

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD
R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL) NO. 16016
of 2026

=====

SUDHANSHU AAMODBHAI JHA
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:
MR YATIN OZA, SENIOR ADVOCATE WITH MR.TEJAS BAROT, SENIOR
ADVOCATE WITH MR ANURAG R RATHOR WITH MR HARSHIL DATTANI
(9315) for the Applicant(s) No. 1
MR TIRTHRAJ PANDYA, APP for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SANJEEV J.THAKER

Date : 14/07/2026

ORAL ORDER

1. By way of this application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short*, “BNS”), the applicant/s has prayed for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in connection with the FIR being C.R. No.11191011260198 of 2026, registered with the DCB Police Station, District Ahmedabad, for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (‘BNS’ for short).

2. Heard, the learned senior advocate for the applicant and learned APP for the State.

3. Learned senior advocate for the applicant has submitted that the written application was given to the

Navrangpura Police Station by Satishbhai Patel, Manager of Vishnubhai Kantilal Angadiya on 13.05.2025 stating certain facts. Pursuant to the same, the applicant was asked to remain present before the said police station on 30.09.2025 and the applicant remained present and his statement was recorded. Thereafter, the complainant herein – one of the partners of the said Angadiya firm, gave another application in the DCB Crime Police Station with regard to the same transactions. It is submitted that as the applicant was apprehending arrest with regard to the said complaint filed before the Navrangpura Police Station, the applicant approached the learned Sessions Court by filing application for anticipatory bail. The said application was disposed of vide order dated 6.10.2025 by passing some protective directions.

3.1 Learned senior advocate for the applicant has submitted that though both the applications are filed for the same transactions, the version in both the applications are different. The application, first in point of time, reflects certain facts and the application, later in point of time, reflects the improvised version of the same.

3.2 Learned senior advocate for the applicant has submitted that number of statements have been recorded in connection with the first application submitted before the

Navrangpura Police Station but no FIR was registered. Thereafter, on the application given to the DCB Police Station for the same transactions, FIR in question is filed. He further submitted that the applicant has cooperated with the investigation and shall continue to do so.

3.3 Learned senior advocate for the applicant has submitted that the whole case is based on documentary evidence and therefore, custodial interrogation of the applicant is not required. He, therefore, prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

4. *Per contra*, learned APP has submitted that there are whatsapp messages between the applicant and Vijay, one of the partners of the Angadiya firm; there are rail and air tickets and hotel accommodation receipts showing that the applicant has travelled to Mumbai in connection with the transactions alleged in the FIR; that the investigation is in progress and therefore the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required to unearth the truth. He, therefore, prayed to dismiss this application.

5. Considering the facts of the case, more particularly, in the application which has been filed at Navrangpura Police Station, no role is attributed to the present applicant; the allegation that has been made in the

said complaint is that the applicant is a practicing lawyer and legal assistance was taken from the applicant by the said complainant; the applicant has cooperated with the investigation and his statement has been recorded on 27.09.2025 which is prior to the protective order passed by the learned Sessions Judge on 06.10.2025; earlier also, the applicant has been protected by the learned Sessions Judge vide order dated 06.10.2025; prima facie, this Court is of the opinion that the protection is required to be granted.

6. Under the circumstances, *Notice*, returnable on 07.08.2026. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor waives service of notice on behalf of the respondent – State.

7. By way of interim protection, no coercive steps shall be taken against the applicant/s till the next date, on condition that the present applicant/s appear before the concerned Investigating Officer for recording of the statement on 18.07.2026 between 11:00 a.m. and 02:00 p.m. The investigation shall go on and the applicant shall cooperate with the investigating agency.

Direct service is permitted.

(SANJEEV J.THAKER,J)

SRILATHA