



**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 23rd DAY OF JUNE, 2026.

Crl.Misc.No.607/2026

PETITIONER:-

Sri Bhaskar P.,
S/o Shantharam,
DOB 17/06/1973,
R/o H.No. MIG 2/62,
Infantry Road,
Near Vasavi School,
Ballari, Karnataka,
Ballari- 583101.

(Rep. by Sri K. Prakash, Advocate)

.. V/s ..

RESPONDENT :

The State of Karnataka by
the Police Sub-Inspector
Brucepete Police Station,
Ballari.

(Rep. by Public Prosecutor, Ballari)

--

ORDER

Bhaskar P Son of Shantharama being the accused person of Crime No.103/2026 of respondent Brucepet Police Station, Ballari does prefer this petition dated 05.06.2026 by invoking Section 482 of BNSS seeking an order of Anticipatory Bail in his favour

2. Sri.Prakash Son of Shivaputhrappa Hadapada an Engineer attached to Ballari City Municipal Corporation, in his FIS dated 22.05.2026 mentions *inter-alia* that on 21.05.2026 at about 11.30 p.m. he has based upon the directions of his superiors, visited Ward No.39 of Nethaji Nagar, so as to discharge his official duty. At that time, the accused No.3 Bhaskar had not only obstructed his official duty, but also gave him life threat, besides abusing him in filthy language and therefore the FIS as against Bhaskar the bail petitioner herein. That basing on the said FIS, the respondent Brucepet Police have registered the case as

against the accused/bail petitioner by invoking offences punishable under Sections 132, 352,351(2) of BNS.

3. The above being the facts, the accused/bail petitioner in his pleadings urges *inter alia* that he is innocent of the offences alleged, that he has been falsely implicated; that the FIS is devoid of merits. That the disputes if any is between his Landlord and the Informant. The FIS is on account of misunderstanding. That at no point of time did the accused-bail petitioner committed the offences as alleged. That the FIS does not disclose the physical attack or injury to the informant. On the other hand, the allegations confined to exchange of words. He further says that the informant and another person have entered the premises without any permission and the same was questioned by the accused-bail petitioner. Being aggrieved by the said questioning, the informant has created false and fictitious averments. That the offences alleged are not punishable with death penalty or life

imprisonment. That the accused-bail petitioner is the permanent resident of the address as mentioned in the Cause Title. That he is ready and willing to abide by any of the conditions which may be imposed by this Court. Therefore, that he be granted with anticipatory bail as sought for.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor in his objections repeats the averments of FIS. He further mentions that the accused-bail petitioner has deliberately involved with the official work of the informant. That in the event of grant of bail, the accused would evade the trial and he would repeat the similar type of offences. That there is ample scope of tamper with the prosecution witnesses. Therefore that the bail petition be dismissed.

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

1. Is the 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. The offences alleged being punishable under Sections 132, 352, 351(1) of BNS, 2023, the same are not punishable with death penalty or life imprisonment.

6.2. It is not the case of the prosecution that the accused-bail petitioner was previously convicted by any Court of law for the similar offences. Nor is the case of prosecution that the accused-bail petitioner is a habitual offender.

6.3. However, the apprehension as pointed out by the State prosecution in its objection can overcome by allowing

the bail petition on terms. Therefore, while answering point No.1 in the **Affirmative on terms**, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

That, for the aforementioned reasons the bail petition preferred under Section 482 of BNSS by the accused-bail petitioner of Crime No.103/2026 of respondent Brucepet Police Station, Ballari is hereby allowed on the following terms:

1. That the bail petitioner/accused shall execute personal bond for ₹25,000/- and he shall offer surety for like sum.
2. He shall not tamper with the prosecution witnesses.
3. He shall not indulge in similar type of offence.

(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 **23rd day of June, 2026**).

(Siddalinga Prabhu)
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Ballari.