

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR SUCCESSIVE REGULAR BAIL -
AFTER CHARGESHEET) NO. 22239 of 2025**

=====

RONAK @ MEET S/O CHETANBHAI DHIRAJLAL RATHOD
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:

MR SALIM M SAIYED(5172) for the Applicant(s) No. 1
MR KRUTIK PAREKH, APP for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M. R. MENGDEY**Date : 16/10/2025****ORAL ORDER**

1. 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.11191011240309 of 2024 registered with DCB Police Station, Ahmedabad City.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the Applicant and learned APP for the Respondent – State.

Rule. Learned APP waives service of notice of Rule on behalf of the Respondent - State.

3. Learned Advocate for the Applicant has submitted that the Applicant has good reputation in the society and 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.

4. Per contra, learned APP has opposed the present application for grant of regular bail contending that the present applicant had procured the format of Australian Currency from Australia and had provided the same to the other co-accused and on the basis of said format, the applicant and the other co-accused had counterfeited the Australian Currency notes and were found in possession of such currency notes. The other co-accused who has been considered for grant of bail had played some different role than the role attributed to the present applicant and therefore, the aspect of parity cannot be applicable in the case of the applicant. Learned APP has therefore submitted that looking to the nature of offence, this Court may not exercise the discretion in favour of the applicant and the Application may be dismissed.

5. Heard learned Advocates for the parties and perused the record. The investigation is over and charge sheet is filed. From the record it appears that the applicant had preferred an CRMA No.4839 of 2025 which was allowed to be withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 17.03.2025. The applicant has been arrested in connection with the present offence on 28.11.2024.

5.1 As per the case of the prosecution, the applicant had procured the design of Australian currency note from the Australia and on the basis of those designs, the counterfeited currency notes were prepared by the applicant and the other co-accused. This Court vide order dated 08.10.2025 has considered the case of the other co-accused for grant of bail. Having regard to these aspects, the Application deserves consideration. This court has also considered the following aspects:

- (a) As per catena of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court, there are mainly 3 factors which are required to be considered by this court i.e. prima facie case, availability of Applicant accused at the time of trial and tampering and hampering with the witnesses by the accused.
- (b) That the learned Advocate for the Applicant has submitted that the Applicant Accused is not likely to flee away.
- (c) That the Applicant is in custody since 28.11.2024.
- (d) The law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Sanjay Chandra v. C.B.I. Reported in (2012) 1 SCC 40.**

6. Having heard the learned Advocates for the parties and perusing the record produced in this case as well as taking into consideration the facts of the case, nature of allegations, gravity of accusation, availability of the Applicant Accused at the time of Trial etc. and the role attributed to the present Applicant accused, the present Application deserves to be allowed and accordingly stands allowed. This Court has also gone through the FIR and police papers and also the earlier order passed by the learned Sessions Court where the learned Sessions Judge has disallowed the bail Application at initial stage. The Applicant Accused is ordered to be released on bail in connection with the aforesaid FIR on executing a personal bond of Rs.10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court, subject to the following conditions that he shall:

- (a) not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the fact of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or any

Police Officer or tamper with the evidence.

(b) maintain law and order and not to indulge in any criminal activities.

(c) furnish the documentary proof of complete, correct and present address of residence to the Investigating Officer and to the Trial Court at the time of executing the bond and shall not change the residence without prior permission of the trial Court.

(d) provide contact numbers as well as the contact numbers of the sureties before the Trial Court. In case of change in such numbers inform in writing immediately to the trial Court.

(e) mark presence before the concerned Police Station once in a month for a period of six months between 11:00 a.m. and 2.00 pm.

(f) file an affidavit stating his immovable properties whether self acquired or ancestral with description, location and present value of such properties before the Trial Court, if any.

(g) not leave India without prior permission of the Trial Court

(h) surrender passport, if any, to the Trial Court within a week. If the Applicant does not possess passport, shall file an Affidavit to that effect.

7. Bail bond to be executed before the Trial Court having jurisdiction to try the case. It would be open for the Trial Court concerned to give time to furnish the solvency certificate if prayed for.

8. If breach of any of the above conditions is committed, the Trial Court concerned will be free to issue warrant or take appropriate action according to law. The Authorities will release the Applicant forthwith only if the Applicant is not required in

connection with any other offence for the time being.

9. At the trial, the concerned trial Court shall not be influenced by the *prima facie* observations made by this Court in the present order.

10. Rule is made absolute. Direct service permitted.

AHS

(M. R. MENGDEY,J)