requirement of their custodial interrogation during the investigation of the case, this Court is not inclined to give the privileges of anticipatory bail to the above-named petitioners.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the above-named petitioners is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated:-30.09.2026
Saroj/