



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (ABA) NO.438 OF 2025

Dharmaraj Sennimalai

Vs.

State of Maharashtra, through Police Station Officer, Police Station
Rajapeth, District Amravati

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. S. B. Gandhe, Counsel for the applicant.
Mr. M. J. Khan, APP for non-applicant / State.

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
DATED : 17/07/2025

1. Apprehending the arrest at the hands of police in connection with Crime No.264/2025 registered with Police Station Rajapeth, District Amravati for the offence punishable under Sections 305(a), 331(3) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the applicant approached this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. The crime is registered on the basis of report lodged by one Vinayak Murti Palniswami on an allegation that he is residing along with his room partner Satishkumar. On 28.05.2025 he left the room by locking the same and when he returned back, it is observed by him that the lock was broken and two Laptops and cash amount of Rs.1,95,000/- is stolen by some unknown person. During the

investigation, the other co-accused were arrested and from whom two Laptops were recovered. The present applicant is shown to be an accused on the basis of the statement of the co-accused.

3. Heard learned Counsel for the applicant who submitted that except the statement of the co-accused, there is no material to connect the present applicant with the alleged offence. As far as the custodial interrogation is concerned, which is not required. He also fairly submitted that the applicant has attended the concerned Police Station as per the directions of this Court only once.

4. Learned APP strongly opposed the said application and submitted that the *prima facie* material collected by the investigating agency shows the involvement of the present applicant. Moreover, he is not co-operating with the investigating agency. Moreover, the online transfer shows that the applicant has received the amount.

5. On hearing both sides and on perusal of the recitals of the FIR, there is *prima facie* material against the present applicant to connect him with the alleged offence. However, he was protected by this Court by granting ad-interim anticipatory bail, but he is not co-operating with the investigating agency and not attended the Police Station. Thus, he has not shown any regard to the order of this Court, in view

(3)

916.aba.438.2025

of that the application deserves to be rejected.
Accordingly, I proceed to pass following order:

ORDER

The application is rejected.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)