

KABR010010922026



**IN THE COURT OF I ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS
JUDGE, BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU.**

Dated this the 01st day of April, 2026

PRESENT **Sri. Siddalinga Prabhu. B.Sc., LL.B.,**
I Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.

Crl.Misc.No.408/2026

PETITIONER: Ravindra Singha,
S/o Ramlavat Singh,
Aged about 31 years,
R/at 3rd Floor, Murthy's
Building, Udayanagara,
Near Humming Sports Academy,
Dommasandra, Sarjapura Road,
Bengaluru-562 125

Permanent resident of
Badhaya, Sihtikar,
Sant Kabir Nagar,
Sitikar, Uttar Pradesh,
272 199.

**[represented by–
Sri.MPC.- Advocate]**

-Vs-

RESPONDENT : State of Karnataka by

Varthur Police Station,
Bengaluru Rural District.

**[represented by:
Public Prosecutor]**

ORDER

Sri. Ravindra Singh S/o Ramalouth Singh the accused of Crime No.443/2025 of respondent police and being in judicial custody does prefer this bail petition under Section 483 of BNSS.

2. The informant Sri. Bijendra Singh in his FIS dated 28.08.2025 as lodged before the respondent police mentions inter-alia that his Niece by name Poonam Singh was given in marriage to accused/bail petitioner. That there are two children in the wedlock of Poonam Singh and the accused/bail petitioner. That the accused/bail petitioner have been living in Bengaluru along with his family. That on 28.08.2025 at about 11.30 am., the informant was received a phone call from his sister-in-law by name Pushpadevi who had mentioned that the accused/bail petitioner had murdered his wife Poonam Singh. That the said Pushpadevi had insisted the informant to visit the spot and verify. That accordingly the informant at about 2 pm., on 28.08.2025 visited the house

of accused and deceased Poonam Singh and he had noticed the dead body of his Niece Poonam Singh on the Divaan Cot of the said house owned by Sri. Murthy, situate near Hamming Sports Academy of Dommasandra. Therefore the FIS which resulted in registration of case in Crime No.443/2025 by the respondent police by invoking penal provisions of 103 of BNS.

3. The above being the facts, the accused/bail petitioner being in judicial custody, urge inter-alia that he is innocent of the alleged offences, that he has been falsely implicated, that there are no recoveries whatsoever at the instance of accused/bail petitioner, that the accused/bail petitioner had no intention or motive to kill the deceased as alleged. That the police have compelled the relatives of deceased to lodge complaint against the accused/bail petitioner on the threat that the police would not give dead body of deceased and that the relatives of deceased should pay Rs.8,000/- per day as Mortuary Charges. Thus the informant had put the law in motion as against the accused at the instances of respondent police. That the petitioner/accused has enormous love towards the deceased. That the accused/bail petitioner had purchased property worth of Rs.18,00,000/- in the name of deceased

at his native place. That the children of bail petitioner will reveal the actual facts. That the incident is not a murder/homicide and on the other hand it is a suicide as the deceased was upset due to the fact that the bail petitioner is chronic alcoholic and that he had not conceded the requests of deceased. That CW.1 does not know about the facts of the case. That the FIS do not reflect any accusation as against the accused/bail petitioner. That the bail petitioner/accused is very friendly with the kith and kins of deceased. That the charge sheet and accompanied documents do not prima facie reveal any case as against the accused/bail petitioner. That he does not have bad antecedents. That he is ready and willing to abide by any of the conditions which may be imposed by this court.

3.1. The bail petitioner/accused by way of additional grounds urge inter-alia that the contents of postmortem report do categorically narrate that the incident alleged is suicide but not homicide. That the observations made by the doctor who conducted Autopsy do prima-facie narrate that the incident of death was due to suicide. Therefore that he be released on bail.

4. The learned public prosecutor in his objections dated 07.03.2026 mentions inter-alia that in the event of grant of bail, the accused/bail petitioner would evade the trial and would tamper with the prosecution witnesses. That the reasons assigned are not valid reasons. The learned public prosecutor in his pleadings relied on the following case laws :

- (1) (2011) 3 SCC (Cri) 765
- (2) (2011)1 SCC 694
- (3) (2016)9 SCC 443
- (4) 2023(1) KCCR 327
- (5) AIR 2022 SC-4546

He further mentions that the accused is of UP state and therefore that the bail petition deserves to be dismissed.

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

- 1) Is the accused/bail petitioner entitle for an order of bail to be granted under Section 483 of BNSS ?
- 2) What order?

6. Having perused the aforementioned rival pleadings, the materials placed before this court and having heard the parties hereto, this court assigns the following:

REASONS

7. While urging the grounds, the accused/bail petitioner is fair enough to say that prior to alleged incident, there was verbal clash and the same was followed by use of force by the accused upon the deceased. It is his further say that the deceased at that relevant time went into her room and had put the lock/bolt from inside the room and committed suicide. That it was the accused/bail petitioner who break open the lock. This particular ground of defence and its truth and veracity can be assessed only by means of trial, but not by means of pleadings at this relevant stage. So also the observations made by the Doctor who conducted Autopsy. Therefore it is no good for this court to arrive at the conclusion that the accused is innocent and that he has been falsely implicated and therefore that he be released on bail. As the offence alleged being heinous in nature in the interest of society, the bail petition deserves to be dismissed. Hence, while

answering ***point.1 in the Negative***, this court proceeds to pass the following :

ORDER

That, for the aforementioned reason the bail petition preferred under Section 483 of BNSS by the accused/bail petitioner is hereby dismissed.

(Dictated to the Stenographer transcribed by her and transcript, corrected by me and then pronounced in open Court on this the **01st day of April, 2026**)

(Siddalinga Prabhu)

I Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.