

Filed on	25/05/2026
Registered on	25/05/2026
Decided on	04/06/2026
Duration	Y - M - Days
	00- 00- 10

**IN THE COURT OF HON'BLE 3RD ADDITIONAL SESSIONS
JUDGE, PATAN, AT PATAN**

CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION No.403/2026
Exh.10

APPLICANT/ACCUSED:

Keyur Rasiklal Anadkat,
Age: Adult, Occupation : Security Agency,
Residing at Maruti Nagar, 202, Gokul Apartment, Rajkot

V/s.

OPPONENT :

The State of Gujarat

Appearance:

Mr.Y.S.Trivedi	Ld.Advocate for applicant/accused
Mr.R.P.Raval	Ld.PP for opponent/State

-: J U D G M E N T :-

1. Applicant has moved this anticipatory bail application u/s 482 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 [in short BNSS] in connection with Patan City 'B' Division Police Station vide C.R. No.11217020260379 for the offence punishable u/S 308[2], 316[2], 336[2], 336[3], 338, 340[2] of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the FIR are that present applicant/accused has committed the crime of not paying the deposit amount of Rs.91,000/- (Rupees Ninety One Thousand) on the basis of bid on the Government's e-market place GEM Portal, and despite not performing duty as a watchman in the months of January-2026, February-2026 and March-2026, by showing such persons with false names as watchmen, making

bills of such persons with false names and not paying the amount as per the prescribed minimum wage payable to the watchmen, and threatening to dismiss the watchmen from their jobs, by withdrawing a total of Rs.23,500/ and by making false bills and using them as genuine and committed the offence. Therefore, to apprehension of arrest present anticipatory bail application is filed by the applicant/accused.

3. The Ld.Advocate appearing on behalf of the applicant/accused and submits that the applicant is innocent and falsely implicated into the alleged FIR. It is submitted that there is no prima facie case made out against the present applicant. It is submitted that the applicant is the resident of above stated address. Therefore, he is unlikely to run away. The applicant will remain present before the investigating officer and will cooperate the investigation and will abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed upon him while exercising discretion in favour of the applicant. Hence, present applicant/accused has urged to allow present application.

4. The Ld.APP appearing on behalf of the State has opposed the grant of bail to the applicant. The applicant/accused has got contract to provide the watchmen on outsourced for the period from 01/01/2026 to 30/09/2026 for providing the services of 09 (nine) watchmen. The total amount of Rs.18,10,860.86ps. As per the agreement the deposit of Rs.91,000/- has not been paid. Present applicant has not paid the security guard wages as per the minimum wage rate of Contract. It is evident from the complaint and witness statement that bills of different names have been approved in the three months of January, February and March

and despite not performing duty as a watchman in the months of January-2026, February-2026 and March-2026, he has shown such persons with false names as watchmen, made bills of false names, did not pay the amount as per the prescribed minimum wage payable to the watchmen, threatened to dismiss the watchmen from their jobs, and has obtained a total of Rs.23,500/- and has obtained government money by making false bills and using them as genuine, etc. So if such a person with a criminal mindset is granted bail, it will create an atmosphere of fear in the society and if the accused is granted anticipatory bail, the applicant/accused will not cooperate in the investigation, and the investigation may remain incomplete. Considering the role attributed to the applicant/accused, present anticipatory bail should be rejected.

5. Having heard both the sides, going through the police-papers, complaint, affidavit of IO vide Exh.7 and considering the factual matrix of the case. As per the agreement, the applicant/accused has not been paid deposit of Rs.91,000/-. Further, it is also evident that present applicant has not paid the security guard wages as per the minimum wage rate of Contract. It is also evident that after threatening the six watchmen and got Rs.4,000/- back online from the six watchmen, which is evident from the transactions of the watchmen. Out of 08 (eight) employees of the applicant (accused) Ram Security Agency, have not been paid their salaries as per the minimum wage. It is evident from the complaint and witness statement that bills of different names have been approved in the three months of January, February and March. The applicant/accused has given a

final notice dated 06/05/2026 by the office of the Deputy Executive Engineer, but the salary of the watchman employees was not paid as per the minimum wage and two other watchmen. Applicant/accused has committed a crime by entering into an agreement to pay a deposit of Rs.91,000/ on the basis of a bid on the Government's e-market place GEM Portal, but has not paid the deposit amount, and despite not performing duty as a watchman in the months of January-2026, February-2026 and March-2026, he has shown such persons with false names as watchmen, made bills of false names, did not pay the amount as per the prescribed minimum wage payable to the watchmen, threatened to dismiss the watchmen from their jobs, and has obtained a total of Rs.23,500/ and has obtained government money by making false bills and using them as genuine. So if such a person with a criminal mindset is granted bail, the applicant will not co-operate in the investigation, and the investigation may remain incomplete. Hence, this court is of the opinion that, releasing the present applicant at this stage could harm the investigation and hence is not inclined to utilize its discretion in favour of the applicants at this stage. Hence pass the following order.

-: ORDER :-

1. The present application is hereby rejected.

Pronounced and signed in the open court today.

Date : 04/06/2026
Place:Patan

(Mahammadirfan A. Shaikh)
3rd Addl.Sessions Judge, Patan
U.I.Code No.GJ00892

VSS