

GJVD220002042026



RECEIVED ON : 29/05/2026

REGISTERED ON : 29/05/2026

DECIDED ON : 04/06/2026

DURATION : Y. M. D.

00 - 00 - 06

**IN THE COURT OF 5TH ADDITIONAL DISTRICT &
SESSIONS JUDGE, VADODARA AT DABHOI**

Criminal Misc. Application No. 66/2026

EXH. No. :

Name of the Police Station.	Chanod Police Station
FIR No.	11197008260239/2026
Offence.	Section 115(2), 118(2), 352, 351(2), 54 of BNS and section 135 of GP Act.
Name of the accused.	(1) Sureshbhai Ranchhodbhai Tadvi, (2) Bharatbhai @ Bhupin Gopalbhai Tadvi, (3) Budhabhai Bhikhabhai Tadvi, (4) Naginbhai Bhikhabhai Tadvi,
Date of arrest.	26.05.2026
Produced before which court?	In the Court of Ld. Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dabhoi.
Date on which the accused had been sent to Judicial custody.	26.05.2026
Accused has been in which jail?	Central Jail, Vadodara.
E-Mail address of the jail in which the accused has been lodged.	sp-jail-vad@gujarat.gov.in
Whether the charge-sheet has been filed?	No
In which Court, the trial has been	-

started?	
How many bail applications has been filed by the accused?	First.

(1) Sureshbhai Ranchhodbhai Tadv,

Age: Adult, Occupation: Labour,

Resi.: Village: Asodara, Ta.: Dabhoi, Dist.: Vadodara.

(2) Bharatbhai @ Bhupin Gopalbhai Tadv,

Age: Adult, Occupation: Labour,

Resi.: Village: Karnali, Ta.: Dabhoi, Dist.: Vadodara.

(3) Budhabhai Bhikhabhai Tadv,

Age: Adult, Occupation: Labour,

Resi.: Bhathiji Faliyu, Village: Asodara, Ta.: Dabhoi, Dist.: Vadodara.

(4) Naginbhai Bhikhabhai Tadv,

Age: Adult, Occupation: Labour,

Resi.: Bhathiji Faliyu, Village: Asodara, Ta.: Dabhoi, Dist.: Vadodara.

Applicants.....

Versus

The State of Gujarat ,

Through A.P.P. Shri, Dabhoi.

Opponent.....

APPLICATION FOR REGULAR BAIL

APPEARANCE :

-
- Ld. Advocate Mr. A. H. Makrani, for the applicants.
 - Ld. APP Mr. H.B.Chauhan, for the opponent-State.

J U D G M E N T

- 1) The applicant – accused have preferred this application for releasing them on regular bail in connection with F.I.R. No. 11197008260239/2026 of Chanod Police Station, Vadodara for the offences punishable under Section 115(2), 118(2), 352, 351(2), 54 of BNS and section 135 of GP Act.
- 2) Pursuant to filing of the application, notice came to be issued and served upon the opponent and the learned A. P. P. Mr.

H.B.Chauhan, appeared on behalf of the State and filed the affidavit prepared by the Investigating Officer at Exh.6. Ld. Advocate Mr. M. R. Hande has appeared for the complainant and filed his affidavit to oppose the present application at Exh.8.

- 3) I have heard the learned advocate for the applicant and Ld. A.P.P. for the opponent-State.
- 4) The brief facts giving rise to the present application are that on 24.05.2026, the above FIR was registered for the offences punishable under Section 115(2), 118(2), 352, 351(2) & 54 of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita and Section 135 of the G.P. Act with the allegation that on that day, the present applicants had attacked upon the wife of the complainant and caused injuries to her and when the complainant intervened to rescue her, the applicants had caught hold of the complainant and the applicant Budhabhai had given a severe blow on the head of the complainant with a stick due to which the complainant became unconscious. It is further stated in the FIR that the applicants had also caused injuries to the son of the complainant. It is further stated in the FIR that, the applicants/accused persons had caused several injuries including a fracture in head of the complainant/injured Rameshbhai. The applicants have been arrested on 26.05.2026 and presently they are in judicial custody.
- 5) The Ld. Advocate the applicants has submitted that; the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further argued by the learned advocate for the applicants that the complainant has lodged a false and concocted FIR against them. It is further argued that even if the contents of the FIR be

admitted then also, looking at the nature of the weapons used in the offence, no prima facie offence punishable under Section 118(2) of BNS is made out in the present case. It is further argued on behalf of the applicants that now, the investigation qua them is completed and they are not required for the purpose of any recovery or discovery. It is further argued that the applicants are ready to abide by all the conditions imposed by this court. With these arguments, the learned advocate for the applicant has prayed that the present application may be allowed.

- 6) Per contra, learned A. P. P. for the State has strongly opposed the bail application on the ground that several serious injuries have been caused to the complainant in the incident. It is further argued by the learned APP for the State that the serious injuries and fracture are caused by the applicants to the complainant. It is further argued by the Ld. APP for the State that the affidavit filed by the IO shows that the applicant No.1 Sureshbhai Ranchhodbhai Tadvai is a habitual offender and he has previously found involved in five other cases. It is further argued by the Ld. APP for the State that if the applicants would be enlarged on bail, they may attempt to threaten or win over the witnesses. It is further argued by the Ld. APP for the State that considering the nature of the allegations and gravity of the offence, the present application may be rejected.
- 7) I have heard arguments of both the parties and perused the documents and file of the case. In the applications for regular bail, the jurisdiction to grant bail has to be exercised on the basis of well settled principles having regard to the circumstances of each case. While, granting the bail, the Court has to keep in mind the

nature of accusations, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of punishment which conviction will entail, the character, the behavior means and its standing of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interest of the public or State and other similar considerations.

- 8) The perusal of the record shows that due to the act of the applicants, several serious injuries are caused to the complainant of the case. Further, I find force in the arguments of the Ld. APP for the State that if the applicants would be enlarged on bail, there is a possibility that they may attempt to threaten or win over the witnesses. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this court is not inclined to allow the present application and the following order is passed.

However, it is made clear that; any observations made herein shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

// O R D E R //

- 1] The present Criminal Misc. Application No. **66/2026** is hereby rejected.

Pronounced in open Court on this 4th day of June, 2026.

DABHOI
DATE : 04/06/2026

Sd/-
(RAHUL SHARMA)
5th ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE,
VADODARA @ DABHOI
CODE No. 01588