

Shivgan

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 541 OF 2025

Ramagauda Chandrayagaud Idgai	...Applicant/s
<i>Versus</i>	
State of Maharashtra	...Respondents

Mr. Taraq Sayed, *with Anish Pereira, Ashwinii Achari and Perashish Phanjode*, for the Applicant.
Ms. Shilpa Gajare, APP for the Respondent-State.
Mr. Shriram Ghodake, *API attached to Unit 9, DCB, CID, Mumbai present.*

CORAM: R. M. JOSHI, J.
DATED: 25th MARCH, 2026.

PC:-

1. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that herein in this case, without making company as an Accused, the involvement of the Applicant being its director, is sought to be alleged. It is his submission that in the year 2021, the Applicant became director of the said company and the investment in the said company by itself cannot be considered as financing to the alleged manufacture of Mephedrone ('MD'). It is his further submission that in a parallel crime registered at Solapur, the Applicant had been enlarged on bail by this Court, Circuit Bench at Kolhapur. He further argued by pointing out to the statement of the Co-accused, i.e., Accused No.1 recorded before the Authority under the MCOCA, which according to him, indicates that the Applicant has no nexus to the alleged

crime. It is submitted that for the first time in the year 2023, the Co-accused came to know about the contraband being produced in the factory by one Faiyaz. The said statement, according to him, further indicates that the Co-accused stolen the said product and sought to sell the same in Mumbai. It is his further submission that merely on the basis of statement of the wife of the Applicant, which only indicates about the investment made in the company and CDRs, which are obviously would be a non-incriminating circumstance in view of the fact that the Applicant was director of the said company. It is his submission that relying upon C.A. Report that the same also indicates that a legal product was also manufactured in the factory in question. All these submissions are supported by the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Aneeta Hada v. Godfather Travels and Tours Private Limited*¹, to seek enlargement of the Applicant on bail.

2. The learned APP opposes the Bail Application. However, she seeks time in order to make further submissions.

3. At her request, stand over to **2nd April 2026. Part-heard.**

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)

Digitally
signed by
SHAMBHAVI
NILESH
SHIVGAN
Date:
2026.03.26
18:35:01
+0530

1 (2012) 5 Supreme Court Cases 661