

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/SPECIAL CRIMINAL APPLICATION (QUASHING) NO. 7633 of
2025**

=====

JAGRUTIBEN NAUTAMLAL VYAS (JAGRUTIBEN VYAS)

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT & ANR.

=====

Appearance:

MR JAIMIN D PANDYA(10040) for the Applicant(s) No. 1

MS NIDHI PANDYA(13931) for the Applicant(s) No. 1

NOTICE SERVED for the Respondent(s) No. 2

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D. M. VYAS**Date : 09/10/2025****ORAL ORDER**

1. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner/original accused no.2 Mr. Jaimin Pandya and learned APP Mr. Bhargav Pandya. Despite service of notice upon respondent no.2, none appears.
2. The present petitioner/original accused no.2 filed this petition with a prayer to quash the impugned FIR being **C.R. No. 11202009251041/2025** for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 351(2) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 with the City B Division Police Station, Jamnagar and all other proceedings in pursuance thereto qua the petitioner.
3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that the

petitioner is a senior lady advocate and social worker and without any criminal record. It is further submitted that around three months prior to the registration of the FIR, accused person along with complainant and other persons visited the office of the petitioner regarding their business dispute, at that time, in a good faith, mediated amongst them and advised all to settle the dispute. It is further submitted that the dispute between the parties is in civil nature. Even though the respondent no.2 lodged the impugned FIR and the entire transaction is between the complainant and accused no.1, the petitioner was never a part of any business transaction between the complainant and accused no.1.

4. The learned Advocate further submitted that the investigation is going on and chargesheet is not yet filed and lastly prayed to pass the appropriate order in the interest of justice.
5. Learned APP submitted that he has not received any report from the investigating officer of the concerned police station and seeks time to file the detailed report of investigation.
6. Though notice was served upon respondent no.2, he did not appeared before the Court. Considering the facts and circumstances of the subject matter, allegations in the FIR and alleged role attributed to the petitioner/original accused no.2, the present

application deserves consideration.

7. **RULE** returnable on **11.11.2025**.
8. Learned APP waives service of notice of Rule for and on behalf of the respondent no.1-State of Gujarat.
9. At this stage, investigating officer/concerned police station is directed not to file the chargesheet without prior permission of this Court till further orders qua the petitioner/original accused no.2.

Direct service is permitted.

(D. M. VYAS, J)

Anuj