

**(AFR)(Reserved)**

**Court No. - 23**

**Case :- BAIL No. - 9113 of 2015**

**Applicant :- Imtiyaz**

**Opposite Party :- State Of U.P.**

**Counsel for Applicant :- Sumit K. Srivastava**

**Counsel for Opposite Party :- Govt.Advocate**

**(With)**

**Case :- BAIL No. - 9310 of 2015**

**Applicant :- Gaus Mohammad**

**Opposite Party :- State Of U.P.**

**Counsel for Applicant :- Gulam Rabbani**

**Counsel for Opposite Party :- Govt.Advocate**

**(With)**

**Case :- BAIL No. - 9291 of 2015**

**Applicant :- Vikki @ Khalilurrahman And Another**

**Opposite Party :- The State Of U.P.**

**Counsel for Applicant :- Rajiva Dubey**

**Counsel for Opposite Party :- Govt.Advocate**

**(With)**

**Case :- BAIL No. - 9299 of 2015**

**Applicant :- Suresh Kumar And Others**

**Opposite Party :- State Of U.P.Thru Prin. Secy. Home, Civil Sec.,  
Lucknow**

**Counsel for Applicant :- Abdul Fazal Jaffrey**

**Counsel for Opposite Party :- Govt.Advocate**

**(With)**

**Case :- BAIL No. - 9275 of 2015**

**Applicant :- Rasheed**

**Opposite Party :- State Of U.P.**

**Counsel for Applicant :- Dharendra Pratap Singh**

**Counsel for Opposite Party :- Govt.Advocate**

**(With)**

**Case :- BAIL No. - 8927 of 2015**

**Applicant :- Lukman**

**Opposite Party :- State Of U.P.**

**Counsel for Applicant :- Prateek Kumar Srivastava**

**Counsel for Opposite Party :- Govt. Advocate**

**(With)**

**Case :- BAIL No. - 9211 of 2015**

**Applicant :- Noorul Hasan**

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Sunil Kumar Singh  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt.Advocate  
**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9204 of 2015  
**Applicant :-** Rukshad  
**Opposite Party :-** The State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Nadeem Murtaza  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt.Advocate  
**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9148 of 2015  
**Applicant :-** Anvar  
**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Ramakar Shukla  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt.Advocate  
**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9119 of 2015  
**Applicant :-** Natay Yadav  
**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Mayank Pandey  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt.Advocate  
**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10294 of 2015  
**Applicant :-** Jabir Mansoori  
**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Jalaj Kumar Gupta  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt.Advocate  
**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10284 of 2015  
**Applicant :-** Ali Ahmad  
**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Abdul Samad  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt.Advocate  
**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9469 of 2015  
**Applicant :-** Sonu @ Pradeep Kumar  
**Opposite Party :-** The State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Rajwant Singh  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt.Advocate  
**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10051 of 2015  
**Applicant :-** Gulpham  
**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Rajiv Kumar Bajpai  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9370 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Mobin

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Rajiv Kumar Bajpai, Ajay Singh, Sunita Misra

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9993 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Masooq Ali And Another

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Bajhul Quamar Siddiqui

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10806 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Sartaj

**Opposite Party :-** The State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Kuldeep Kumar Awasthi, Azmi Yousuf

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9783 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Akeel

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Rajneesh Dixit, Manoj Kumar Misra

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10881 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Faheem

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Alok Kumar Mishra

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10901 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Paale

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Jalaj Kumar Gupta

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10900 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Chhotann @ Kale @ Kallu

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.  
**Counsel for Applicant :-** Jalaj Kumar Gupta  
**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 10922 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Usman

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Suresh Kumar Upadhyay

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**(With)**

**Case :-** BAIL No. - 9913 of 2015

**Applicant :-** Ram Singh

**Opposite Party :-** State Of U.P.

**Counsel for Applicant :-** Mohd. Ayub

**Counsel for Opposite Party :-** Govt. Advocate

**Hon'ble Sudhir Kumar Saxena,J.**

1. This batch of bail applications has been filed seeking release of the accused persons challaned mainly under the Uttar Pradesh Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955 ('Act' in short).
2. Smt. Madhulika Yadav, learned Additional Government Advocate has strongly opposed the bail and contended that cow slaughtering leads to acrimony between various groups of society. It has also resulted into riot like situations which poses serious problem for law and order before the State. She further submitted that due to above reason, State had to apply U.P. Gangster Act against some of the applicants. She has placed the provisions of U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955, Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, U.P. Goshala Adhiniyam, 1964 and U.P. Go-Sewa Ayog Adhiniyam, 1999, apart from some judgments in support of her arguments.
3. On the other hand, counsels appearing for accused persons, namely, Messers Sumit K. Srivastava, Rajiva Dubey,

Nadeem Murtaza, Abdul Samad, Dhirendra Pratap Singh, have emphasized that applicants have been falsely implicated. In fact, Act is being misused against innocent persons. Their submission is that whenever any meat is recovered, it is normally shown as cow meat (beef) without getting it examined or analyzed by the Forensic Laboratory. In most of the cases, meat is not sent for analysis. Accused persons continue in jail for an offence that may not have been committed at all and which is triable by Magistrate Ist Class, having maximum sentence upto 7 years.

4. It is further submitted that whenever cows are shown to be recovered, no proper recovery memo is prepared and one does not know where cows go after recovery.
5. It is further argued that Goshalas do not accept the non-milching cows or old cows and they are left to wander on the roads. Similarly, owner of the cows after milking, leave the cows to roam on roads, to drink drainage/sewer water and eat garbage, polythene etc. Moreover, cows and cattle on the road are menace to the traffic and number of deaths have been reported due to them. In the rural areas cattle owners who are unable to feed their live stock, abandon them. They cannot be transported outside the State for fear of locals and police. There are no pastures now. Thus, these animals wander here and there destroying the crops. Earlier, farmers were afraid of 'Neelgai' (Vanroj an antelope) now they have to save their crops from the stray cows. Whether cows are on roads or on fields their abandonment stands to adversely affect the society in a big way. Some way out has to be found out to keep them either in the cow shelters or with the owners; if Cow slaughter Act is to be implemented in letter and spirit.

6. Sri Udai Raj Singh, Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Lucknow, Director Animal Husbandry, Sri Anoop Yadav Director, Mandi Parishad, U.P. and Registrar, Goshala Ayog have assisted the Court.
7. It was informed by Registrar of the Goshala Ayog that the Ayog has come into being and it will take care of street cows found wandering here and there.
8. Sri Udai Raj Singh, Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Lucknow has expressed his difficulty in catching the cattle on road owing to opposition by locals and non availability of police force.
9. Director, Mandi Parishad, Sri Anoop Yadav informs the Court that in exercise of the power under Section 19 of the U.P. Krishi Utpadan Mandi Adhiniyam, 1964, one percent of total income of Mandi Samitis (specified) is marked for Goshalas, but rampant misuse of funds has been reported.
10. Needless to say that Article 48 of the Constitution of India enjoins the State Government to organize animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and, in particular, to take steps for preserving and improving the breeds, and prohibiting the slaughter of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle.
11. Articles 48, 48-A and 51-A(g) (relevant clause) of the Constitution are reproduced below:  
  
"48. Organisation of agriculture and animal husbandry. The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall, in particular, take steps for preserving and improving the breeds, and prohibiting the slaughter, of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle.  
  
48-A. Protection and improvement of environment and

safeguarding of forests and wild life. The State shall endeavour to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wild life of the country.

51-A. Fundamental duties. It shall be the duty of every citizen of India

(g) to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wild life, and to have compassion for living creatures;"

12. His Lordships of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Gujrat Vs. Mirzapur Moti Kureshi Kassab Jamat and others** reported in [(2005) 8 SCC 534] while considering the scope of Article 48 of the Constitution of India have held that even after a milch cattle ceases to produce milk and a draught cattle loses its utility and rendered useless on account of injury or sickness would not take them out of the purview of Article 48. Relevant paragraph nos. 66, 67 and 68 of the judgment are being reproduced below:

“66. Any other meaning assigned to this expression is likely to result in absurdity. A milch cattle goes through a life cycle during which it is sometimes milch and sometimes it becomes dry. This does not mean that as soon as a milch cattle ceases to produce milk, for a short period as a part of its life cycle, it goes out of the purview of Article 48, and can be slaughtered. A draught cattle may lose its utility on account of injury or sickness and may be rendered useless as a draught cattle during that period. This would not mean that if a draught cattle ceases to be of utility for a short period on account of sickness or injury, it is excluded from the definition of 'draught cattle' and deprived of the benefit of Article 48.

67. This reasoning is further strengthened by Article 51A(g) of the Constitution. The State and every citizen of India must have compassion for living creatures. Compassion, according to Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary means "a strong feeling of sympathy for those who are suffering and a desire to help them". According to Chambers 20th Century Dictionary,

compassion is "fellow feeling, or sorrow for the sufferings of another : pity". Compassion is suggestive of sentiments, a soft feeling, emotions arising out of sympathy, pity and kindness. The concept of compassion for living creatures enshrined in Article 51A(g) is based on the background of the rich cultural heritage of India the land of Mahatama Gandhi, Vinobha, Mahaveer, Budha, Nanak and others. No religion or holy book in any part of the world teaches or encourages cruelty. Indian society is a pluralistic society. It has unity in diversity. The religions, cultures and people may be diverse, yet all speak in one voice that cruelty to any living creature must be curbed and ceased. A cattle which has served human beings is entitled to compassion in its old age when it has ceased to be milch or draught and becomes so-called 'useless'. It will be an act of reprehensible ingratitude to condemn a cattle in its old age as useless and send it to a slaughter house taking away the little time from its natural life that it would have lived, forgetting its service for the major part of its life, for which it had remained milch or draught. We have to remember : the weak and meek need more of protection and compassion.

68. In our opinion, the expression 'milch or draught cattle' as employed in Article 48 of the Constitution is a description of a classification or species of cattle as distinct from cattle which by their nature are not milch or draught and the said words do not include milch or draught cattle, which on account of age or disability, cease to be functional for those purposes either temporarily or permanently. The said words take colour from the preceding words "cows or calves". A specie of cattle which is milch or draught for a number of years during its span of life is to be included within the said expression. On ceasing to be milch or draught it cannot be pulled out from the category of "other milch and draught cattle."

13. Taking resort to entry 15 of list-II Schedule VII of Constitution of India, State Government has enacted the Uttar Pradesh Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955. Purpose is to prohibit and prevent the slaughter of cow and its progeny, as culled out from preamble.

14. Section 3 of the Act is being reproduced below:

**“3. Prohibition of Cow Slaughter-** No person shall slaughter or cause to be slaughtered, or offer or cause to be offered for slaughter, a cow, bull or bullock in any place in Uttar Pradesh, anything contained in any other law for the time being in force or any usage or custom, to the contrary notwithstanding.”

15. It placed prohibition on slaughtering of cows in Uttar Pradesh, with Section 4 providing exception for cows suffering from any contagious/infectious disease or subjected to experimentation in the interest of medical and public health research. However, Section 4 of the Act has been omitted by U.P. Act No. 14 of 2002 dated 12.09.2002.

16. Section 5 of the Act prohibits sale and transport of beef or beef products except for medicinal purpose. Section 5-A regulates transport of cows etc..

17. It is, thus, apparent that there is absolute prohibition on the slaughtering of cows, transportation or sale for the purpose of slaughtering.

18. Section 7 of the Act obligates Goshala to accept cow, bull or bullock, surrendered by its owner but quoting non availability of accommodation, old and infirm cows/progeny are seldom accepted. Section 7 of the Act is being reproduced below:

**“7. Maintenance of cows, etc-**

(1) Any person may surrender his cow, bull or bullock to a Goshala or an institution which shall accept such cow, bull or bullock according to the availability of accommodation. Any cow, bull or bullock so surrendered shall not be returned to such person.

(2) The state Government may make such other alternative and additional arrangements for taking care of such cows, bull or bullocks as it may deem necessary.

(3) Any Goshala or any institution may receive any cow, bull or bullock for custody from police or any other person which may be released to the owner on such terms and conditions and in such manner and on payment of such charges as may be prescribed.”

19. Submission at bar is that old or infirm cows become liability as it has become difficult for owners to afford the fodder for them, that is why either cattle is left unattended, abandoned or sold for petty amount, willingly or knowingly sending them to slaughter houses. More so because Goshalas are reluctant to take such cows quoting scarcity of fund/space.

20. Sri Anoop Yadav, Director Mandi Parishad has stated that he would release the requisite fund for Goshala on the proposal made by Department of Animal Husbandry subject to completion of certain formalities like utility certificate etc.

21. Mandi Parishad is giving funds for maintenance of Goshalas. It is competent to put such conditions as are deemed by Board to be proper and to authorize someone to oversee whether fund is being properly utilized or not and that cows are also placed in a good condition. Such Goshalas would not refuse entry to any cow or its progeny whether animal is old, infirm or non-milching. Mandi Parishad would be justified in withholding the funds if it is found that either Goshala are refusing to take above mentioned animals or misusing the fund, apart from taking such other penal actions as may be permissible under law.

22. Director, Mandi Parishad states that if necessary, resolution in this regard may be passed in its next meeting.

23. Submission that old, ill, infirm or non-milching cows can be slaughtered, does not appear to be correct and Section 11 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 does not

come in contradiction to U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955, an special enactment for State.

24.It is settled that cow and her progeny constitute the backbone of Indian agriculture and economy. The increasing adoption of non-conventional energy sources like Bio-gas plants justify the need for bulls and bullocks to live their full life in spite of their having ceased to be useful for the purpose of breeding and draught. Thus, protection of cow/progeny is needed in the interest of Nation's economy. Majority of the population is engaged in farming within which a substantial proportion belong to small and marginal farmers category. Protection of cow/progeny will help them in carrying out their several agricultural operations and related activities smoothly and conveniently. Organic manure would help in controlling pests and acidification of land apart from resuscitating and stimulating the environment as a whole. Moreover, cattle who have served the owner throughout its life cannot be left unattended for slaughter by the owner. **(State of Gujrat Vs. Mirzapur Moti Kureshi Kassab Jamat and others) (supra).**

25.This Court is approaching these matters strictly from the point of view of administration of justice, which contemplates that a law enacted validly should be enforced in toto. U.P. Act places a total ban on slaughtering. However, the problem of farmers who are unable to feed cows etc. is equally important to visualize.

26.The contention that it has become difficult for peasants to sustain cows breeding and rearing due to high prices of fodder, needs a serious consideration. Booking violators under the Act and punishing them will not help the situation. Instead of treating symptoms, effort should be to cure the

disease itself.

27. It was submitted at the bar that cow urine, having medicinal value, is selling in packed bottles. Similarly, cow dung which is said to be used for hygienic purpose in the houses, is capable of producing bio-gas and fuel gas which comes cheaper than the LPG. Cow dung is invariably used to prepare manures obviating the need of chemicals/fertilizers.

28. Submission of Registrar, Goshala Ayog is that cows may be developed as assets instead of liability. Reference was made by Registrar to Goshalas maintained at Kanpur, Hardwar etc. where rearing of cows and bullocks has become profitable. It was suggested that Goshala Ayog will develop a mechanism whereunder cow rearing be made profitable and owner does not have to sell them because of growing expenditure in maintaining them. Unless cow rearing is made a profitable venture and cows/progeny become, an asset, violation of Act would remain unabated notwithstanding any amount of policing.

29. Uttar Pradesh Goshala Ayog has been constituted under the Uttar Pradesh Go-Sewa Ayog Adhiniyam, 1999. This is statutory Commission. Under Section 11 of the Adhiniyam, functions and powers of Ayog have been prescribed. Relevant Clauses of Section 11 are being reproduced below:

“(ii) work for the welfare of cow in the State;

(iii) work for the scientific use of drug and urine of cow so as to enhance their utility in the sphere of agriculture including soil fertility and domestic use;

(iv) work for promotion of and assistance of Goshalas;

(v) activate defunct Goshalas;

(vi) in addition to, and not in derogation of, of provisions of Uttar Pradesh Goshala Adhiniyam, 1964 assist in the working and functioning of the Goshalas,

established and run by the voluntary organization, for the purposes of providing financial assistance, training in the field of scientific rearing of various breeds of cows as also for the proper utilization of drug and urine of the cow for agriculture and domestic use, including propagation and use of bio-gas plant based on dung of cow;

(vii) exercise supervision over Goshalas to check malafide diversion of funds provided by the Ayog or the Government and the property belonging to the Goshalas and other voluntary organization and bring to the notice of the Government specific instances for appropriate action;

(x) educate, campaign and make people aware about the economic benefits which can be derived out of cow;

(xiv) promote Schemes to encourage use of organic manure and recommend to Government suitable measure including incentive Schemes for use of dung or urine of cow as organic manure and pesticides by farmers to minimize the use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides and encourage manufacturing and use of recently developed bullock driven agricultural implements and carts;

(xvi) take into custody the abandoned, stray, rescued, confiscated or seized cows for the concerned local bodies, other competent authority or courts after due authorization in accordance with law for the time being enforced and maintain them or get them maintained properly;”

30. It is, thus, apparent that Goshala Ayog has been obligated to develop a mechanism where cow dung and cow urine are put to a profitable use.

31. Moreover, State Government needs to be reminded of its duty envisaged under Section 7(2) of the U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act. If adequate alternative and additional arrangements are made for taking care of unattended/abandoned cows, bulls and bullocks e.g. setting up Goshalas/Cow Shelters in sufficient numbers then alone

purpose of the Act can be achieved.

32. Here comes the duty of State Government to make alternative and additional arrangements like setting up Goshalas/cow shelters in adequate number so as to prevent them from reaching out on roads, fields and destroying crops apart from obstructing traffic. Furthermore, cow urine and cow dung be made profitable so that cattle owners do not feel any pinch in maintaining them rather they become a source of income. State Government would do well to set up substantial number of Goshadan and Goshalas itself or with the help of NGOs. Mandi Parishad would support them financially so as to make them sustainable.

33. Goshala Ayog with the help of Animal Husbandry Department will engage NGOs in order to make cow urine and cow dung profitable. Enactment of law without making mechanism for its observance would remain a futile exercise.

34. Court in these proceeding is refraining from issuing any direction to State in this regard and matter is left to the wisdom of State Government, Mandi Parishad, Department of Animal Husbandry, Goshala Ayog and its officers.

35. There is no reason why the menace of cow slaughtering would not remain unaddressed if State Government and Goshala Ayog perform their duties prescribed under Section 7(2) of U.P. Cow Slaughter Act and Section 11 of U.P. Go-Sewa Adhiniyam, 1999. Court is not unmindful of the difficulty likely to be faced in taking up all the steps immediately. Registrar of Go-Sewa Ayog assures to take up task in phased manner.

36. Goshala Ayog should prepare a plan at micro and macro

level to help the cow owners so that cow dung or cow urine is utilized and marketed making it a profitable job. These are the issues to be better addressed by the Goshala Ayog and Department of Animal Husbandry.

37. It is hoped that the officers who have appeared in the Court and have given assurance, would galvanize the machinery and implement the suggestions in right spirit.

38. So far as cows and cattle roaming on roads are concerned, it is duty of Nagar Nigam and Police to remove them and to ensure that no cows or animals come on road creating obstruction to traffic and threat to life.

39. Secretary, Nagar Vikas, State of U.P. is directed to issue necessary instructions in this regard to Nagar Ayukts/Executive Officers of local bodies. If animals are spotted on city roads and not removed quickly, proper action may be contemplated. Superintendents of Police are directed to extend necessary assistance to the Municipal Boards/Municipal Corporations in carrying out the above directions.

40. Cattle owners cannot be seen withholding their hands, to leave the cattle on road surviving on water of drains/sewer and garbage which is definitely a cruelty. As such, owners of such animals should be prosecuted under the provisions of The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, Police Act and Sections 289, 428, 429 I.P.C. as well. This will deter cattle owner from frequently leaving animals free on roads, putting their as well as citizens' life in danger.

41. Cows basking on road/traffic islands and digging polythene in garbage yard is not a pleasant sight, especially in the capital city of State. To rid Lucknow of this menace, Nagar

Ayukta, Lucknow is directed to launch a drive immediately in the light of discussion made above, with the help of police force to be provided by S.S.P.

42. So far as prayer for bail is concerned, since offence under the Act is triable by Magistrate Ist Class and maximum sentence provided is 7 years imprisonment, this Court finds all the applicants entitled to bail. In some cases some Sections of I.P.C. have been added, but major offences mentioned in the F.I.R. are Section 3/5/8 of U.P. Cow Slaughter Act.

43. Consequently, all the above-noted bail applications are allowed.

44. Applicant-Imtiyaz involved in Case Crime No. 121 of 2015, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 323, 504, 506, 332, 353, 186, 224, 225 I.P.C., Section 3/5/8 of U.P. Prevention of Cow Slaughter Act, 1955, Section 11 of Prevention of Animal Cruelty Act and Section 7 Criminal Law Amendment Act, Police Station Udaipur, District Pratapgarh, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond with two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

45. Copy of this order will be sent to Agriculture Production Commissioner, Uttar Pradesh, Secretary, Nagar Vikas, D.G.P. and Registrar, Go-Sewa Ayog, Uttar Pradesh for necessary action.

46. Copy of this order will be placed in all the files. Individual orders are being passed in respective bail applications, mentioned above.

**Order Date :-04/12/2015**

kkv/