

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

Dated this the 16th day of July, 2026

PRESENT

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

Crl.Misc.No.1378/2026

Petitioners: 1. R. Dinesh Kumar,
S/o Sri. Rajendran,
Aged about 26 years,
R/at: A.L. Coliving P.G.,
White Rose Layout,
Whitefield,
Bengaluru – 560066.

2. Mrs. R.Rajendran,
Aged about 66 years,
R/at A.L. Coliving P.G.,
White Rose Layout,
Whitefield,
Bengaluru – 560066.

3. Smt. Kokila,
W/o Shri. Rajendran,
Aged about 50 years,
R/at A.L. Coliving P.G.,
White Rose Layout,

Whitefield,
Bengaluru – 560066.

**(Rep. By Mohammed Moin Ulla,
Advocate)**

-Vs-

Respondent: State by Whitefield
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.244/2026 registered by the respondent-police for the offences punishable U/sec. 305 of BNS.

2. The facts averred in the complaint preferred by the complainant discloses that, the complainant got married on May 18, 2025. Initially, her husband worked at Tech Mahindra Limited in Sholinganallur, Chennai, Tamil Nadu. On August 25, 2025, he joined AT&T Business

Services India Private Limited in Whitefield, Bengaluru, Karnataka, as a Senior Software Engineer. Consequently, the complainant moved to Bengaluru with her husband on August 28, 2025, residing in Nallurahalli. Her husband forced her to give up her job, leading her to resign from her position at HDFC Bank on July 2, 2025. For their Nallurahalli residence, the complainant's father purchased household appliances (like a fridge, washing machine, LED TV, etc.) worth approximately ₹4 Lakhs and gave her ₹2,00,000 in cash for emergency expenses. Her mother gave her 60 sovereigns of Sreedhan jewelry, out of which 15 sovereigns were for daily use. Even after five months of marriage, harassment continued in various forms demanding a high-end vehicle, causing her mental and physical cruelty. On September 24, 2025, the complainant locked all her clothes in a wardrobe, placed about 120 grams of gold jewelry and 1.450 kg of silver items in the bedroom and left for Madurai. She also left ₹1,65,000/- in cash (remaining from the money given by her father) inside a Tanishq bag with her clothes and placed some silver and bronze puja items on an open puja shelf. On

February 17, 2026, the husband and his family vacated the residence through a caretaker without informing anyone. When the complainant visited the residence on February 27, 2026, to check on her valuables and belongings, she discovered that her in-laws and husband had completely vacated the place a week prior and the lock on the wardrobe was broken open. Upon inquiring, the caretaker (Kashi) informed her that her husband, Dinesh Kumar, along with his family members, Rajendran and Mrs. Kokila, had packed all the items and moved them via a truck. The complainant alleges that her husband Dinesh Kumar, along with Sri. Rajendran and Smt. Kokila, have stolen her valuable items and household belongings. Based on this complaint, a case has been registered and an investigation is underway.

3. Based on the said information, the respondent-Police have registered FIR against the accused for the above said offences. Now, the petitioners who is 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 state that the criminal complaint is completely baseless and arises from ongoing marital discord and failed family mediations. They argue that a civil/matrimonial dispute regarding moving a rented residence from Bengaluru to Madurai has been falsely twisted into a criminal narrative of theft and economic abuse. The petitioners vehemently deny stealing gold jewelry and valuables worth ₹29 lakhs. They clarify that the gold ornaments in question were actually pledged jointly by Petitioner No.1 and the complainant at the Indian Overseas Bank and the assets are securely held in banking custody. Because valid bank receipts exist, they argue there is no need for police recovery or custodial interrogation. Despite cooperating with the investigation, the petitioners claim they are facing continuous verbal threats of arrest from the respondent police, which target the entire family, including elderly in-laws. They state that Petitioner No.1 is experiencing severe health issues (hypertension and high blood pressure) aggravated by this police harassment. The alleged offenses are not

punishable by death or life imprisonment. The petitioners have no prior criminal history, belong to respectable families and have deep roots in society, posing no flight risk. They cite the Supreme Court precedent (Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab, 1980) to argue they have reasonable and well-founded grounds to fear an imminent arrest. The petitioners emphasize that detention would severely traumatize them and tarnish their social reputation. They formally undertake to fully cooperate with the police investigation, abide by any conditions imposed by the Court and furnish acceptable surety to ensure their availability. Based on the aforesaid grounds he seek for allowing of the petition.

4. The bail petition was opposed by the learned Public Prosecutor for state by filing his objections by contending that there is a strong possibility that the applicants, if granted anticipatory bail, will fail to appear before the court for trial, elude the police and permanently go into hiding. The applicants are highly likely to threaten, intimidate, or influence the complainant and the

prosecution witnesses to prevent them from testifying before the court. The reasons stated by the applicants in their bail petition are baseless and are explicitly denied. The allegations in the original complaint establish a prima-facie case against them. There is a high probability that the accused will engage in similar criminal activities or commit further atrocities against the complainant if released on bail. Granting bail to these individuals would negatively impact and influence the ongoing investigation of 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 has produced certified copies of FIR, information, remand application, requisition, arrest report and copy of Adhaar card.

9. The petitioners are accused of commission of offence punishable U/s.305 of IPC is cognizable, apprehension of accused-petitioners 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 is not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The differences arose between complainant and accused/petitioners is due to matrimonial affairs. There are no chances of causing interference with the investigation by this accused/petitioners and causing threat to the prosecution witnesses or destroying the evidence or proof of prosecution. The accused/petitioners submit that the accused petitioner no.1 along with complainant have pledged the gold articles in the bank for the purpose of availing of loan amount and it is contended all the ornaments are in the custody of bank and available. The accused/petitioners appears to be the permanent residents of address mentioned in the cause title of the petition.

There are no previous criminal antecedents found against this accused/petitioners. The presence of this accused/petitioners for custodial interrogation is not required at this stage of the proceedings. They can co-operate with investigating agency after disposing of this bail petition also. 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.244/2026 of Whitefield Police Station, they are ordered to be

released on bail, on his 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 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 Grade-I, transcribed by her and transcript, corrected by me and then pronounced in open Court on this the **16th day of July, 2026**)

(Devananda)

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

Order pronounced in open court
(vide separate order sheet)

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.244/2026 of Whitefield Police
Station, they are ordered to be released on
bail, on his 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 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 him.

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.