



**IN THE COURT OF VII ADDL. DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, BELAGAVI SITTING AT CHIKODI.**

:: PRESENT ::

SRI. VIJAY KUMAR, B.Sc.,L.L.B,
VII Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Belagavi sitting at Chikodi.

Dated this the day of 23rd day of June, 2026

Crl. Misc.No. 5311/2026

PETITIONER: Rambabu S/o. Tatarao Gandhavarapu
Age: 54 years, Occ: Area Sales Manager,
Famous Pan Masala,
R/o: Hyserabad Almasgud, Badangpet
Town Panchayat, K. V. Rangareddy,
4-29/68/1 SSR Nagar House No.68,
Telangana State-500058.

**[By: Sri. S. K. Patil, Advocate]
v/s.**

RESPONDENT: State by : Sadalaga, P.S.
[By: Public Prosecutor]

**ORDERS ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION FILED BY
THE PETITIONER/ ACCUSED U/S 482 OF BNSS, 2023.**

This bail petition filed U/Sec.482 of BNSS by
accused praying to enlarge him on anticipatory bail in
the event of his arrest in Crime No.82/2022 registered
at Sadalaga Police Station for the offence punishable
U/Sec.465, 468, 471, 472 r/w 149 of IPC.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that at 12-15 p.m. near Rajalaxmi Grocery shop situated near Basaveshwar Chouk, at Sadalaga, the accused-Mujammel had possessed 14 boxes of duplicate RMD paan Masala and on examining the same, the complainant found the label thereon as TM owner PR Dhariwal having one line containing 15 pouches. It is alleged that the said RMD duplicate paan Masala resembled to the original RMD paan Masala of the complainant and therefore, the accused has cheated the complainant as which are genuine RMD paan masala. Based on the complaint, the police registered the case and started the investigation.

3. The accused filed this bail application on the grounds that, he being innocent, law abiding and has not committed the alleged offence. He is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court for releasing on anticipatory bail. It is contended by the accused in such a way that alleged offences are not at all committed as alleged in the complaint. On these main grounds, it is prayed for granting the anticipatory bail.

4. Per-contra, the learned Public Prosecutor for the State has filed objections along with I.O. objections and xerox copies of FIR and complaint praying to reject the bail application on the main grounds that the accused has committed the above said offences and therefore, if he is enlarged on bail, he is likely to threaten the prosecution witnesses and abscond.

5. Heard arguments on both sides. The following points that arise for my consideration;-

POINTS

1. Whether the petitioner/accused has made out sufficient grounds to grant bail?
2. What order ?

6. My findings on the above points are as under :

Point No.1 : In the Affirmative,
Point No.2 : As per the final order;

REASONS

7. **POINT NO.1:-** Initially FIR registered only against accused No.1. Petitioner/Accused No.2 name not mentioned in the FIR. After completion of investigation in the charge sheet itself accused arrayed as accused No.2.

Accused No.1 already released on bail in Cri.Misc.No. 5338/2022 and rule of parity applicable to the case on hand. It is not the case of the prosecution that custodial interrogation of accused No.2 is required in this case.

8. The alleged offences are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The complaint is silent to the effect as to from where or from whom, this accused brought the said duplicate RMD paan Masala and it is also silent to the effect as to on which date, the complainant saw and examined the said duplicate RMD paan Masala in the possession of the accused. There are no sufficient prima facie materials to show that the accused committed the alleged offence either by manufacturing or possessing the said paan Masala. However it is matter of trial. The accused not having criminal antecedents.

9. The accused no. 2 is permanent resident of the address mentioned in the cause title and having immovable properties. Considering these aspects the apprehension of the prosecution can be met with by

imposing some conditions. The principle of presumption of innocence until convicted applies to the facts of this case. It is true that there is apprehension of arrest by the police to the petitioner. Taking into consideration of these facts, this is fit case to excise discretionary power to grant bail. Hence, I answer point No.1 in the 'Affirmative'.

10. **Point No.2:** For the reasons given to point No.1, I proceed to pass the following:

:: ORDER ::

The petition filed by the petitioner/accused no.2 Under Section 482 of BNSS is allowed.

The respondent police is directed to release the petitioner/ accused No.2 in the event of his arrest in Crime No.82/2022 of Sadalaga police Station for the offence punishable U/Sec. 465, 468, 471, 472 r/w 149 of IPC on executing personal bond of Rs.50,000/- with one **Local surety** for like sum to the

satisfaction of investigation officer
/Jurisdictional magistrate with the
following;

:CONDITIONS:

1. The petitioner shall appear before the investigation officer/Jurisdictional Magistrate within 30 days from the date of this order to execute bail bond.
2. The petitioner shall regularly appear before the court during the trial without fail unless exempted by court for valid reason.
3. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly tamper the prosecution witnesses.

(Dictated to the stenographer directly over the computer and typed by her and corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the Open court on this the 23rd day of June 2026.)

(VIJAY KUMAR)
VII Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Belagavi, Sitting at Chikodi.