

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

Dated this the 17th day of June 2026

PRESENT

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

Crl.Misc.No.1150/2026

Petitioner : Sri. Lakshman @ Lacchu,
S/o Thammaiah,
Aged about 29 years,
R/at No.24, Srigandhanagar,
Hegganahalli cross,
Bengaluru – 560021.

**(By Sri. Mohana C -
Advocate)**

-Vs-

Respondent: State by Byadarahalli
Police Station.

(By Public Prosecutor)

ORDER

This petition is filed by the petitioner/accused U/s.483 of BNS. seeking his release on bail in Cr.No.129/2016 registered by the respondent-Police for the offences punishable U/s. 399, 402 of IPC.

2. It is alleged in the complaint that, while CW1 was on patrolling duty along with CW2 to CW4, they received information that a group of five individuals possessed weapons and were gathering to commit a crime. CW1, along with the accompanying staff (CWs 2, 3, and 4) and in the presence of panchas (independent witnesses) CW5 and 6, conducted a raid at the specified location. The five accused individuals had gathered with the intent to intercept, threaten and rob solitary pedestrians and motorists. Their plan involved throwing chili powder to disorient victims, assaulting them with weapons and robbing them of their money and jewelry. During the raid, the police caught the accused and seized the following items from them:

CW1 through CW4, in the presence of CW 5 and 6, successfully raided the spot, took all five accused into custody and seized the mentioned materials. Consequently, a charge sheet has been submitted against the accused.

3. Now, the petitioner/accused who alleged to have committed the offences stated supra, seeking for his release on bail, on following amongst other grounds:

The petitioner asserts complete innocence, stating they did not commit the alleged offense detailed in the complaint and FIR. The petitioner argues that a mere reading of the complaint reveals a lack of ingredients necessary to attract the alleged offenses. It is noted that while the alleged offenses are non-bailable, they are not punishable by death or life imprisonment. The petitioner confirms that no similar petition has been filed before this court or any other court of law. The petitioner explains that past non-appearances before the trial court were due to undergoing medical treatment and he having "old aged parents". The petitioner is 31 years old and the sole breadwinner of the family, responsible for taking care of

small children. The petitioner is a permanent resident at the address in the cause title, possesses deep roots in the society, hails from a respectable family and has no bad antecedents. The petitioner guarantees he will neither abscond nor delay the proceedings. The petitioner is ready and willing to abide by any terms and conditions imposed by the court and to provide solvent sureties to ensure regular appearances. The petitioner requests permission to raise additional grounds during the hearing. Based on the aforesaid grounds, he seeks for grant of regular bail by preferring the aforesaid petition and prays for allowing of the petition.

4. The bail petition was opposed by the learned Public Prosecutor for state by filing his objections. The reasons provided by the petitioner seeking bail are invalid and explicitly denied. If released on bail, there is a high probability that the petitioner will threaten or intimidate the complainant and witnesses, preventing them from testifying in court. There is a strong likelihood that the petitioner will abscond and flee from justice if granted

bail. Release on bail poses a significant risk that the petitioner will destroy prosecution evidence. There is a high probability that the petitioner will repeat similar criminal offenses if released. The case was registered in 2016. Although the petitioner was granted bail on April 21, 2016, they have been continuously absent since then, prompting the court to issue a Non-Bailable Warrant (NBW). Because this is a 10-year-old case, granting bail will further obstruct and delay the trial, making disposal highly difficult. Incriminating material/objects were seized from the petitioner's possession during the investigation. The petitioner has failed to provide any valid or sufficient grounds in his application to justify their release. Based on the aforesaid grounds of objections, the prosecution seeks for rejection of anticipatory bail petition.

5. Heard arguments of both sides.

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

1. Whether the petitioner has made out

sufficient grounds for grant of bail?

2. What order?

7. The findings 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 petitioner along with petition has produced the certified copies of FIR, Information, final report along with annexures.

9. Examined the materials placed by the petitioner through his counsel. Verified the facts pertaining to alleged incident involved in the case on hand. Examined the available prosecution materials placed before the court by the investigating agency through the prosecution and the petitioner.

10. On examination of the overall materials placed before the court by prosecution, it could be ascertained

that the offenses alleged against the accused are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. There are no previous criminal antecedents found against the accused. This accused was already arrested and he is in prison. The requisite investigation at the instance of this accused was already proceeded with. This accused is not further required for the purpose of investigation as IO has not sought for his requirement for custodial interrogation. Further detention of this accused in prison will not fulfill any object. The accused/petitioner appears to be permanent resident of address mentioned in cause title. The chances of causing interference and causing threat to the complainant or repeating of similar offences against the complainant appears to be less. The chances of destroying the evidence or proof of prosecution appears to be less. Hence, for the aforesaid reasons this court is of the opinion that the accused has made out sufficient grounds to allow the petition. However, in respect of the apprehension expressed by the prosecution regarding absence of this accused from 21.04.2016 after granting of bail by committal court and expiration of 10 years at

present, imposing of one of the conditions to furnish cash security amount of Rs.30,000/- will fulfill the object under the facts and circumstances of this case. Hence, this court hereby answer the Point No.1 in the **Affirmative**.

11. **Point No.2:** In view of the above said discussions and findings of this court on the above said point no.1 which held in the Affirmative, this court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The petition filed by the accused/petitioner U/Sec.483 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, the accused/petitioner, is ordered to be released on bail in Cr.No.129/2016 of Byadarahalli Police Station on him executing the personal bond for the sum of Rs.50,000/- and shall furnish a surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the court with cash security of Rs.30,000/- to be deposited by accused/petitioner before the office of this court subject to the conditions that:

1) The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating officer as and when required and extend his fullest co-operation in the investigation.

2) He shall not give threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.

3) He shall appear before the court on all the dates of hearing unless prevented by any genuine cause and exempted by the Court.

4) He shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner whatsoever.

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

(DEVANANDA)

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

Order pronounced in open court vide separate order for the following:

ORDER

The petition filed by the accused/petitioner U/Sec.483 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, the accused/petitioner, is ordered to be released on bail in Cr.No.129/2016 of Byadarahalli Police Station on him executing the personal bond for the sum of Rs.50,000/- and shall furnish a surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the court with cash security of Rs.30,000/- to be deposited by accused/petitioner before the office of this court subject to the conditions that:

1) The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating officer as and when required and extend his fullest co-operation in the investigation.

2) He shall not give threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.

3) He shall appear before the court on all the dates of hearing unless prevented by any genuine cause and exempted by the Court.

4) He shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner whatsoever.

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