

KABR010027882026



Presented on : 11.06.2026
Registered on : 11.06.2026
Decided on : 19.06.2026
Duration : 8 days.

**IN THE COURT OF I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU**

Dated this the 19th day of June, 2026

:PRESENT:

Shri. Mohammed Mujeer Ulla C.G.,
B.A. LL.B,
C/c I Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.

Criminal Miscellaneous No.1209/2026

Petitioners : Abhiram B.M.,
S/o. Shivaiah,
Aged about 23 years,
R/at No.13P, RR Layout,
1st Main Road, 1st Cross,
Near Petrol Bunk, Ayyappa
Nagara, Bengaluru North,
Bengaluru-560 036.

(Repted. by Sri. Nizam Pasha, Adv.)

Vs.

Respondent : The State through Nandagudi
Police Station,
(Represented by the learned
Public Prosecutor)

ORDER

Petitioner has filed the instant petition U/Sec.482 of Barathiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhitha, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in case of his arrest in connection with Crime No.56/2026 of Nandagudi Police Station for the offences punishable U/Sec.316(3), 316(4), 318(4) and 323 of BNS.

2. The learned Public Prosecutor has filed objections.
3. Heard the arguments on both side and perused record.
4. The Points for consideration are:
 1. Whether the petitioner is entitle for anticipatory bail?
 2. What order?
5. My findings on the above points are as under:

Point No.1: In the affirmative,

Point No.2. As per final order

For the following;

REASONS

6. **Point No.1:-** The case of prosecution is that petitioner accused No.3 is the owner of Goods Vehicle bearing No.KA-52-B-2622. The complainant Deepak Kumar is the Manager of Shine Logistic Transport Company. The said company has taken the contract of supplying goods of the Flipkart company. For that purpose the Shine Logistic Transport Company inter-alia took the goods vehicle of petitioner/accused No.3 bearing No.KA-52-B-2622 and another vehicle bearing No.KA-04-AB-8186. Accused No.1 and 2 were the drivers of the above said goods vehicles. While transporting the goods belonging to flipkart, they committed theft of valuable mobile phones and other valuable goods worth of RS.57,02,763/-. During the investigation it was revealed that the accused No.1 colluding with accused No.3 the owner of goods vehicle bearing No.KA-52-B-2622 committed theft of mobile phones and other valuables belonging to Flipkart company. Further the prosecution would submit that during the course of investigation stolen goods worth of Rs.13,17,420/- was seized on the basis of information

given by accused No.2. Therefore the accused committed the offences punishable under Sections U/Sec.316(3), 316(4), 318(4) and 323 of BNS.

7. A perusal of the record would show that on the basis of complaint dated 17.03.2026 alleged to have given by Deepak Kumar the Manager of Shine Logistic Company, in the charge sheet the petitioner is shown as accused No.3. Therefore he filed instant petition seeking anticipatory bail.
8. A perusal of the record would show that the name of petitioner is not noted in the FIR. From facts stated in the complaint would show that the petitioner gave his goods vehicle to the Shine Logistic Company along with driver. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that after petitioner gave his goods vehicle to the Logistic Company, it is the duty of said company to supervise the transportation. The

petitioner is not responsible for transporting the goods of Flipkart.

9. Having regard to the material available on record I am of the opinion that there is considerable force in the above arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner. Therefore it appears that in the FIR the complainant did not mention the name of accused No.3. In the instant case the investigation is completed and charge sheet was submitted. Accused No.2 the driver who actively engaged in transporting the goods belonging to the Flipkart in the goods vehicle and from whom the stolen goods worth of Rs.13,17,420/- was alleged to have been seized was released on bail. When such is the case I am of the opinion that the petitioner who was aged about 23 years and has no criminal antecedents is entitle for anticipatory bail as his presence is required only before the court to participate in the proceedings. The apprehensions raised by the prosecution can be

suitably safeguard by imposing conditions. In view of the above, I answer point No.1 in the affirmative.

10. **Point No.2:** For the reasons stated above, I pass the following:

ORDER

The petition filed by the petitioners/accused No.3 under section 482 of BNSS is allowed.

The petitioners-accused No.3 is ordered to be released on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with Crime No.56/2026 of Nandagudi Police Station for the offences punishable U/Sec.316(3), 316(4), 318(4) and 323 of BNS by taking bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with a surety of like sum subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner/accused No.3 shall appear before the trial court within 15 days and execute bail bond
2. He shall not pose threats or inter-meddle with the complainant and prosecution witnesses.
3. He shall furnish documents relating to his and his surety present and permanent addresses and photo of his houses sufficient to easily locate in the locality and file affidavit stating in

what capacity, he is residing therein.

4. He shall furnish his Aadhar Card and Ration Card of his family.

5. He shall not change his residence without prior intimation to the Court.

6. He shall provide his contact number tagged to his Aadhar Card and shall not change the number without prior intimation to the Court.

7. He shall file affidavit stating his and his surety occupations, occupational addresses with supporting documents.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by her, the same is corrected by me and then pronounced in the open Court on this the 19th day of June, 2026).

(Mohammed Mujeer Ulla C.G.)
C/c I Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.