
Anil Vs State Of Uttarakhand

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 677 Of 2024

Court: Uttarakhand High Court

Date of Decision: Nov. 28, 2024

Acts Referred:

Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 " Sections 9, 39(3), 51

Hon'ble Judges: Ravindra Maithani, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Neeti Rana, Pankaj Joshi

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

Ravindra Maithani, J

1. Applicant seeks anticipatory bail in R.C. No.8/ Lachhiwala/2024-25, under Sections 9, 39 (3) & 51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, Police

Station Range Lachhiwala, District Dehradun.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

3. It is argued that merely based on the confessional statement of the co-accused, the applicant has been implicated.

4. Learned State Counsel would submit that meat of Sambhar (Deer) was recovered from the co-accused. He revealed that applicant was also

involved in the case.

5. Having considered the entirety of facts, this Court is of the view that it is a fit case for anticipatory bail. The instant anticipatory bail application

deserves to be allowed.

6. The anticipatory bail application is allowed.

7. In the eventuality of arrest, the applicant shall be enlarged on bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond with two sureties, each in the like

amount, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer (आफ़ीस). In addition to it, the applicant shall also comply with the following conditions:

(i) The applicant shall co-operate with the investigation.

(ii) He shall not approach any witness in any manner, whatsoever.

(iii) He shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned court.

(iv) The applicant shall deposit his passport with the AO. The passport may only be returned by the order of the court concerned.
In case, the

applicant does not have passport, he shall give an undertaking to that effect to the AO.

(v) The applicant shall also give an undertaking on (i), (ii) & (iii) above.