

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

Dated this the 09th day of June, 2026

PRESENT

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

Crl.Misc.No.1074/2026

- Petitioners:
1. S.M. Rajappa
S/o Late Muninagappa,
Aged about 48 years,
 2. Murali S.R,
S/o Late Ramaswamy,
Aged about 33 years,
 3. Narayanaswamy,
S/o Late Muninagappa,
Aged about 61 years,
 4. G.V. Manjula,
W/o S.M. Rajappa,
Aged about 40 years,
 5. Yeshodamma,
W/o Narayanaswamy,
Aged about 49 years,
 6. Smt. Neelamma,
W/o Ramaswamy,

Aged about 55 years,

7. Ramesha Kumar S.M.
S/o Manjunatha,
Aged about 25 years,

All are r/at Shivanapura village,
Nandagudi Hobli,
Hosakote Taluk,
Bengaluru Rural District.

(Rep. By B Pramod Kumar, Advocate)

-Vs-

Respondent: State by Nandagudi Police Station.

(By learned Public Prosecutor)

ORDER

This petition is filed by the petitioners/accused U/Sec.482 of BNSS seeking a direction to respondent-Police to release them on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.113/2026 registered by the respondent-police for the offences punishable U/secs. 109(1), 115(2), 189(2), 190, 191(2), 118(1), 351(2), 352 of BNS.

2. The facts averred in the complaint preferred by the

complainant discloses that, the complainant works as a driver. A person named Venu had been living as a tenant in the complainant's house for about 7–8 months. On May 20, 2026, at around 5:30 PM, Venu requested the complainant to drive him to Shivanapura village to visit his elder sister, Bindu. At around 6:00 PM that same evening, the complainant, Venu, and Venu's parents (Ganesh and Ramavati) arrived at Shivanapura village. Upon arrival, they witnessed three brothers—Murali, Rajappa, and Narayanaswamy—quarrelling with Bindu and her husband, Manjunath: Rajappa assaulted Manjunath on his left hand with a wooden stick (club), while Murali assaulted Manjunath with his hands. When the complainant and Venu intervened to stop the fight, Rajappa threatened them, stating he would not leave them alive. With the intent to kill, Rajappa struck the complainant on the head with the wooden stick. Narayanaswamy also assaulted Manjunath with his hands. When Manjunath's father (Muniyappa), sister (Bindu) and brother (Mohan) tried to intervene, Rajappa, Murali and Narayanaswamy verbally abused them and the

complainant's group using highly derogatory and obscene language. Shortly after, Manjamma, Yashodamma, Neelamma, Ramesh, and others arrived at the scene and joined in, assaulting Muniyappa, Mohan and Bindu with their hands. While leaving the scene, the attackers threatened them, stating that if they ever interfered in the matter of the land again, they would not be left alive. The complainant received medical treatment at the Hoskote Government Hospital, where he required 7 stitches on his head. Manjunath is currently receiving treatment at Srinivasa Hospital. Rajappa, Murali, Narayanaswamy, Manjamma, Yashodamma, Neelamma, Ramesh and others. The complainant filed this formal complaint on May 21, 2026, after receiving treatment, requesting legal action against the accused for assault with the intent to kill, verbal abuse and life threats. An investigation has been initiated based on this complaint.

3. Based on the said information, the respondent-Police have registered FIR against the accused for the above said offences. Now, the petitioners who are accused

of commission of offences alleged, apprehending their arrest at the hands of respondent-Police, have filed this petition seeking pre-arrest bail on the following amongst other grounds:

The petitioners assert they are respectable, law-abiding citizens who are entirely innocent and have not committed any of the alleged offences. They claim the respondent police registered a false case against them. They state that individuals inimical to them instigated the complainant to file a false complaint. Furthermore, Petitioner No. 1 (Rajappa) had already filed a counter-complaint against the complainant and eight others, registered as Crime No. 114/2026 under various sections of the B.N.S., 2023. The petitioners own house properties in their locality and are the sole caretakers of their elderly parents. They argue that denying them bail will cause severe loss, injury and hardship to their entire family. They emphasize that the alleged offences are not punishable by death or life imprisonment. They maintain that the case is concocted and the alleged offences do not apply to them. The petitioners explicitly undertake to abide by any

conditions imposed by the Court. They promise not to interfere with the police investigation, not to tamper with police witnesses and state they are ready to furnish the required surety for their release. Based on the aforesaid grounds they seek for allowing of the petition.

4. The bail petition was opposed by the learned Public Prosecutor for state by filing his objections. The reasons stated by the petitioner in the anticipatory bail application are baseless, denied by the prosecution and do not constitute sufficient or valid grounds for bail. If released on anticipatory bail, there is a strong possibility that the petitioner will threaten, intimidate or coerce the complainant and witnesses to prevent them from testifying in court. There is a high probability that the petitioners will abscond and go into hiding to evade justice. Release on bail could lead to the destruction of prosecution evidence. There is a strong likelihood that the petitioners will engage in similar criminal activities or repeat the offenses if granted liberty.

The prosecution requests the court to consider the

guidelines established by the Supreme Court regarding anticipatory bail in serious criminal offenses:

- *Prasanthkumar Sarkar v. Ashis Chatterjee & Another* (2011): Courts must consider whether a prima facie or reasonable ground exists to believe the accused committed the offense, the nature and gravity of the accusation, and the severity of the punishment upon conviction.
- *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra* (2011): Society has a vital interest in the granting or refusal of bail because criminal offenses are against the State. Bail orders must strike a perfect balance between individual liberty and societal interest.
- *Chandrakeshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar* (2016): Judicial discretion must be applied judiciously when granting bail, balancing individual liberty against the interests of society, rather than treating bail as a matter of routine course.

The police visited the crime scene as identified by the complainant. In the presence of witnesses (panchas), a detailed spot inspection report (panchnama) was

conducted. During this process, the complainant's torn/stained clothes from the time of the altercation, along with the wooden sticks (donne) used by the accused to commit the crime, were identified and seized for further legal action. The investigation is ongoing. The police still need to obtain the official medical injury certificates of the victims, collect scene-of-crime documentation, and gather further supporting evidence related to the case. Based on the aforesaid grounds of objections, the prosecution seeks for rejection of anticipatory bail petition.

5. Heard arguments on both sides. Perused the records.

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

1. Whether the petitioners have made out sufficient grounds for grant of anticipatory bail?

2. What order?

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

Point No. 1: In the Affirmative.

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

REASONS

8. **POINT NO.1:** The petitioners along with petition have produced certified copies of FIR, information, remand application, requisition, arrest report and copy of Adhaar card.

9. The petitioners are accused of commission of offences punishable U/secs. 109(1), 115(2), 189(2), 190, 191(2), 118(1), 351(2), 352 of BNS. As the offences U/secs. 109(1), 115(2), 189(2), 190, 191(2), 118(1), 351(2), 352 of BNS are cognizable, apprehension of accused-petitioner of their arrest is well founded. As such, they can maintain this petition.

10. The learned counsel for petitioners urged that, the petitioners have not committed any offences as alleged by the informant. The informant has lodged false information against the petitioners. On the other hand, the

learned PP submitted that, there is prima-facie case against the petitioners. If they are released on bail, there are chances of petitioners giving threat to the witnesses, destroying of evidence, abscond permanently and derail the investigation process.

11. On examination of over all materials placed before the court by the investigating agency through prosecution as well as by the petitioners, it could be ascertained that the offence alleged against the accused are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The accused/petitioner no.4 to 6 are ladies. Further, there are no previous criminal antecedents found against the accused/petitioners. The injured already discharged from the hospital and already obtained treatment as per the information furnished. It is in respect of property affairs, the dispute arose between parties. There are no chances of causing interference with the investigation by the accused/petitioners and causing threat to the prosecution witnesses or destroying the evidence or proof of prosecution. The accused/petitioners appears to be permanent residents of address mentioned in the cause title

of the petition. In respect of the apprehension expressed by the prosecution and on the basis of the manner in which the alleged offences committed by the accused, it is just and necessary to impose one of the conditions to furnish cash security amount of Rs.10,000/- each by each petitioner along with other conditions will fulfill the object under the facts and circumstances of this case. Therefore, this court is of the opinion that the petition preferred by the petitioners merits the consideration of this court and deserves to be allowed in the interest of justice as the petitioners have made out sufficient grounds to consider their petition and hence, this court hereby answers the point no.1 in the **Affirmative**.

12. **POINT NO.2:** In view of the discussions and findings to above said point no.1, this court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Petition filed by petitioners/accused
U/Sec.482 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, in the event of arrest of

petitioners/accused in Crime No.113/2026 of Nandagudi Police Station, they are ordered to be released on bail, on their executing personal bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- each and with a surety for like-sum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Police Officer and to furnish cash security amount of Rs.10,000/- each in the office of concerned Judicial Magistrate court on the following conditions:

1. The petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer on or before one month from the date of this order and in that event Investigation Officer to take bonds and to release them.
2. They shall appear before investigating officer as and when called upon and to extend fullest co-operation in the investigation.
3. They shall not cause threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
4. They shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner.

(Dictated to the Stenographer transcribed by her and transcript, corrected by me and then pronounced in open Court on this the **09th day of June, 2026**)

(Devananda)

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

Order pronounced in open court
(vide separate order sheet)

ORDER

Petition filed by petitioner/accused
U/Sec. 482 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, in the event of arrest of petitioners/accused in Crime No.113/2026 of Nandagudi Police Station, they are ordered to be released on bail, on their executing personal bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- each and with a surety for like-sum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Police Officer and to furnish cash security amount of Rs.10,000/- each in the office of concerned Judicial Magistrate court on the following conditions:

1. The petitioners/accused shall appear before the Investigating Officer on or before one month from the date of this order and in that event Investigation Officer to take bonds and to release them.

2. They shall appear before investigating officer as and when called upon and to extend fullest co-operation in the investigation.

3. They shall not cause threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.

4. They shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner.

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