

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD
R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR REGULAR BAIL - BEFORE
CHARGESHEET) NO. 10594 of 2026**

=====

INDRESH DEVISHANKAR SHUKLA

Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:

RAVI B SHAH(5346) for the Applicant(s) No. 1
MR TRUPESH KATHIRIYA, ADDL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the
Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NIKHIL S. KARIEL

**Date : 07/05/2026
ORAL ORDER**

1. Heard learned advocate Mr.Darshan Dave for learned advocate Mr.Ravi Shah appearing on behalf of the applicant and learned Additional Public Prosecutor Mr.Trupesh Kathiriya appearing on behalf of the respondent-State.

2. **Rule.** Learned APP waives service of rule on behalf of the respondent-State.

3. The applicant has filed this application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for enlarging the applicant on Regular Bail in connection with FIR being C.R. No. 11188002260057/2026 registered with Bayad Police Station, Aravalli for the offence punishable under Sections 336(3), 316(4), 338, 340(2), 54, 61(2) of the BNS.

4. Learned advocate for the applicant would submit that

considering the role attributed to the applicant, and nature of the allegation levelled, the applicant may be enlarged on regular bail. It is further submitted that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant in jail for indefinite period. It is further contended that the applicant is ready and willing to abide by all the conditions that may be imposed by this Court if released on bail.

5. As against the same, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent - State has vehemently objected to the grant of regular bail. Learned APP has submitted that looking to the nature of offence and the role attributed to the present applicant, this Court may not exercise the discretion in favour of the applicant and the application may be dismissed.

6. I have heard learned advocates appearing on behalf of the respective parties and perused the papers. Following aspects are considered:-

- i. The allegation being that the accused had caused loss to the complainant - company more particularly the accused working in the complainant - company and were prohibited from having business of their own which was co-relatable

with the business of the complainant – company.

ii. It appears that the role attributed to the present applicant being very limited inasmuch as though the main accused had forged the PAN card of his wife and whereas, the present applicant was knowing about the forged PAN card, yet, he has circulated the same.

iii. Beyond the same, there is no specific role being attributed to the present applicant.

iv. It also appears that the present applicant is in custody since 10.04.2026, without any antecedents, more particularly, being the manager of the company in question.

This Court has taken into consideration the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Sanjay Chandra v. Central Bureau of Investigation reported in [2012] 1 SCC 40.**

7. In the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the nature of the allegations made against the applicant in the First Information Report, without discussing the evidence in detail, prima facie, this Court is of the opinion that this is a fit case to exercise the discretion and enlarge the

applicant on regular bail.

8. Hence, the present application is allowed. The applicant is ordered to be released on bail in connection with F.I.R. registered as C.R. No. 11188002260057/2026 registered with Bayad Police Station, Aravalli, on executing a bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court and subject to the conditions that he shall;

[a] not take undue advantage of liberty or misuse liberty;

[b] not act in a manner injurious to the interest of the prosecution;

[c] surrender passport, if any, to the lower court within a week;

[d] not leave the State of Gujarat without prior permission of the Sessions Court concerned;

[e] furnish the present address of residence to the I.O. and also to the Court at the time of execution of the bond and shall not change the residence without prior intimation to the I.O.;

[f] mark presence once a month for a period of six months

before the concerned police station.

9. The Authorities will release the applicant only if he is not required in connection with any other offence for the time being. If breach of any of the above conditions is committed, the Sessions Court concerned will be free to take appropriate action in the matter.

10. Bail bond to be executed before the lower court having jurisdiction to try the case. It will be open for the concerned Court to delete, modify and/or relax any of the above conditions in accordance with law.

11. At the stage of trial, the trial court shall not be influenced by any observations of this Court which are of preliminary nature made at this stage, only for the purpose of considering the application of the applicant for being released on regular bail.

12. The application is allowed in the aforesaid terms. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. Direct service is permitted.

(NIKHIL S. KARIEL,J)

Bhoomi