

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD****R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR SUCCESSIVE REGULAR BAIL -  
AFTER CHARGESHEET) NO. 15053 of 2026**

=====

KRUTIKABEN RAVINDRABHAI SONVANE  
Versus  
STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

**Appearance:**

MR ASHISH M DAGLI(2203) for the Applicant(s) No. 1  
MR ANVESH V VYAS(5654) for the Respondent(s) No. 1  
MR HARDIK SONIA ADDL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the Respondent(s)  
No. 1

=====

**CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NIKHIL S. KARIEL****Date : 31/07/2026****ORAL ORDER**

1. Heard learned advocate Mr. Jigar Patel for learned advocate Mr. Ashish Dagli appearing on behalf of the applicant, learned Additional Public Prosecutor Mr. Hardik Soni appearing on behalf of the respondent-State and learned advocate MR. Anvesh Vyas for the original complainant.

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.11201001250020 of 2025 registered with CID Crime Gandhingar Zone Police Station, Gandhinagar, for the offence punishable under Sections 406, 409, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

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 since the charge-sheet is filed 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 as coming out from the charge-sheet, 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 against the accused being that the accused had defrauded the complainant and other victims by promising them for Visa and employment in various countries and whereas having taken large sums of money from the victims, had not provided them Visa etc. as promised.
- (ii) The role of the present applicant appears to be of being a Director in the Company and having received the substantial amount of alleged defrauded amount, yet this Court has noticed the order of this Court dated 05.05.2026 passed in case of a franchise owner and an order passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court dated 28.07.2026,

whereby the order of this Court has been set aside.

- (iii) It would appear to this Court that the aspect, which weighed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court was that the said accused was in custody since 05.12.2025 i.e. as similar to the present applicant.
- (iv) Furthermore, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had considered the fact of the investigation being completed, charge-sheet having been filed and the case being predominately based on documentary evidence and whereas all the consideration, which weighed with the Hon'ble Supreme Court would apply "Mutatis mutandis" to the present applicant.
- (v) Furthermore, the present applicant being a lady accused, the said aspect would go in her favour.

Considering such a position, though learned advocate Mr. Vyas would try and distinguish role of the present applicant and the role of the accused, who has been considered by the Hon'ble Apex Court, yet it would appear that the consideration which weighed with the Hon'ble Apex Court would apply squarely to the present case and also considering the gender of present applicant, the applicant is also entitled for the benefit of parity.

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. 11201001250020 of 2025 registered with CID Crime Gandhinagar Zone Police Station, Gandhinagar, on executing a bond of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh 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.

Y.N. VYAS

**(NIKHIL S. KARIEL,J)**