

KABR010025322026



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

Dated this the 09th day of June, 2026.

PRESENT:

Smt. B.S. Rekha, B.A.(Law), LL.M.,
Principal District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District,
Bengaluru.

Crl.Misc.No.1070/2026

Petitioner : Narasimha Murthy, A.5
S/o Manjunath,
Aged about 19 years,
R/at: No.11, 3rd Cross,
Ganesh Maruthi Layout,
Hesaraghatta Hobli,
Silvepura, New Extension,
Yalahanka,
Bengaluru-560 090.

*Represented by
Sri S. Manjunatha-Advocate.*

V/s.

Respondent : State of Karnataka by
Soladevanahalli Police Station.

*Represented by
learned Public Prosecutor.*

O R D E R

This is the petition filed by the counsel for the petitioner U/S.483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter called as BNSS, 2023 for convenience) praying for release of petitioner on regular bail in Crime No.190/2026 of Soladevanahalli Police Station, Rural District, Bengaluru for the offences punishable U/Ss.115(2), 118(1), 140(2) R/W.S.190 of BNS, 2023 and under S.66(E) of the Information Technology Act, 2008 (hereinafter called as IT Act for convenience) on the file of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rural District, Bengaluru.

2. The facts of complaint are narrated in detail in the bail petition. It is further stated in the bail petition that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences and has got valid and tenable defence. The alleged incident is said to have taken place on 22.05.2026 and the complaint came to be lodged on 23.05.2026. Thus, there is delay in lodging the complaint. The petitioner never

involved in commission of offence. The petitioner is in judicial custody from the date of his arrest. The petitioner is a student and if he is not granted bail, then, his career will be spoiled. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is already taken place and further detention of the petitioner in judicial custody will amounts to punishment before trial. There is no prima-facie case made out against the petitioner. The petitioner is having deep roots in the society. The petitioner is the permanent resident of address mentioned in the petition cause-title. The alleged offences are not exclusively punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The petitioner is ready and willing to abide by the terms and conditions imposed by this court. The petitioner is ready and willing to offer surety to the satisfaction of this court. Hence, prayed for allowing the regular bail petition.

3. The learned Public Prosecutor has filed objections to the bail petition wherein, she has narrated the facts of the case in detail. It is further stated in the objections that the statements of the witnesses is yet to be recorded. The offences committed by the petitioner is heinous in nature. The investigation of the case is still in progress. If petitioner is released on bail, there is every chance of he committing similar offences, tampering and threatening the witnesses and abscondance from proceedings. Hence, prayed for rejection of bail petition. Along with objections, IO report is furnished.

4. Heard arguments of both sides.

5. From the above facts, the points that arise for consideration are:-

1. *Whether the petitioner is entitle for regular bail?*

2. *What order?*

6. Findings of this Court on the above points are as under:-

Point No.1: In the ***Affirmative***;

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

REASONS

7. **Point No.1**:- On 23.05.2026, at about 06.45 p.m, the complainant Smt.Anet Vinaya Sequera has lodged the complaint, which is registered in Crime No.190/2026 alleging the offences punishable U/Ss.115(2), 118(1), 140(2) R/W.S.190 of BNS, 2023 and under S.66(E) of the I.T. Act.

8.1. It is stated in the complaint that on 22.05.2026 at 3.30 p.m., the friends of complainant's son-Steve Aran Raj viz., Deekshith Anthony Gonsalves, Deekshith, Swaroop, Akash and Shashank had called him to come near Kuteera Dhaba situated at Hesaraghatta Road stating that their vehicle has been broken down. When Steve Aran Raj went near the said

place, his friends snatched the two-wheeler key and mobile from him, assaulted him and also demanded him to pay ₹.10,000/-. At that time, the son of the complainant-Steve Aran Raj called his friends and credited ₹.9,000/- to the account of Swaroop.

8.2. It is further alleged that thereafter, at about 5.15 p.m., they took Steve Aran Raj in the Swift Dzire car belonged to accused No.1 bearing registration No.KA-04-AF-1632 to Oyo room. They consumed alcohol and thereafter one Narasimha (present petitioner) also joined them and all of them disrobed the clothes of the son of the complainant-Steve Aran Raj and the same was video recorded by Narasimha. All of them assaulted the son of the complainant with rod and machete and kicked with their legs and demanded him to pay ransom of ₹.1,00,000/-. All the said persons at about 10.30 p.m., took the son of the complainant to Samruddhi Dhaba at Nelamangala and had their dinner and

thereafter, as the son of the complainant was unable to pay ₹.1,00,000/- they demanded ₹.30,000/- and told him that if he pays ₹.30,000/- he would be set free and threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint to take action against the accused persons.

9. The aforesaid facts alleged in the complaint *prima-facie* reveal the offences punishable U/Ss.115(2), 118(1), 140(2) R/W. S.190 of BNS, 2023 and under S.66) (E) of the I.T. Act against the petitioner and other accused, which are non-bailable in nature and maximum punishment is imprisonment for life and fine. The offence punishable U/S.140(2) of BNS, 2023 is triable by Court of Sessions.

10. Based on this complaint, petitioner who is accused No.5 was arrested and produced before concerned Court and then, he was remanded to judicial custody and now, petitioner is in judicial custody.

11. Whether the petitioner has committed the offences alleged against him or not is a matter of investigation which can be adjudicated at the time of full-fledged trial.

12. Anyway, investigation is in progress. The petitioner is already arrested and after investigation he is remanded to judicial custody. Thus, his custodial interrogation is not required. Furthermore, the petitioner is ready to furnish surety and would abide by the terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Court for his release. Hence, the apprehension of learned Public Prosecutor that tampering and threatening prosecution witnesses, commission of similar offences and abscondence of petitioner could be safeguarded by imposing suitable conditions. Hence, this Court holds that petitioner is entitled for bail with some suitable conditions. Accordingly, the point No.1 is answered in the ***Affirmative***.

13. **Point No.2:-** In view of findings on point No.1, this Court proceeds to pass the following:-

ORDER

The bail petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is hereby ***allowed***.

The petitioner is released on bail in Soladevanahalli Police Station, Bengaluru Rural District, in Crime No.190/2026 for the offences punishable U/Ss.115(2), 118(1), 140(2) R/W.S.190 of BNS, 2023 and under S.66(E) of the I.T. Act on he executing self-bond for a sum of ₹.75,000/- with a surety for like sum to the satisfaction of learned Magistrate subject to following conditions:

1. Petitioner shall not threaten or tamper with the prosecution witnesses directly or indirectly.
2. He shall not commit similar offences.
3. In the event charge-sheet is filed against the petitioner, the petitioner shall appear before the Court regularly without fail till completion of trial without exception.

4. The surety is directed to produce title deeds of the property before the jurisdictional Magistrate.

If any of these conditions are violated, then, the bail bond will be automatically cancelled.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by her, corrected, print out taken, signed and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 09th day of June, 2026)

(B.S. REKHA)

Prl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District,
Bengaluru.