

MHLA010007122026



**Criminal Bail Application No.**  
116/2026

**Dnyaneshwar Sachin Nilame**

**Vs. State of Maharashtra**

**(A) Case Details**

FIR Number & Date  
Police Station,  
District & State

87/2026 dtd. 26/02/2026  
Shivaji Nagar, Latur, Dist. Latur,  
State - Maharashtra

Sections invoked

Under Ss. 332, 125, 189 (1), 190,  
191 (2), 191(3), 324(4), 352, 351  
(3) of B.N.S.

Maximum punishment  
prescribed

U/S.332- imprisonment for 02 yrs.  
U/S.125- imprisonment for 03  
months.  
U/S.189(1)- imprisonment for 06  
months.  
U/S.190- imprisonment for 02 yrs.  
U/S.191(2)-imprisonment for 02  
yrs.  
U/S.191(3)-imprisonment for 05  
yrs.  
U/S.324(4)-imprisonment for 02  
yrs.  
U/S.352-imprisonment for 02 yrs.  
U/s.351(3)-imprisonment for 07  
yrs.

**(B) Custody & Procedural Compliance**

Date of Arrest  
Total period of custody  
undergone

N.A.  
N.A.

**(C) Status of Trial**

Stage of proceedings Investigation

(Investigation/ charge sheet/  
cognizance/ framing of  
charges/ trial

Total Number of witnesses N.A.

cited in the charge-sheet

Number of prosecution N.A.

witnesses examined

**(D) Criminal Antecedents**

FIR No. and Police Station Nil

Sections N.A.

Status ( Pending / Acquitted N.A.

Convicted)

**(E) Previous Bail Applications**

Court Nil

Case No. Nil

Outcome of case Nil

**(F) Coercive Processes**

Whether any Non-Bailable Nil

warrant was issued

Whether declared a Nil

proclaimed offender

**ORDER BELOW EXH.1**

The applicant has presented this application for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S. in connection with Crime No.87/2026 registered with Shivaji Nagar police station, Latur, Dist. Latur for the offence punishable under Sections 332, 125, 189 (1), 190, 191 (2), 191(3), 324(4), 352, 351 (3) of B.N.S., 2023.

2. According to advocate of applicant, the applicant has not committed alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in

the given crime by the informant. He has no nexus with the alleged incident. The name of applicant is Dnyaneshwar Sachin Nilame and not Ayush Nilame as mentioned in FIR. Just because his surname is Nilame, he is taken to the accused no.3 Ayush Nilame and the police are coming to his house and asking about him. There is every likelihood that he will be arrested without any reason.

3. According to advocate for applicant the applicant is a student. None of the offences alleged in this crime are triable by Court of Sessions. None of the said offence is punishable with imprisonment of more than 10 years. Nothing is to be seized or recovered from the possession of applicant. The other three accused in this crime have been granted bail by the Ld. trial Court. On the ground of parity the applicant is also entitled for bail. Custodial interrogation of applicant is not required. He does not have any criminal antecedents. He is ready to co-operate the investigation and is also ready to abide by all terms and conditions subject to which anticipatory bail is granted to him. Hence, he prayed that applicant be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Instant application has been strongly opposed by A.G.P. and I.O. on the ground that offences registered against applicant are serious. The applicant has been clearly named in the FIR. The accused Ayush Nilame and Dnyaneshwar Sachin Nilame is the same person who is the accused in present crime.

He alongwith the prime accused Balaji shared common intention to commit the offence. He alongwith other accused broke the window glasses of the house of informant and also the window glasses of the vehicles standing on the road. They committed the offence to terrorize the informant and his family and also the people in the area. The said offence cannot be taken lightly. Just because other accused who were remanded to M.C.R. after being in P.C.R. for 03 days are granted bail by the Ld. trial Court, it cannot be a ground to grant anticipatory bail to applicant by way of parity. The investigation is at initial stage. The custody of applicant would be required for interrogation, collection of evidence and for knowing details of the crime. This is not a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, they prayed that application be rejected.

5. Heard both sides. Perused the investigation papers and the documents filed on record. The offence registered against the applicant though not session triable, but are serious offences. The applicant has been clearly named in the FIR. It appears that he actively participated in the given crime. The alleged offence took place at about 03.00 a.m.. In the alleged offence stones were pelted on the house of informant and on the vehicles part on the road. The fashion in which the alleged offence has been committed is a serious matter and cannot be taken lightly. It is an attempt to terrorize the informant and his family and also the people residing in the vicinity.

6. It is true that nothing is to be seized or recovered

from present applicant. However, as per submission of the A.G.P. the applicant may be required for interrogation to know details of the crime and for collection of more evidence. The investigation is at initial stage. Some of the accused in this crime are yet to be arrested. The other accused who have been released on bail were in M.C.R. after being remanded P.C.R. for 03 days. Hence, the ground of parity is not applicable to the applicant.

7. Looking to the nature and gravity of the offence, the fact that applicant has been specifically named in the FIR and the fact that he may be required by the investigation agency for custodial interrogation to know details of the crime, the motive and intention behind the crime and for collection of evidence I am of a considered opinion that anticipatory bail is not justified. Hence, the following order :

**ORDER**

Instant application for grant of anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

Date : 18/03/2026

Sd/-  
( R.B. Bhagwat )  
Additional Sessions Judge-2,  
Latur.