

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

Dated this the 17th day of March, 2026

PRESENT

Sri. Devananda. B.com, LL.M.
VI Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.

Crl.Misc.No.446/2026

Petitioner: Accused Raja S/o late Elumalai,
Aged about 34 years,
R/at Holalu village, Near Photo
Studio, Dudda Hobli,
Mandya Taluk and District.

(By K.N.Vipin Kumar, Advocate)

-Vs-

Respondent: State by Byadarahalli
Police Station.

(By Public Prosecutor)

**ORDERS ON THE PETITION FILED BY THE
PETITIONER U/SEC. 483 OF BNSS**

The petitioner has filed the instant petition to modify
the bail conditions passed in the order dated 18.02.2025 in

Crl.Misc.No.236/2025. Since it is only in respect of modification of the conditions while granting the bail, stating of the facts of the case once again is not necessary. Therefore, the facts which have been already stated in the aforesaid petition while granting the bail is hereby construed as part and parcel of this petition to avoid repetition of facts and to save the time of the court.

2. It is the contention of petitioner that the petitioner filed a petition under Section 482 of BNSS, which was initially allowed regarding Crime No. 537/2018 from the Byadarahalli Police Station. The court originally ordered the petitioner's release on the following terms: Execution of a personal bond for Rs.1,00,000/-. Provision of one surety for a like sum (Rs. 1,00,000). A cash security deposit of Rs. 25,000/- to be deposited to the office of concerned Court. An appearance before the concerned court within three weeks of the order date. The petitioner is seeking to modify the orders passed in Cri.Misc.236/2025 (dated 18.02.2025) based on the following claims: Since the petitioner was absconding

from the respondent-police, and also the petitioner is suffering from eye sight problem, could not be able to appear before the jurisdictional court for compliance in time, henceforth the petitioner most pleased to modify the said condition and grant two more days to comply the order.

3. The said application is opposed by learned Public Prosecutor by filing objections. It is contended that the offence alleged is serious offence and in the event of relaxing of the condition of bail the petitioner may absconding and there are no reasonable grounds offered. Therefore, the prosecution seeks for rejection of bail application.

4. Heard arguments of both sides.

5. The following points that arise for consideration of this court are:

1. Whether the application filed by the accused U/Sec. 482 of BNSS deserves to be allowed?
2. What order?

6. The finding of this court on the above said points are as under:

Point No.1: In the Negative

Point No.2: As per the final order
for the following:

REASONS

7. **Point No.1:** The bail petition filed by the petitioner in Crl.Misc.No.236/2025 was allowed by this court on 18.02.2025 subject to the conditions specified in the order portion. Accordingly, he is required to execute personal bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and shall furnish one surety for like sum to the satisfaction of the court and to furnish cash security amount of Rs.25,000/- to be deposited before the Office of concerned Judicial Magistrate Court.

8. It is pertinent to note that the offences alleged against the accused is U/Sec. 341, 364A, 120B and 506 of IPC. As per the facts put forth before the court in the petition the reasons assigned and the difficulties faced by

the petitioner were not supported by requisite documentary evidence. Moreover it is one year back the order has been passed during the year 2025. In spite of it after lapse of one year also the accused/petitioner has not complied the order and conditions imposed by this court. Instead he appeared before this court with present petition seeking for further extension of two more days time. The attitude and approach of accused petitioner not appears to be that of a prudent person. It is not within reasonable time he approached the court seeking for extension of time. Instead it is after lapse of one year he come up with this petition. This attitude of the accused/petitioner shows that he having gross negligence and having disobedience towards orders passed by the court by not complying any of the conditions imposed by the court. Hence, under the circumstances relaxing of the condition in order portion as prayed by the petitioner not appears to be necessary in the interest of justice. The petitioner not even deposited the cash security amount of Rs.25,000/- being one of the conditions. Hence, under the circumstances relaxing of condition as prayed by the accused/petitioner does not

arise at all and does not merits the consideration of this court under the facts and circumstances of this case. Accordingly, Point No.1 under consideration is answered **in the Negative.**

9. **POINT No.2:** In view of the above discussions and findings to above said Point No.1, this court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The petition filed by petitioner U/Sec.482 of
BNSS is hereby rejected. No order as to costs.

(Dictated to the Stenographer transcribed by her and transcript, corrected by me and then pronounced in open Court on this the **17th Day of March, 2026**)

(Devananda)

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

(Order pronounced in open Court
vide separate order)

ORDER

The petition filed by
petitioner U/Sec.482 of
BNSS is hereby rejected.

No order as to costs.

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