

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, TIRUCHIRAPPALLI

**Present: Thiru. M. Christopher, B.A., B.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruchirappalli**

Thursday, the 4th day of June 2026
Crl. M.P. No. 1947 / 2026

Pravin Balaso Nalavade, aged 37/26, S/o. Balaso Dhanu ...Petitioner

Vs.

Inspector of Police,
Fort P.S., Trichy Cr.No. 132/2026 ...Respondent

This petition coming before me for hearing, on this day, in the presence of Thiru. P. Savarimuthu, Public Prosecutor for the State and of advocate Thiru. S. Shagar, for the petitioner and after hearing both sides and considering these necessary materials, this court today passed the following:-

ORDER

It is an application for bail filed u/s.483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

FIR was registered against the four unknown persons for the offence u/s. 309(6) of BNS. The petitioners were remanded for the offences u/s 119, 309(6), 310(2), 49, 54 and 61 of BNS. The occurrence happened on 25.04.2026. The petitioner has been in judicial custody from 03.05.2026 onwards. As per reply given by the respondent police, the petitioner is arrayed as A4 in this case.

According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is an innocent and he has not committed any such offence and the earlier bail applications were dismissed by the vacation court and hence, prays to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that on investigation, there are 5 accused in this case and the petitioner is A4 and the petitioner belongs to other State and the investigation is become difficult, if he is to be released on bail and objected to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Heard both sides. Records perused. On perusal of records, it would show that the defacto complainant is doing gold business and when the de-facto complainant was alone in his home, the accused came to the house of the defacto complainant asking to sell acid and while the same was refused by him, the four persons pulled him down and punched on his face and demanded the gold jewels and snatched 1kg of gold ingot from the cupboard and broke the cell phone and CCTV camera recordings from his house and threatened to kill him and sealed the de-facto complainant mouth with a cellotape and locked him in the bathroom and when he untied the tape and came out from the bathroom, his employee one Nithin's hands and legs were tied with a rope and the defacto complainant untied him. It is submitted by the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that there are 5 accused in this case and it is a case of robbery and the petitioner and other accused caused injuries to victim at time of occurrence and the investigation is pending and no recovery was made from the petitioners and also, the accused are belong to other State and if the petitioner is to be released on bail, it is much difficult to secure him and strongly objected to grant bail. Considering the overt act against the petitioner and also, the nature and gravity of the offence and the way in which the offence was committed by the petitioner and considering the quantity involved in this case and considering the preliminary stage of the investigation and considering the submissions made by the prosecution, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, the application for bail is dismissed.

Pronounced by me, in the open court, on this the 4th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruchirappalli.

Copy to:

1. The Petitioner through petitioner's counsel.
2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tiruchirappalli.
3. The Inspector of Police, Fort P.S., Tiruchirappalli.