

KABR010012512026



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

Dated this the 24th day of April, 2026

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

Crl.Misc.No.475/2026

PETITIONER: Smt. Rabina Kaur @ Raveena,
W/o Late Rajeev,
Aged about 28 years,
R/at Flat No.B-405, 4th Floor,
Silver Tower Building,
Sai Baba Temple Road,
Munekolala, Bengaluru Rural
District, Karnataka - 560037.

(Accused is in JC)

[represented by–
Sri. L.M.D- Advocate]

-Vs-

RESPONDENT : State of Karnataka by
Varthur Police Station,
Bengaluru Rural District.

[represented by:

Public Prosecutor]

ORDER

Smt. Rabina Kaur @ Raveena, W/o Late Rajeev, the accused of Crime No.738/2025 of respondent police and being in judicial custody do prefer this bail petition seeking an order of Regular bail to be granted under Section 483 of BNSS.

2. That Miss. Muskhan, the resident of Jharkhand being the resident of Bengaluru city since 2024, in her FIS mentions inter alia that she is the resident of Flat B-405 which situates opposite to that of the accused/bail petitioner. That on 24.12.2025, the accused and her late husband were fighting. The inmates of the neighbouring flats complained to the security who tried to pacify the said dispute. That the security was called upon to restrain himself and not to interfere with the dispute of couples. That at about 4-17 a.m., the accused/bail petitioner had knocked the door of the informant and those of other flats situate in the same floor. That when the informant came out of her flat, she noticed a man laying on the ground and she spotted certain blood marks at the spot. That accused/bail petitioner was asking for help. As security did not respond, informant was constrained to dial 112. That

basing on suspicious, she lodged FIS which resulted in registration of case in Crime No.738/2025 by the respondent Varthur police by invoking Section 103 of BNS as against the accused/bail petitioner.

3. The above being the facts, the accused/bail petitioner urge inter-alia that, the accused/bail petitioner is innocent of the alleged offence, that the case of prosecution depends on circumstantial evidence, the accused/bail petitioner is not involved in the commission of offence, the very fact that the accused knocked the door of the informant and those of others in the same floor, is itself inconsistent with the guilt of the accused. That the bail petitioner has cooperated with the investigation team. She has a child of two year seven months old to be looked after. She is, having deep roots in the society, ready and willing to abide by any of the conditions which may be imposed by this court and therefore that bail be granted.

4. The learned public prosecutor in his objections dated 06.04.2026 while repeating the facts of the FIS, mentions inter-alia that the bail petitioner assigned no valid reasons, that there is ample scope for tampering of prosecution witnesses. That the accused originally hails

from Assam, therefore, in the event of grant of bail, she would evade the trial and therefore, the bail petition be dismissed. .

5. Under the above circumstances, 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 as sought for ?

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. That the materials placed before this court do reveal that at the relevant point of time, the accused was with the deceased at her flat, that the accused and the deceased were fighting before the incident, that it was mid night, that the security guard was called upon to mind his business. Therefore, it is the accused and accused alone must explain the cause of death of her husband as she was the only person who was with her husband at the relevant time and circumstance. Therefore, the suspicious as

expressed by the informant in her FIS cannot ruled out at this stage of pre charge. That the offence alleged is punishable with death penalty. Therefore, irrespective of the fact that the accused/bail petitioner is a lady and that she is mother of a child of two years seven months old, this court answers the point No.1 in **Negative** and passes the following :

ORDER

That, for the aforementioned reason the bail petition as preferred by the accused/bail petitioner (of Crime No.738/2025) under Section 483 of BNSS is hereby dismissed.

(Dictated to the Typist directly on computer, typed by her, corrected by me and then pronounced in the open Court on this the 24th day of April, 2026)

(Siddalinga Prabhu)

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

Order pronounced in open court
(vide separate order sheet)

ORDER

That, for the aforementioned reason the bail petition as preferred by the accused/bail petitioner (of Crime No.738/2025) under Section 483 of BNSS is hereby dismissed.

I ADJ, BRD.