

MHRG170004042026



**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS  
JUDGE AT PANVEL, DISTRICT- RAIGAD**

**Criminal Bail Application No. 197/2026**

1. Rutik Dattatray Nimbalkar  
2. Ganesh Pandurang Gaikwad ---Applicants  
Vs.  
State of Maharashtra --- Opponent

**Appearance-**

Ld. Advocate Shri. A. A. Shirsat for applicants.  
Ld. Addl. P P Shri. A.R. Kadam for State.

**ORDER BELOW EXH. 1**

1. This is an application filed by applicant No.1. **Rutik Dattatray Nimbalkar** and 2. **Ganesh Pandurang Gaikwad** under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (in short "BNSS") for anticipatory bail.
2. I.O. has filed say to this application at Exh.5 and strongly opposed the bail application.
3. Perused application, say thereon and documents produced on the record. Heard both sides.
4. Ld. Advocate for applicants submitted that, the applicants are innocent and not committed any offence. There is delay in lodging FIR. No criminal antecedents. Dispute is

of civil in nature. The applicants are ready to abide any condition to be imposed by the Court. They are ready to co-operate the investigating agency.

5. Ld. Addl. P. P. Shri. A.R. Kadam submitted that offence is of serious nature. Co-accused Pratik Nimbalkar sold misappropriated edible oil to Tejas Bhandari and obtained Rs.10,80,000/-. The said amount was given to his brother Rutik Nimbalkar-applicant No.1. However, he is remaining absconding. Applicant No.2 is maternal uncle of the co-accused Pratik. Custodial interrogation of the applicants is necessary. Applicant No.2 is owner of the vehicle used for carriage. If the applicants are released on anticipatory bail, there is possibility of tampering evidence and pressurizing of prosecution witnesses. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, it is not proper to release applicants on anticipatory bail. Hence, prosecution prayed for rejection of bail.
6. Perused FIR and documents placed on record. Informant Vikas Ramkishor Singh is doing transport service business by name Spectra Logistic Solution Transport Company at Vashi, Navi Mumbai. Informant's transport company had contract with Frigorifico Allana Private Limited, Khopoli. As per the order of the said company, the informant's transport company used to provide vehicles for transport of the goods. On 24/01/2026 informant's company received order from Frigorifico Allana Private Limited

company for providing transport vehicles. Accordingly, informant uploaded request for edible oil transport on Black-buck App. Thereafter, on 25/01/2026 supervisor Mangesh Kumar Yadav received call and he was asked whether any goods available for transporting at Satara and Kolhapur. The said person told his name as Dinu Bagziya. The said order was confirmed and accordingly, truck No.KA-02-AH-8777 reached at Frigorifico Allana Private Limited. Freight charges were paid to the said truck driver. The goods were required to be unloaded at Phaltan, Lonand and Satara. The said truck along with Ten tones loaded goods left from Khopoli at about 5.32p.m. However, the informant came to know that the goods were not delivered at Phaltan, Lonand and Satara. Driver of the truck Dinu Bagziya was also out of reach. Therefore, informant came to know that he was cheated by Dinu Bagziya and said person dishonestly misappropriated edible oil of Rs.13,22,687/-. Therefore, informant lodged report to Khopoli Police Station C.R.No.30/2026 for the offences punishable under Section 316(3), 318(4), 336(3), 340 of the BNS.

7. During investigation it was revealed that co-accused Pratik Dattatray Nimbalkar fraudulently and dishonestly misappropriated edible oil of the informant. He also used false number plate to truck used for transport of goods. He represented himself as a Dinu Bagziya. The said truck is owned by applicant No.2 Ganesh Gaikwad, who is

maternal uncle of the co-accused Pratik. Co-accused Pratik sold the said edible oil to shopkeeper Tejas Bhandari for Rs.10,80,000/-. During investigation Rs.7,37,092/- goods were recovered and Rs.5,85,992/- received by the shopkeeper after retail sale of the edible oil has also been recovered. Co-accused Pratik after receiving the amount from shopkeeper and given the said amount to brother Rutik. Said amount is not recovered. Prima facie it appears that both the applicants and co-accused Pratik in furtherance of common intention cheated the informant. The applicants are involved in the commission of crime. Anticipatory bail is granted, it would hamper the investigation of the case. Considering nature and gravity of the offence, custodial interrogation of the applicants is necessary. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicants. As a result, I pass following order.

**:: ORDER ::**

1. Application (Exh.1) is rejected.
2. Interim application (Exh.4) is also rejected.
3. Inform concerned police station accordingly.

Panvel,  
Dated :- 13/03/2026

(S. R. Chavan)  
Addl. Sessions Judge  
Panvel, Dist.-Raigad