

KABC010146342026



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL CITY CIVIL AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, AT BENGALURU**

Dated this the 11th day of June, 2026

Present: Shri K.S. Bharath Kumar,
B.A., LL.B. (Hons)
Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.

Crl. Misc. Nos. 5268 & 5330/2026

Petitioners :1. Neha,
(In Crl. Misc. No. D/o. Mahaveera,
5268/2026) Aged about 24 years,
R/at. No.402, Janatha Colony,
SOS Nagara, Nayagav Post,
Mohali, Punjab.

2. Paramjith Singh,
S/o. Omkar Singh,
Aged about 25 years,
R/at. No.239,
Khudda Aliser Village,
Chandigarh.

3. Ankith,
S/o. Ravi Goutham,
Aged about 30 years,
R/at. No.198/1,
Haravance Nagara,
Merata Road, Gaziabad,
Uttar Pradesh.

(By Sri. T. Sateesha, Advocate)

Petitioner : Suhail,
[In Crl. Misc. No. 5330/2026) S/o. Ekarar Ahammed,
Aged about 26 years,
R/at. Bakasapura Village,
Hajarihagh District,
Jarkhand State.

(By Sri Sathish, Advocate)

Vs.

Respondent : The State of Karnataka,
(common) Amruthahalli Police Station,
Bengaluru.

[By Sri Chinnavenkataravanappa,
Public Prosecutor]

ORDER

Accused Nos.2 to 4 in Crl. Misc. No. 5268/2026 and
Accused No.5 in Crl. Misc. No. 5330/2026, in Crime No.
146/2026 of Amruthahally Police Station, Bengaluru, have
preferred the instant petitions under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking regular bail in the
case.

2. It is stated by the Petitioners in both the petitions
that they are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the
present case. It is further contended that the alleged offences
are neither punishable with death nor imprisonment for life.

The Petitioners submit that they hail from respectable families and have no criminal antecedents. They are permanent residents of the addresses mentioned in the cause title of the petitions. The Petitioners contend that they were not present at the place of the incident at the relevant point of time. They are the sole earning members of their respective families. The Petitioners further submit that they are ready and willing to abide by any terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Court while granting the relief sought. Since they are in judicial custody, they requested this Court to allow the petitions and enlarge them on bail.

3. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the petitions by filing objections along with the report of the Investigating Officer and has reiterated the averments stated in the complaint and FIR. It is further contended that the Respondent Police, on the basis of the complaint, has registered a case against the Petitioners and others, since there were sufficient materials to connect the Petitioner with the alleged crime. It is further contended that the grounds urged by the Petitioners seeking their release on

bail is not satisfactory and untenable. It is further contended that if the Petitioners are enlarged on bail, they may further abscond and tamper prosecution witnesses and may further indulge in committing similar offences. Therefore, taking into consideration the gravity of the offences committed by the Petitioners, he requested this Court to reject the petitions.

4. Heard the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioners and learned Public Prosecutor.

5. Perused the petition, objections and the materials available on record.

5. The Points that arise for my consideration are:

1. Whether the Petitioners have made out sufficient grounds for grant of bail under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in both the petitions?

2. What Order?

6. My findings to be above Points are as under:

Point No.1:- In the Affirmative;

Point No.2:- As per final order;
for the following:

REASONS

7. **Point No.1:** The case of the prosecution in gist is that, the Complainant had become acquainted with one Ayesha, an employee of Amaira Spa International, Malleswaram, about two months prior to the incident. It is alleged that Ayesha had borrowed a sum of Rs.5,000/- from the Complainant on the pretext of being in financial difficulty, and thereafter they remained in contact over the phone.

On 18.05.2026 at about 11.00 a.m., Ayesha informed the Complainant that she was leaving for Ahmedabad and would return the borrowed amount. She shared her location with the Complainant, who accordingly reached the said place at about 1.20 p.m. It is further alleged that Ayesha and another unidentified woman were present in the house. After the Complainant had been inside the house for about ten minutes, certain unknown persons entered, assaulted him, and forcibly took away two gold chains weighing about 80 grams, a bracelet weighing about 40 grams, his mobile phone, and his Honda Activa scooter. Based on the said complaint, Amruthahalli Police registered Crime No.146/2026 for the

offence punishable under Section 310(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

8. It is contended by the learned Counsels appearing for the Petitioners that they are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further contended that the alleged offences are neither punishable with death nor imprisonment for life. The Petitioners submit that they hail from respectable families and have no criminal antecedents. They are permanent residents of the addresses mentioned in the cause title of the petitions. The Petitioners contend that they were not present at the place of the incident at the relevant point of time. They are the sole earning members of their respective families. Since they are in judicial custody from the date of their arrest, they requested this Court to allow the petitions and enlarge them on bail.

9. I have perused the materials available on record. The allegations against the Petitioners are that they, along with other accused persons, were involved in the commission of the alleged offence. At this stage, it is pertinent to note that

the alleged offence is not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The question as to whether the Petitioners have actually participated in the commission of the offence is a matter to be established during the course of trial on the basis of evidence to be adduced by the prosecution.

10. The records further disclose that two gold chains, two bracelets and five mobile phones have already been seized by the Investigating Officer from the possession of Accused No.1. The prosecution material prima facie indicates that Accused No.1 was working at the massage centre where the Complainant had become acquainted with her. Insofar as Accused Nos.2 to 4 are concerned, it is not the case of the prosecution that they were employees of the said massage centre. The evidentiary value of the material collected by the prosecution and the specific role attributed to each of the accused are matters that require appreciation during the course of trial.

12. The Petitioners are in judicial custody from the date of their arrest. The substantial part of the investigation, including recovery of the alleged stolen articles, has already been completed. Therefore, the continued custodial detention of the Petitioners does not appear to be necessary for the purpose of further investigation. The apprehension of the prosecution that the Petitioners may abscond or tamper with the prosecution witnesses can be effectively addressed by imposing stringent conditions. The Petitioners are stated to be permanent residents of the addresses furnished in the cause title and there is no material placed before the Court to show that they have criminal antecedents.

13. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the recovery already effected by the Investigating Agency, the period of custody undergone by the Petitioners, and the fact that the offences alleged are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life, this Court is of the considered opinion that the Petitioners have made out sufficient grounds for grant of bail. The prosecution has not placed any compelling material to demonstrate that their further detention is

required for a fair and effective investigation. Accordingly, I deem it appropriate to exercise the extraordinary discretion vested in this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and enlarge the Petitioners on bail by imposing certain stringent conditions. Hence, for the reasons stated supra, I answer Point No.1 in the ***affirmative***.

13. **Point No.2:** In the result, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

The petitions in Crl. Misc. Nos.5268/2026 and 5330/2026 filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 are allowed.

The Petitioners in both the petitions are ordered to be enlarged on bail in Crime No. 146/2026 of Amruthahally Police Station, Bengaluru, subject to following conditions:

1. The Petitioners in both the petitions shall execute a personal bond for Rs.50,000/- each with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of jurisdictional magistrate.
2. The Petitioners shall not tamper the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
3. The Petitioners shall regularly appear before concerned court on all hearing dates and

cooperate with further proceeding of the case.

4. The Petitioners shall furnish details of their present place of residence, registered mobile numbers and e-mail IDs if any along with supporting documents.
5. The Petitioners shall not change their place of residence pending disposal of the case without prior permission of the Court.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-II directly on the computer, typed by her, then corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 11th day of June, 2026)

(K.S. Bharath Kumar)
Principal City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.