

KABC010150192026



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

Dated this the 12th day of June, 2026

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

Crl. Misc. No. 5365/2026

Petitioners : 1. Manisha Reddy,
S/o. Venkatesh Perumal,
Aged about 36 years,
R/at. No.16/1, 4th Main,
Vasanthappa Block,
Ganganagara, Bengaluru – 32.

2. D. Venugopal,
S/o. Dorai Swamy Reddy,
Aged about 54 years,
R/at. No.30, 2nd Main Road,
Kuvempunagar, Kattigenahalli,
Bengaluru – 560 064.

(By Sri R.V.Rajashekara, Advocate)

Vs.

Respondent : The State of Karnataka,
Yelahanka Police Station,
Bengaluru.

[By Sri Chinnavenkataravanappa,
Public Prosecutor]

ORDER

The Petitioners, who are arrayed as Accused Nos.1 and 2, in Crime No. 234/2026 of Yelahanka Police Station, Bengaluru, registered for the offense punishable under Sections 118(1), 351(2), 352 read with Section 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, have preferred the instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail and for a direction to the Respondent Police to release them on bail in the event of their arrest in connection with the said case.

2. It is stated by the Petitioners in the petition that they are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the Petitioners have no role whatsoever in the commission of the alleged offence and are not involved in the alleged offence in any manner. It is further contended that they are permanent residents of the address shown in the cause title and are readily available for the purposes of investigation and trial. The Petitioners submit that the allegations made in the complaint are false and baseless. It is also contended that the alleged offences are not

punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The Petitioners undertake to cooperate with the investigation and trial and express their willingness to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. They are also ready to furnish substantial sureties to the satisfaction of this Court. Since the Respondent Police are making hectic efforts to arrest them, they requested this Court to allow the petition and grant anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest by the Respondent Police.

3. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor has resisted the petition by filing objections along with the report of the Investigating Officer and 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 since there were sufficient materials to connect the Petitioners with the alleged crime. Hence, the grounds urged by the Petitioners seeking anticipatory bail is not satisfactory and untenable. It is further contended that, investigation is in progress and at this stage, if the Petitioners are granted anticipatory bail,

they may again abscond and tamper the prosecution witnesses and further indulge in committing similar offences. Therefore, taking into consideration the gravity of the offences committed by the Petitioners, he requested to reject the petition.

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.

6. The Points that arise for my consideration are:

1. Whether it is a fit case to exercise the discretion vested in this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in favour of the Petitioners ?

2. What Order?

7. 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

8. **Point No.1:** The case of the prosecution in gist is that, the Complainant, a resident of Bengaluru, alleged that on 30.05.2026, his father-in-law, Venugopal, had provoked him to come near his house. It is further alleged that there were frequent minor disputes between the Complainant and his wife. In that connection, at about 10.00 p.m. on the said day, when the Complainant went near the house of father-in-law situated at Kattigenahalli, the accused, namely Venugopal and his nephew Manish, abused him in filthy language, assaulted him with a brick causing bleeding injuries and criminally intimidated him. It is also alleged that the accused had called the Complainant from Devanahalli and thereafter abused and assaulted him. Based on the said complaint, Yelahanka Police registered Crime No.234/2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 3(5), 351(2) and 352 of the BNS.

9. It is contended by the learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioners that the alleged incident arose out of a petty quarrel between close relatives on account of a family

dispute. It is contended that due to the said family issue, an altercation took place between the Complainant and the accused. The Petitioners further submit that, after the incident, the Complainant took treatment at the hospital and thereafter approached the police station and lodged the complaint against the Petitioners. It is also submitted that the complainant is out of danger and has not sustained any life-threatening injuries. Hence on these grounds, he requested this Court to allow the petition and grant anticipatory bail to the Petitioners.

10. I have perused the materials on record. The allegations in the complaint disclose that the incident in question arose out of a dispute between close relatives, namely the Complainant and his father-in-law and other family members. The materials placed on record prima facie indicate that the alleged occurrence stemmed from a family dispute and the altercation appears to have taken place in that background.

12. According to the prosecution, the Complainant sustained injuries in the said incident. However, the

prosecution has not produced any wound certificate in support of the alleged injuries. Further, there is nothing on record at this stage to indicate that the injuries sustained by the Complainant are grievous or life-threatening in nature. On the contrary, the Complainant is stated to be out of danger.

13. The offences alleged against the Petitioners are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The Petitioners are permanent residents of the addresses shown in the cause title and there is nothing on record to indicate that they are likely to flee from justice. The Petitioners have undertaken to cooperate with the investigation and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court.

14. The investigation can be effectively carried out by securing the presence of the Petitioners as and when required. Their custodial interrogation does not appear to be required for the purpose of investigation. Any apprehension of the prosecution regarding tampering with witnesses or hampering the investigation can be adequately safeguarded by imposing suitable conditions.

15. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the relationship between the parties, the circumstances under which the incident is alleged to have occurred and the fact that the offences are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life, this Court is of the opinion that the Petitioners have made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, I answer Point No.1 in the ***affirmative***.

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

ORDER

The petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is allowed.

The Petitioners shall be released on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No. 234/2026 of Yelahanka Police Station, Bengaluru, subject to following conditions:

1. The Petitioners shall execute a personal bond for Rs.1,00,000/- each along with a surety for the like sum, to the satisfaction of the concerned Investigating Officer.

2. Initially, the Petitioners shall appear before the Investigation Officer on or before 27.6.2026 and co-operate with further investigation in the case.
3. They shall not tamper the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
4. They shall furnish their present addresses, mobile numbers and email IDs if any to the Court with supporting documents.
5. They shall not change their residence or leave the country 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 12th day of June, 2026)

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