



IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD
R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR REGULAR BAIL - AFTER
CHARGESHEET) NO. 10728 of 2024

=====

TUSHAR @ TULSI KESHAVBHAI PARGHI
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:

MR ZUBIN F BHARDA(159) for the Applicant(s) No. 1

MR. TRUPESH KATHIRIYA, APP for the Respondent(s) No. 1


=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M. R. MENGDEY

Date : 14/06/2024


ORAL ORDER

1. **Rule.** Learned APP waives service of notice of Rule on behalf of respondent-State.
2. This application is filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for regular bail in connection with **F.I.R. No.11822012232218 of 2023 registered with Gandevi Police Station, District Navsari.**
3. Learned advocate for the applicant submits that considering the nature of offence and role attributed to the applicant, the applicant may be enlarged on regular bail by imposing suitable conditions.



4. The learned APP appearing for the respondent State vehemently submits that the present applicant was very much part of the conspiracy which was hatch to eliminate the deceased. The present applicant had introduced the other co-accused who was contract killer to the other co-accused who had given contract to eliminate the deceased. Thus, the present applicant had played an active role in commission of offence in question. Moreover, the applicant has other criminal antecedents for commission of offence similar in nature. He, therefore, submits that the offences which have been charged, are serious in nature and looking to the facts as well as the allegations levelled against the applicant, no discretion is required to be exercised.

5. I have heard learned advocates appearing for the parties and perused the papers of investigation. From the record it appears that the investigation is over and Charge-sheet has already been filed. As per the case of the prosecution, the present applicant had introduced the contract




killer, namely, Harsh to the other co-accused Kalpesh at some egg eatery. Actually it was the co-accused Kalpesh who himself had introduced the said co-accused Harsh to the owner of egg eatery. There appears to be doubt about role attributed to the present applicant in commission of offence. Except this, no other overt act is attributed to the present applicant. Having regard to the seriousness of offences and allegations levelled against the present applicant, the present application deserves to be allowed.

6. 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




05.02.2024.

(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.**

7. In the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the nature of allegations made in the FIR and without discussing the evidence in details as well as without going into details, prima-facie, this Court is of the opinion that this is a fit case to exercise the discretion to enlarge the applicant on bail. Hence, the application is allowed and the applicant is ordered to be released on bail in connection with the aforesaid FIR, on executing a bond of **Rs.10,000/-** with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court and subject to the conditions that;

(a) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the fact of the case so as to dissuade from disclosing such facts to the Court or any Police Officer or tamper with the evidence.


(b) shall maintain law and order and not to



indulge in any criminal activities.

- (c) shall 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 residence without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (d) shall 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) shall file an affidavit stating immovable properties whether self acquired or ancestral with description, location and present value of such properties before the Trial Court, if any.
- (f) shall not leave India without prior permission of the Trial Court
- (g) surrender passport, if any, to the Trial Court within a week. If accused does not possess passport, shall file an Affidavit to that effect.

8. The authorities concerned shall 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 Judge concerned will be free to issue warrant or take appropriate action in the matter. 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.

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 made absolute to the aforesaid extent. Direct service is permitted.

NABILA

(M. R. MENGDEY,J)