

KABR010028012026



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

Present:

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

Dated this the 24th day of June, 2026

Criminal Misc.No.1216/2026

Petitioner:

Ajeet Singh,
S/o Rajeev Singh,
Aged about 36 years,
R/at: B5 1604,
Vidya GIRI BDA Flats,
Behind Safal Market,
Doddabanahalli,
Bengaluru-560 067.

(By Mr. M.K. Metri-Advocate)

-VERSUS-

Respondent:

The State of Karnataka
By Kadugodi Police.

(By learned Public Prosecutor)

O R D E R

The learned counsel for petitioner has filed this petition U/S.482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter called as BNSS, 2023 for convenience) praying for anticipatory bail on behalf of petitioner in Crime No.250/2026 of Kadugodi police station alleging the offences punishable under Ss.85, 115(2), 118(1), 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter called as BNS, 2023 for convenience) on the file of learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.

2.1. The facts of complaint are reiterated in the bail petition. It is further stated in the bail petition that the petitioner is completely innocent and has been falsely implicated. There are no specific allegations attributing any overt act against the petitioner. The petitioner is the owner of the above-mentioned flat

shown as residence, and also the same is the matrimonial house where both parties are residing together. The petitioner is the permanent resident of Bengaluru with deep roots in society. The petitioner undertakes to fully co-operate with the investigation and appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required. The petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that this court may impose. The petitioner has no criminal antecedents. The offences alleged are not punishable with death or life imprisonment. Grant of anticipatory bail will not prejudice the investigation in any manner.

2.2. It is further contended that even after several counselling sessions, the complainant is not ready to understand legalities, and for no reason, is now trying to extort money from the petitioner and since he refused, she is taking the help of the respondent police in troubling the petitioner. No dowry was demanded or

accepted at any stage of the marriage, and the marital issues arose solely due to the complainant's alleged inappropriate behaviour. The petitioner is a law-abiding citizen. The nature of the dispute is essentially civil and matrimonial in character. The petitioner has deep roots in society. The offences alleged are non-bailable and cognizable and hence, the petitioner has apprehension of his arrest. The petitioner is ready and willing to abide by the terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Court. The petitioner is ready to offer surety to the satisfaction of this court. Hence, prayed for allowing the petition.

3. The Learned Public Prosecutor has filed objections to the petition, wherein she has narrated the entire facts of case in short and contended that there is a *prima-facie* case against petitioner. The investigation of the case is still in progress. The petitioner is absconding from the date of incident. If

petitioner is granted with anticipatory bail, there is every chance of tampering with the witnesses, hampering the investigation and committing similar offences and hence prayed for rejection of bail petition.

4. Heard arguments.

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

1. *Whether the petitioner is entitled for anticipatory bail?*
2. *What order?*

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

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

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

R E A S O N S

7. **Point No.1**:- One Smt.Nirmali Baishya, W/o Ajeet Singh has lodged the complaint on 04.06.2026 at

10.30 p.m., which is registered in Crime No.250/2026 alleging the offences punishable U/Ss.85, 115(2), 118(1) & 351(2) of BNS, 2023.

8.1. The statement of the complainant who was admitted as in-patient in the hospital was recorded by WHC-11696 wherein it is alleged that she is from Assam State and about 6 years ago, she had come to Bengaluru in search of job. About 5 years ago, she came in acquaintance with one Ajeet Singh (present petitioner) and subsequently, they fell in love and thereafter, got married on 16.04.2021 at Guwahati with the consent of both the families. The complainant and the petitioner came back to Bengaluru and were residing in the address mentioned in the petition cause-title. The complainant was working as a Senior Manager at Advarra Company situated at M.G. Road near U.B. City and since 2-years she is not doing any job. After the marriage, the petitioner and the

complainant had purchased 2 flats at Vindhyagiri BDA Apartment through home loan wherein one flat was registered in the name of the complainant and another in the name of the petitioner. Subsequently, the flat which was in the name of the complainant was rented out and they were residing in the flat registered in the name of the petitioner. The petitioner was very cordial during the initial days of their marriage, but, thereafter, the petitioner used to pick up quarrel with the complainant over trivial matters and used to abuse her and assault her.

8.2. It is further alleged that the petitioner used to tell the complainant that she made him to perform their marriage lavishly and hence, she has wasted all his money and they could have got registered marriage. The petitioner also did not allow the complainant to keep a maid for doing the house chores and he harassed the complainant to do all the household work

by herself. The complainant has been paying the EMI for one flat from her own salary along with managing the household expenses, groceries and other provisions. The petitioner only took the rental income of another flat. From 2.6 years, though the complainant was not doing any job, she has been paying the EMI for 2 flats. The petitioner also convinced the complainant that he would invest money in the stock market to earn higher returns and took ₹.50,000/- from the complainant every month from the time of their marriage and even continued to take ₹. 30,000/- every month after she left her job.

8.3. It is further alleged that when the complainant asked the petitioner to have a child, the petitioner told that having a child leads to unnecessary expenses and would be impossible to save money. The petitioner opposed for the same even when his parents advised him multiple times to have a child. The

petitioner told the complainant that if she wants to have a child to give him divorce and to marry another person. As the petitioner was harassing the complainant both physically and mentally, the complainant decided to file a divorce petition and she stopped giving any money to the petitioner since January, 2026. In this regard, the petitioner picked up quarrel with the complainant daily and pressurized her that they both would go abroad and to arrange for the same. When the complainant refused for the same, he picked quarrel with her without any reason and tortured her both physically and mentally.

8.4. It is further alleged that on 03.06.2026, while the complainant was working from her home, between 1.00 p.m., and 1.30 p.m., the petitioner picked up quarrel with her stating that his life is ruined because of the complainant and her family members. When the complainant told the petitioner that she would make a

separate house and live therein, the petitioner asked her to give back the jewels given by him at the time of their marriage and asked her as to why she has not brought the gold jewels. When the complainant ignored him and was going to bathroom, the petitioner came from behind, held the head of the complainant and banged it against the bathroom wall. The petitioner also struck the head of the complainant to the bathroom tap, held her and strangled her stating that she should die. When the complainant managed to free her neck, the petitioner again grabbed her head and smashed it hard against the wall. At that time, the complainant fell down with the blood oozing from her head and forehead. The petitioner kicked the complainant with his leg and forcefully strangled her once again. Despite the request of the complainant, the petitioner stated that she should die. The petitioner threatened the complainant that she should not inform about the

incident to anyone and thereafter took her to the hospital and got her admitted. Hence, the complaint to take legal action against the accused.

9. The aforesaid facts alleged in the complaint *prima-facie* reveal the offences punishable under Ss.85, 115(2), 118(1) & 351(2) of BNS, 2023. The offence under S.85 & 118(1) of BNS, 2023 are non-bailable in nature. Thus, the petitioner is having apprehension of his arrest, which appears to be genuine.

10. The petitioner No.1 is the husband of complainant. The above facts *prima-facie* reveal that there is a matrimonial dispute between the parties. If the bail is not granted, that would definitely widen the dispute, which is already exist between the parties. In the case of the present nature, if petitioner is not granted with bail, the relationship of petitioner and

complainant would become further strained and it is impossible for their re-union.

11. The petitioner submits that he is the permanent resident of address mentioned in the petition cause-title and there is no chance of his abscondence, if he is are released on bail. The petitioner is ready to abide by the terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Court for his release. The apprehension of learned Public Prosecutor that tampering and threatening prosecution witnesses, commission of similar offences and abscondance of petitioner could be safeguarded by imposing suitable conditions.

12. For the above reasons, this Court holds that petitioner is entitled for anticipatory 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:-

O R D E R

The bail petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is hereby allowed.

Anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner. The respondent-Police is hereby directed to release the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest for the offences punishable under Ss.85, 115(2), 118(1) & 351(2) of BNS, 2023 registered in Crime No.250/2026 of respondent police i.e., Kadugodi police station, Bengaluru Rural District, subject to following conditions:-

1. The petitioner shall execute personal bond for a sum of ₹.50,000/- with one surety for like-sum to the satisfaction of concerned JMFC Court/arresting authority.
2. He shall not threaten or tamper with the prosecution witnesses directly or indirectly.
3. He shall not commit similar offences.

4. He shall appear before Investigating Officer, as and when called for investigation during the reasonable hours of the day.
5. He is hereby directed to appear before the concerned JMFC within the period of 30 days from the date of this order to execute the personal bond and surety bond and also appear before the Investigating Officer.
6. 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.
7. Petitioner shall produce his ID and address proof documents before learned JMFC.

If any of these conditions are violated, then the bail bonds 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 24th day of June, 2026)

(B.S. REKHA)
Prl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District,
Bengaluru.