

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3836 OF 2025

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3835 OF 2025

IN

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1028 OF 2025

Pravin Velji Dagha

... Applicant

Versus

Union of India and Anr.

... Respondents

.....

Mr. Madhusudan Pareek, Advocate for the Appellant/Applicant.

Mr. Amit Munde a/w. Jai Vohra, Advocates for CBI- Respondent No.1.

CORAM : R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATED : 4th NOVEMBER, 2025.

P.C. :

1. Perused Applications. Heard counsel for both sides.
2. During the course of the hearing learned counsel for the appellant has restricted his arguments not on merit but only on ground that the substantive sentence is short term sentence for four years imprisonment and in view of the fact of there being no possibility of appeal being heard in a near future, substantive sentence deserves to be suspended. On instructions he makes voluntary statement that appellant is ready to deposit entire amount of fine in this Court. The said statement is accepted as an undertaking to this Court.
3. Learned counsel on behalf of CBI opposed the application. It is

his contention that hardly for few days the appellant is in jail and as such this is not the case for grant of bail by suspending the substantive sentence.

4. Owing to the pendency, there is no chance of appeal being heard on merit shortly. Since the appellant is sentenced to suffer four years imprisonment, by impugned Judgment and Order dated 9th October, 2025 passed in C.B.I. Special Case No. 16 of 2019 and since he has undertaken voluntarily to deposit the entire fine amount in this Court, this Court finds no reason to reject the request for suspension of substantial sentence.

5. Perused record. Prima facie consideration of material on record indicates that fine amount of Rs.25,00,000/- is neither excessive nor disproportionate to the offence established. Moreover, in view of the fact that the alleged fraud is in respect of the money belonging to insurance company, it would be necessary to seek deposit of the entire fine amount as a precondition before release of appellant on bail. During trial appellant was on bail and he underwent trial. Thus, there is no reason to apprehend his abscondance.

6. In view of above, I pass following order:

ORDER

- i. The substantive sentence stands suspended subject to

deposit of the amount.

- ii. The appellant be released on P.R.Bond of Rs.30,000/- with two sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of Tiral Court, only after deposit of the entire fine amount in this Court.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the appellant seeks release of the appellant by furnishing cash bail provisionally. In case the amount of fine is deposited and the appellant is unable to furnish two sureties, he be released on furnishing cash surety which shall be limited only to the period of one month.

8. Applications stand allowed in above term.

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)

SONALI
SATISH
KILAJE

Digitally signed
by SONALI
SATISH KILAJE
Date:
2025.11.07
14:30:25 +0700