



IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

R/CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION (FOR REGULAR BAIL - AFTER
CHARGESHEET) NO. 23878 of 2025

=====

RENE JOSHILDA GOLDWIN JOSEPH

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

=====

Appearance:

MR. VISHALKUMAR. R. TOMAR(14520) for the Applicant(s) No. 1

MR L B DHABI, APP for the Respondent(s) No. 1

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NIKHIL S. KARIEL

Date : 26/11/2025

ORAL ORDER

1. Heard learned advocate Mr. Vishalkumar Tomar, appearing on behalf of the applicant, learned Additional Public Prosecutor Mr. L.B. Dhabi, appearing on behalf of the respondent-State.

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.



11192011250293/2025 registered with Bopal Police Station, Ahmedabad, for the offence punishable under Sections 351(3), 353(1)(B) of BNS Act and Section 66(C) of IT Act.

4. Learned advocate Mr. Tomar 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 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 the conditions that may be imposed by this Court if released on bail.


5. As against the same, learned Additional Public Prosecutor Mr. Dhabi 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. Having regard to the fact that the applicant has prayed for grant of regular bail, learned Advocates appearing on behalf of the respective parties do not press for further reasoned order.

7. 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 applicant being of having sent anonymous emails to various organizations, alleging that there are bombs kept in the organizations concerned, which had resulted in unnecessary harassment to the police machinery and to the organizations concerned yet, it would appear that the applicant appears to be a disturbed person more particularly, it would appear that the alleged crime may have been committed by the applicant following some dispute in a relationship with the third party.
- ii. The fact of the applicant being in custody since 28.06.2025.
- iii. The fact of the Investigating Officer having laid the charge-sheet.
- iv. The fact of the Sessions Court having released the present



applicant in similar offences.

v. The fact of the present applicant being a lady accused.

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.

8. In the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the nature of the allegations made against 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.

9. 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. 11192011250293/2025 registered with Bopal Police Station, Ahmedabad, on executing a bond of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousands only)** with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court and subject to the conditions that she 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] 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.;

10. The Authorities will release the applicant only if she 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.

11. 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.



12. 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.

13. The application is allowed in the aforesaid terms. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. Direct service is permitted.

(NIKHIL S. KARIEL,J)

PD