

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO. 1310 OF 2026

Shri. Rutik Balu Chavan

... Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

Mr. Shreyas P. Barsawade, for the Applicant (through V.C.).

Mr. Shahaji Shind, 'B' Panel Counsel for the Respondent-State.

Mr. H. D. Nakate, Shirur Police Station, Pune-Rural.

CORAM : SANDESH D. PATIL, J.

**DATE : 22nd MAY, 2026.
(VACATION COURT)**

P.C. :

1. The Applicant is seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with C.R. No.235 of 2026 registered with Shirur Police Station, Taluka Shirur, District Pune for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 189(2), 191(2), 351(2), 351(3) and 352 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 **(BNS)**, Section 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951 and Sections 3, 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

2. The case of the Prosecution is that there was a quarrel between

the Complainant and some persons in connection with a Cricket Tournament on 17th March 2026. The Complainant received a call from one Mr. Yogesh Machale stating that they would like to resolve the quarrel. The Complainant along with his friend went over there. At that time, Mr. Akshay Patil, Sutradhar Shinde and others including the Complainant were present. At that time, Mr. Akshay Patil drew a pistol from his waist and fired. The shot missed the target. Pappu Kad also fired from his pistol in the direction of the Applicant, however, that round also missed. Thereafter, the Applicant and others hurled stone at the Complainant. This in nutshell is the case of the Prosecution.

3. Learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant submits that it is some other persons who have fired from the firearms and that the Applicant has not fired from the firearm. He submits that the allegation is that the Applicant had hurled stone. He submits that it is very unlikely that stone could be found in the cricket ground. He submits that custodial interrogation is not necessary.

4. Learned A.P.P. opposes the Anticipatory Bail Application. He submits that custodial interrogation is necessary. He submits that *prima facie* case is made out against the Applicant in the complaint. He submits that the allegations are very serious.

5. Heard the learned Counsel appearing for the respective parties. This is a case where there were firing from the side of the Applicant. Two Co-accused in this group have fired at the Complainant. However, that shot was missed. At that time, the Applicant also hurled stones. The intention of the unlawful assembly was very clear. There is strong case against the Applicant. Hence, this is not a fit case for grant of Anticipatory Bail Application. Hence, there can be no interim relief.

6. List the matter on 10th June, 2026 for further consideration.

(SANDESH D. PATIL, J.)