



**IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE AT BALLARI.**

**PRESENT: SRI SIDDALINGA PRABHU, B.Sc., LL.B.,
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, BALLARI.**

DATED THIS THE 16th DAY OF JUNE, 2026.

Crl.Misc.No.277/2026.

PETITIONER:-

K. Sridhara, S/o Tirupathi,
Aged about 39 years,
Private Contractor, R/o Near Guest House,
1st Cross, Indira Nagara,
Ballari.

(Rep. by Sri Gnanamurthy M.H., Advocate)

.. V/s ..

RESPONDENT :

The State of Karnataka by
the Police Dy.S.P.,
Office of Karnataka Lokayuktha,
Ballari. (ACB Police Station, Ballari.)

(Rep. by Spl. Public Prosecutor, Ballari)

--

ORDERS

Sri.K.Sridhar Son of Tirupathi, being the accused
No.12 of Spl. Case No.755/2025 (Crime No.07/2019

of respondent ACB Police Station, Ballari) does prefer this petition by invoking Section 438 of Cr.P.C. (482 of BNSS) seeking an order of Anticipatory Bail in his favour.

2. That basing on the FIS lodged by Rajashekar Mulali a Social Worker, on 18.02.2019 at about 4.30 p.m. with the ACB Police of Ballari, a case was registered in Crime No.07/2019. Thereafter the respondent ACB Police have conducted investigation and filed the Charge Sheet.

3. The sum and substance of Charge Sheet is that the accused No.12 being the Contractor of CMC, Ballari by joining with the Officers of the said CMC and with other accused persons have misappropriated Lakshs of Rupees even though no Public Work was done by this accused and therefore the Charge Sheet as against the accused No.12/bail petitioner and others by invoking Penal Provisions of Section 12 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1998 and Sections of

107, 120(B), 409, 420, 464, 465, 468, 471 and 474 of IPC.

4. The above being the facts, the accused No.12/bail petitioner in his pleadings urges *inter alia* that he is innocent of the offences alleged, that any point of time did he committed the offences as alleged, that he hails from a respectable family, that he does not have any criminal antecedents, that case was registered at the instance of persons who were having ill-will towards him, that informant had not adduced any relevant documents; on the other hand, he had relied upon fake documents. That the other accused persons have already been granted with bail. That the offences alleged are not punishable with death penalty. That the accused No.12/bail petitioner is ready and willing to abide by any of the conditions which may be imposed by this Court. That the IO has already completed the investigation and therefore, that he be granted with anticipatory bail as sought for.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor in his objections dated 08.04.2026 repeats the facts of the case and further says that the offences alleged are serious in nature, as the commission of the offences has bearing on the economy of the Country and the amount involved is that of Public Exchequer. That in the event of grant of bail, the accused would tamper with the prosecution witnesses and therefore that the bail petition be dismissed.

5. The following are the points which do arise for consideration.

1. Is the accused No.12/bail petitioner, for the grounds urged in the bail petition, entitle for an order of anticipatory bail as sought for?

2. What Order?

6. Having perused the aforementioned rival pleadings and having heard the parties hereto, this Court assigns the following:

REASONS

6.1. As pointed out by the learned counsel for the accused No.12/bail petitioner the offences alleged against the accused person being punishable under Section 12 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1998 read with Sections 107, 120(B), 409, 420, 464, 465, 468, 471 and 474 of IPC are not punishable with death penalty.

6.2. It is not the case of the prosecution that this accused No.12/bail petitioner was previously convicted by any Court of law for the similar offences. Nor is it the case of prosecution that this accused No.12/bail petitioner has bad antecedents. The fact that the IO has already completed his investigation and that filed the Charge Sheet being not at dispute, the question of tampering of prosecution does not arise at all. The fact that the other accused have already released on bail being also not at dispute, this accused No.12/bail petitioner, in the opinion of this court, is entitle for Anticipatory Bail on the

principles of parity. Therefore, while answering point No.1 in the **Affirmative**, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

That, for the aforementioned reasons the bail petition preferred under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. (U/S.482 of BNSS) by the bail petitioner/accused No.12 of Special Case No.755/2025 (Crime No.7/2019) of respondent Police Inspector, ACB, Ballari is hereby allowed on the following terms:

1. That the bail petitioner/accused No.12 shall execute personal bond for ₹40,000/- and he shall offer surety for like sum.
2. He shall appear before the Court on all the dates of hearing.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-III, transcribed by her through computer, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this the **16th day of June, 2026**).

(SIDDALINGA PRABHU)
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
BALLARI.