

Reserved On : 24/09/2025

Pronounced On : 29/09/2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

R/CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION NO. 22363 of 2024
(FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL)

FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DIVYESH A. JOSHI : Sd/-**

=====

Approved for Reporting	Yes	No
	--	√

=====

RAVINDRASINH JAYVANTSINH JADEJA

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:

MR DARSHIT H RAVAL(11887) for the Applicant(s) No. 1

MR HARDIK SONI APP for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DIVYESH A. JOSHI**CAV JUDGMENT**

1. By filing instant applications under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNSS"), the applicant has prayed for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in connection with the FIR being C.R. No. 11184002231020/2023 registered with Chhotaudepur Police Station for the alleged offences as mentioned in the FIR.
2. Heard learned advocate, Mr. Chitrajeet Upadhyay for the applicant and learned APP Mr. Hardik Soni for the respondent – State of Gujarat.

3. Learned advocate, Mr. Upadhyay referred to the contents of the FIR and submitted that so-called incident has occurred during the period between 26.07.2021 to 25.10.2023, for which, FIR has been lodged on 26.10.2023 against one Sandip Rajput, wherein the applicant is not named. He submitted that after registration of the FIR, the investigation was put into motion and during the course of investigation, the name of the applicant had come on surface. He submitted that as soon as the applicant came to know about the said fact, he immediately approach this Court by filing present application, wherein while issuing notice by an order dated 13.11.2024, the Coordinate Bench of this Court protected the applicant by passing an order of not to arrest, however, the applicant was directed to remain present before the concerned Investigating Officer for the purpose of interrogation and pursuant to such direction, the applicant had remained present before the concerned Investigating Officer and thereby cooperated in the investigation and such protection is still continued, therefore, now the custodial interrogation of the applicant is not required, therefore this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to exercise the discretion in favour of the applicant by releasing him on anticipatory bail.
4. Learned advocate, Mr. Upadhyay submitted that so far as the allegations and accusation leveled in

the FIR are concerned, it is alleged that the accused named in the FIR, Sandip Rajput had created one bogus Government office in the name of Executive Engineer, Irrigation Project Division, Bodeli and also forged and fabricated the stamp and seal and on the strength of it, forged bills were prepared to the tune of Rs.4,15,54,915/- and submitted before the authority concerned for its approval and sanction and thereby misappropriated huge volume of amount. He, however, submitted that if the Hon'ble Court would make cursory glance upon the contents of the allegations, not a single allegation is leveled against the applicant nor there is whisper about the name of the applicant, which itself suggests false implication of the applicant in the commission of crime. He further submitted that at the relevant point of time, the applicant was discharging his duty as Additional Collector and in fact, he was transferred at that place subsequently. He further submitted that in fact, the State Government has floated one scheme with a sole intent to uplift the border area of tribal village and as a part of said policy, different Government departments were given task to carry out certain mode of operation in particular area and the different Government departments used to prepare proposal to carry out certain development work and submit before the office concerned and on receipt of such proposal, it was the duty of the applicant to forward to the

State Government for the purpose of its sanction and approval and thus, he has acted in discharge of his duty as Project Administrator but except this, no other role is attributed to him. He further submitted that in fact, the amount sanctioned is already credited in the account of concerned department. He further submitted that in fact, the applicant had worked at that particular place only for 6-7 months and during that period, more than 54 different proposals were received by the office of the present applicant from total 22-23 different departments and as stated above, the applicant had acted in discharge of his duty and he is not directly or indirectly connected and/or associated with the alleged commission of crime, therefore at this stage, custodial interrogation of the present applicant is not required, therefore, discretion may be exercised.

5. Learned advocate, Mr. Upadhyay has referred to the document produced at Annexure-C and submitted that the said document pertains to the list of the Project Officer of Chhotaudepur, who have been sanctioned grant, wherein the so-called bogus office is mentioned at Sr. No.22 but the said fact was not within the knowledge of the applicant and on submission of the proposal, he verified it and forwarded it to the State Government for its sanction and approval and the duration of so-called incident is about 2 to 2½ years, whereas the applicant had worked there only for 6-7

months. He further submitted that after registration of the aforesaid FIR, the investigation was put into motion and during the course of investigation, certain Government employees were apprehended and, thereafter, released on bail. He further submitted that in fact, the applicant has also preferred quashing petition before this Hon'ble Court, which is pending for adjudication and pending said application, the concerned Investigating Officer submitted applications under Section 70 of the CrPC as well as under Section 82 of the CrPC, which were allowed by the court concerned, against which, appropriate remedy is availed by the applicant by challenging those orders, however, those proceedings are pending. He further submitted that at the time of hearing of this application, those facts were brought to the notice of the Coordinate Bench of this Court and considering the same, the Coordinate Bench of this Court has protected the applicant by passing appropriate order as stated above.

6. Learned advocate has reiterated his submission that pursuant to the protection granted by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, the applicant had remained present before the concerned Investigating Officer and cooperated therein and his statement has been recorded not only once but he remained present for around three times. He further submitted that other accused, who were

apprehended, have already been released on bail and in fact, chargesheet is also filed in connection with the aforesaid FIR. It is, therefore, urged that when the investigation in the present offence is already concluded and the chargesheet is filed, there is no requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant. He submitted that considering the allegations leveled against the applicant, custodial interrogation at this stage is not necessary and he will keep himself available during the course of investigation, trial also and will not flee from justice. He on instructions submitted that he is ready and willing to abide by all the conditions including imposition of conditions while releasing the applicant on anticipatory bail.

7. Learned advocate, Mr. Upadhyaya has relied upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Ashok Kumar Vs. State of Union Territory Chandigarh**, reported in **2024 SCC OnLine SC 274** as well as the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Pravinbhai Devibhai Bharpoda Vs. State of Gujarat** in Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.2660/2025 and submitted that the case of the applicant is squarely covered by the above decision. It is, therefore urged that considering the above facts, the applicants may be granted anticipatory bail.
8. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, Mr.Soni appearing on behalf of the respondent – State has

opposed grant of anticipatory bail contending that prima facie involvement of the applicant in the commission of crime is clearly found out. He referred to the FIR and submitted that initially FIR has been lodged against one Sandip Rajput, who is partner of Abubakar Saiyed and both have designed a plan in connivance with other Government employees to create a bogus office in the district and through the said office, they have forwarded certain proposal for the purpose of carry out certain development work in the Government and those documents were endorsed by the applicant and without verifying the veracity of those documents, same were forwarded to the Government for its sanction and approval with a sole intent to defraud and dupe the Government. He submitted that as soon as the fact of alleged commission of crime had come to the notice of the Government, immediately actions were initiated and at that relevant point of time, the applicant was called for interrogation and his statement was recorded before registration of the FIR, wherein he had come with a case that the applicant herein had never met Abubakar Saiyed and Sandip Rajput and he had hardly talked with Abubakar Saiyed and Sandip Rajput only for 4-5 times after obtaining phone number from his colleague. He submitted that during the course of investigation, the concerned Investigating Officer has collected CDR, which clearly goes on to show that the present applicant

was in constant touch with those two accused persons. He further submitted that during the course of investigation, the statements of number of Government employees have been recorded by the concerned Investigating Officer under Section 164 of the CrPC before the Magistrate concerned, wherein they have stated in a very categorical terms that Abubakar Saiyed and the Sandip Rajput used to come to the office at regular interval to meet the present applicant and thus, the present applicant is familiar with those persons. He further submitted that during the course of investigation, role of the complainant, Javid Mankanojiya is also carved out, therefore, he was joined as accused and apprehended by the police and during his interrogation, his statement was recorded, wherein he has stated in a very categorical terms that the applicant herein is in touch with other accused and he used to receive 10% commission from credit amount. He further submitted that the concerned Investigating Officer has also recorded statement of co-accused, Dinesh Chaudhary, who was apprehended by the concerned Investigating Officer, wherein also he has stated in a very categorical terms that the present applicant was in touch with other co-accused and was also aware about the illegal activity carried out by the accused viz., Abubakar Saiyed and Sandip Rajput but with a sole intent to get undue benefit of getting 10% commission from the said

transaction, those documents were forwarded to the Government for its sanction and approval despite knowing fact that those documents are forged one and because of which, huge volume of amount has been credited in the account of said bogus office and while doing investigation, it has also come out that total scam is more than Rs.25.00 crores and thus, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. He further submitted that investigation papers indicates that with a sole intent to defraud and dupe the complainant, entire modus operandi has been adopted by the accused in connivance with each other and as a part of it, a bogus office is created and proposal was submitted before the applicant herein, who had also hand-in-glove with other accused and as a part of their conspiracy, the applicant had forwarded those documents to the Government for its sanction and approval without verifying the said documents though having knowledge about the fact that those documents are forged one. He further submitted that in fact, involvement of other officers including higher officers of revenue department is also found out so far and they are yet to be arrested. He further submitted that with a sole intent to connect the chain of transmission of amount from one account to another and as to where it has been utilized, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. He further submitted that there is no dispute about the interrogation

of the applicant pending this application, however, the applicant remained present before the concerned Investigating Officer under the protection of this Hon'ble Court and extended all kind of non-cooperation, therefore, just to solve the entire link and chain, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. He further submitted that as the applicant was evading his arrest, the concerned IO submitted an application under Section 72 of the CrPC before the court concerned, wherein an order came to be passed issuing warrant against the applicant and, thereafter also, an application under Section 82 of the CrPC is also preferred, which was also entertained by the court concerned. It is, therefore, urged that considering the above facts, the present applications may be rejected as there is prima facie case made out against the applicant and the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required.

9. Having heard the learned advocates appearing for the parties and perusing the investigation papers, it is equally incumbent upon the Court to exercise its discretion judiciously, cautiously and strictly in compliance with the basic principles laid down in a plethora of decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court on the point. It is well settled that, among other circumstances, the factors to be borne in mind while considering an application for bail are (i) the nature and

gravity of the accusation; (ii) the antecedents of the applicants including the fact as to whether he has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a Court in respect of any cognizable offence; (iii) the possibility of the applicants to flee from justice; and (iv) where the accusation has been made with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicants by having him so arrested. Though at the stage of granting bail an elaborate examination of evidence and detailed reasons touching the merit of the case, which may prejudice the accused, should be avoided.

10. It is required to be noted that normal procedure prescribed for curtailing the right to life & liberty, is that the investigating officer can arrest the accused even without warrant. No doubt this Court has extraordinary power to protect an innocent person. However, this power has to be exercised by the Courts with due circumspection.
11. It is well settled that an application preferred for anticipatory bail is an exceptional remedy to be granted in exception cases. The parameters and considerations governing the grant of anticipatory bail have been explained by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in number of cases. At this stage, I would like to rely upon the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of (i) **State Rep. by the CBI V/s Anil Sharma** reported in 1997 (7) SCC 187, (ii) **Adri Dharan Das V/s State of W.B.** reported in

2005 (4) SCC 303 (iii) P. Chidambaram V/s Directorate of Enforcement reported in **AIR 2019 SC 4198**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held held as follows:

"The legislative intent behind the introduction of Section 438 CrPC is to safeguard the individual's personal liberty and to protect him from the possibility of being humiliated and from being subjected to unnecessary police custody. However, the court must also keep in view that a criminal offence is not just an offence against an individual rather the larger societal interest is at stake. Therefore, a delicate balance is required to be established between the two rights – safeguarding the personal liberty of an individual and the societal interest.

Ordinarily, arrest is a part of procedure of the investigation to secure not only the presence of the accused but several other purposes. There may be circumstances in which the accused may provide information leading to discovery of material facts and relevant information. Grant of anticipatory bail may hamper the investigation. It may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused

knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Pre-arrest bail is to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal freedom and the right of the investigating agency to interrogate the accused as to the material so far collected and to collect more information which may lead to recovery of relevant information. In this view, it cannot be said that refusal to grant anticipatory bail would amount to denial of the rights conferred upon the appellant/applicant under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

Consequently, power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. The privilege of the pre-arrest bail should be granted only in exceptional cases. The judicial discretion conferred upon the court has to be properly exercised after application of mind as to the nature and gravity of the accusation; possibility of the applicant fleeing justice and other factors to decide whether it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Grant of anticipatory bail to some extent interferes in the sphere of investigation of

an offence and hence, the court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail. Section 438 CrPC is to be invoked only in exceptional cases where the case alleged is frivolous or groundless. Anticipatory bail is to be granted as a matter of rule and it has to be granted only when the court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extraordinary remedy".

Having regard to nature of allegations and stage of investigations, held investigating agency must be given sufficient freedom in process of investigation. Appellant not entitled to anticipatory bail as the same would hamper the investigation".

12. In case of **Pratibha Manchanda and another Vs. State of Haryana and another reported in (2023) 8 SCC 181**, the Hon'ble Apex Court in Paragraph No.21, observed as under:-

"21. The relief of anticipatory bail is aimed at safeguarding individual rights. While it serves as a crucial tool to prevent the misuse of the power of arrest and protects innocent individuals from harassment, it also presents challenges in maintaining a delicate balance between individual rights and the interests of justice. The tight rope we must walk lies in striking a balance between safeguarding individual rights and protecting public interest. While the right to liberty

and presumption of innocence are vital, the court must also consider the gravity of the offence, the impact on society, and the need for a fair and free investigation. The court's discretion in weighing these interests in the facts and circumstances of each individual case becomes crucial to ensure a just outcome."

13. At this stage, it is required to be noted that as this application has been preferred under the provisions of Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail, I court would like to refer the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.,,** reported in (2011) 1 SCC 694, more particularly Paragraph Nos.14 & 112, which read as under :-

"14. It is clear from the Statement of Objects and Reasons that the purpose of incorporating Section 438 in the Cr.P.C. was to recognize the importance of personal liberty and freedom in a free and democratic country. When we carefully analyze this section, the wisdom of the legislature becomes quite evident and clear that the legislature was keen to ensure respect for the personal liberty and also pressed in service the age-old principle that an individual is presumed to be innocent till he is found guilty by the court.

112. The following factors and parameters can be taken into consideration while dealing with the anticipatory bail: The nature and gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made; the antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether the accused has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a Court in respect of any cognizable offence; The possibility of the applicant to flee from justice; The possibility of the accused's likelihood to repeat similar or the other offences. Whereas the accusation have been made only with the object to injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her. Impact of grant of anticipatory bail particularly in cases of large magnitude affecting a very large number of people. The courts must evaluate the entire available material against the accused very carefully. The court must also clearly comprehend the exact role of the accused in the case."

14. Now coming back to the facts of the case, having considered the submissions canvassed by learned advocates for the parties and having considered the documents produced on record including the allegations leveled in the FIR, it is found out that the accused have, in connivance with each other, have hatch conspiracy to defraud and dupe the Government, who have floated one scheme for

the upliftment of the tribal area of village and as a part of said conspiracy, the accused named in the FIR, Sandip Rajput had created one bogus Government office in the name of Executive Engineer, Irrigation Project Division, Bodeli and also forged and fabricated the stamp and seal and on the strength of it, under the guise of carrying out work allotted to them, they have raised bills by submitting proposal before the office of the applicant, where the applicant was discharging his duty as Additional Collector, however without verifying the veracity of the documents and the fact that the applicant was having knowledge about the ill-intention of the accused, the applicant had forwarded the said proposal to the Government for its sanction and approval and for doing said word, the applicant had received 10% commission and on the strength of the endorsement made on the files by the applicant, the Government have released the amount in the account of said bogus office and thus, the accused have in connivance with each other have committed misappropriation of amount in crores of rupees. It is also found out from the record that admittedly, no such work as per the Government policy had undertaken but despite the said fact, though the applicant was having knowledge about the same, he forwarded the proposal before the Government for its sanction and approval and accordingly, payments have been made for no work and thus, the accused have

misappropriated huge volume of public money.

15. It is required to be noted that there is no dispute about the fact that FIR has been lodged against one accused, Sandip Rajput but during the course of investigation, the name of the applicant and other accused persons, who are Government servants had come on surface, therefore, they were arraigned as accused. It is also found out from the record that before registration of the FIR, the applicant was called and his statement was recorded and, thereafter pending this application, the applicant had remained present before the concerned Investigating Officer as per the direction of this Hon'ble Court. What is transpired from the interrogation carried out by the concerned Investigating Officer of the applicant is that the applicant had put forward story of his innocent by stating that he does not know the accused nor he was aware about the conspiracy hatched by the accused, Abubakar Saiyed and Sandip Rajput and he had acted in discharge of his duty after verifying the record, however, the said defence taken by the applicant is falsified from the statements of the co-accused, who have been apprehended by the police during investigation because in their statements, copies of which are provided to me by learned APP during the course of hearing, they have stated in a very categorical terms that the accused used to come in the office to meet the applicant and not on one or

two occasions but there are instances. Over and above that, CDR collected by the concerned Investigating Officer during the course of hearing clearly goes on to show connection between the applicant and other accused persons.

16. Over and above that, it is also found out from the material that this is not the sole FIR but same type of modus operandi has been adopted by the accused persons in connivance with each other and there are around 6-7 FIRs registered alleging misappropriation of huge volume of amount in different districts, which requires detailed investigation. Further, the Collector, who is also involved in the alleged commission of crime, was apprehended by the police after having found material against him and, thereafter, he has been released on bail after submission of chargesheet. However in the present case, so far as the applicant is concerned, the investigation is still under progress, therefore, his custodial interrogation is required.
17. So far as the submission made by learned advocate for the applicant with regard to cooperation extended by the applicant before registration of the FIR and after filing of present petition is concerned, the said submission is misconceived in view of the fact that as can be seen from the investigation papers, the involvement of the applicant is clearly found out. Not only that, material collected by the concerned IO suggest

that right from the beginning, the applicant was aware about the conspiracy hatched by the accused to defraud and dupe the Government on the strength of creation of bogus Government office as also by creating forged and fabricated documents. Therefore though the applicant had cooperated in the investigation after filing of the present petition, it was under the protection of the order passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court and considering the facts of the present case as stated above, custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. Therefore considering the facts of the present case, it is not in dispute that the investigation is at crucial stage and considering the huge scam committed by the accused in connivance with each other, the custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. Therefore, the present application deserves to be rejected.

18. One of the contentions of learned APP with regard to the initiation of proceedings under Section 70 of the CrPC as well as under Section 82 of the CrPC is also required to be considered. It is to be noted that in number of cases, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the power to grant anticipatory bail is an extraordinary power and though it was held that bail is said to be a rule, it cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be said that anticipatory bail is the rule and the question of its grant should be left to the

cautious and judicious discretion by the Court depending on the facts and circumstances of each case and the Court concerned has to be very cautious as the grant of interim protection or protection to the accused in serious cases, which may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper the investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or distraction of the evidence. It is also required to be noted that in view of various decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, as and when warrant of arrest or proclamation is issued, in that event, the applicant is not entitled to invoke the extraordinary power and it is not that this will not deprive the power of the Court to grant pre-arrest bail in extreme, exceptional cases in the interest of justice but here in the present case, as stated above, the applicant is continuously defying orders and keeping himself absconding, therefore, he is not entitled to grant anticipatory bail. The factual narration made hereinbefore would reveal the consistent disobedience of the applicant to comply with the orders of the trial Court as he failed to appear before the Court concerned after the issuance of the summons. It is not in dispute that the applicant has availed remedy by challenging the orders of issuing warrant as contended by learned advocate for the applicant. Such conduct of the applicant in the light of the aforesaid

circumstances, leaves no hesitation for me to hold that he is not entitled to seek the benefit of pre-arrest bail.

19. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Sumitha Pradeep Vs. Arun Kumar C.K. & Anr.**, reported in **2022 SCC OnLine SC 1529** held that merely because custodial interrogation was not required by itself could not be a ground to grant anticipatory bail. The first and the foremost thing the Court hearing the anticipatory bail application is to consider is the prima facie case against the accused. The relevant extract of the judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

"It may be true, as pointed out by learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.1, that charge-sheet has already been filed. It will be unfair to presume on our part that the Investigating Officer does not require Respondent No.1 for custodial interrogation for the purpose of further investigation. Be that as it may, even assuming it a case where Respondent No.1 is not required for custodial interrogation, we are satisfied that the High Court ought not to have granted discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. We are dealing with a matter wherein the original complainant (appellant herein) has come before this Court praying that the anticipatory bail granted by the High Court to the accused should be cancelled. To put it in other words, the complainant says that the

High Court wrongly exercised its discretion while granting anticipatory bail to the accused in a very serious crime like POCSO and, therefore, the order passed by the High Court granting anticipatory bail to the accused should be quashed and set aside. In many anticipatory bail matters, we have noticed one common argument being canvassed that no custodial interrogation is required and, therefore, anticipatory bail may be granted. There appears to be a serious misconception of law that if no case for custodial interrogation is made out by the prosecution, then that alone would be a good ground to grant anticipatory bail. Custodial interrogation can be one of the relevant aspects to be considered along with other grounds while deciding an application seeking anticipatory bail. There may be many cases in which the custodial interrogation of the accused may not be required, but that does not mean that the prima facie case against the accused should be ignored or overlooked and he should be granted anticipatory bail. The first and foremost thing that the court hearing an anticipatory bail application should consider is the prima facie case put up against the accused. Thereafter, the nature of the offence should be looked into along with the severity of the punishment. Custodial interrogation can be one of the grounds to decline custodial interrogation.

However, even if custodial interrogation is not required or necessitated, by itself, cannot be a ground to grant anticipatory bail."

20. Thus while taking into consideration the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre (supra)** as also ratio laid down in other decisions as stated above, I have gone through the contents of the FIR, which is placed on record and also considered the affidavit of the investigating officer filed before the learned Judge concerned opposing the bail application preferred by the applicants. Upon going through the contents of the FIR, it appears that *prima facie* case is made out against the applicants and material collected so far suggests the involvement of the applicants in the commission of crime.
21. For the foregoing reasons, having regard to facts and circumstances, peculiar to the instant case, as have been analyzed hereinabove, the applicant has failed to make out a special case for exercise of power to grant bail and considering the facts and parameters, necessary to be considered for adjudication of anticipatory bail, this Court does not find any exceptional ground to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the BNSS to grant anticipatory bail. More so, investigation is still going on in the present case. It is settled proposition of law that power exercisable under Section 482 BNSS, is somewhat

discretionary in character and it is to be exercised with caution in exceptional cases.

22. Hence, the present application seeking for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected. Notice is discharged. Interim protection granted earlier stands vacated.

23. Needless to say that observations and findings made hereinabove are limited to the decision of these pre-arrest bail applications, and shall not influence any other proceedings arise from impugned FIR.

Sd/-
(DIVYESH A. JOSHI, J.)

FURTHER ORDER

After the pronouncement of the order, learned advocate for the applicant has requested for stay of the present order so as to enable the applicant to approach higher forum.

Learned APP has strongly objected to the request made by learned advocate for the applicant.

However in view of the reasons recorded in the present order, the request made by learned advocate for the applicant is refused.

Sd/-
(DIVYESH A. JOSHI, J.)

Gautam

Original copy of this order has been signed by the Hon'ble Judge.
Digitally signed by: GAUTAM G PATIL(HC00190), Principal Pvt. Secretary, at High Court of Gujarat on 29/09/2025 15:33:35