



**IN THE COURT OF THE II ADDL. DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE AT KOLAR**

PRESENT

Smt. DIVYA P.K., M.A., LL.B.,
II Additional District & Sessions Judge, Kolar.

DATED THIS THE 6th DAY OF OCTOBER 2025

Spl.SC.IPC & SC.ST.No.3/2024

COMPLAINANT : **State of Karnataka,**
Rep. By Sub-Inspector of Police,
Srinivasapura Police Station,

(Rep. by Smt. Nirmala,
Public Prosecutor.)

V/S

ACCUSED NO. 6. Nagendra,
S/o. Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 24 years,

7. Arunkumar,
S/o. Ramanappa,
Aged about 22 years,

Both are R/at. Ganeshpalya,
Mulbagal Town,
Kolar District.

(Rep. by Sri.S.M.G. Adv.for A6 &
A7)

COMMON ORDERS ON APPLICATIONS FILED ON
BEHALF OF ACCUSED No.6 & 7 UNDER SECTION 439
OF Cr.P.C

The application is filed on behalf of accused No.6 and 7 under Section 439 of Cr.P.C., seeking for their enlargement on bail in this case involving allegations of having committed the offences punishable under Sections 120-B, 109, 212, 307, 302 read with Section 149 of IPC and Section 3(2)(v), 3(2)(va) of SC/ST POA Act.

2. Brief facts of the case are as follows:

One Amaranatha.S/complainant/CW-1 lodged a complaint alleging that on 23.10.2023 at about 12:15 p.m. when he along with Srinivas, Krishna and a security guard were sitting under a mango tree having tea, at that time 6 persons arrived in two motor bikes among them one person was holding a cement gunny bag, they came near Srinivas, one person gave shake hand saying uncle how are you, by then another person sprayed some liquid on the face of Srinivas, all of sudden took knife, long and talwar from the cement gunny bag and assaulted Srinivas all over his body. They also tried to assault

complainant and other persons who were present at the spot. When the complainant shouted for help all the persons ran away from the spot. The complainant called Manjunath and Pradeep over phone and he along with Krishna and Rajesh took the injured Srinivas to Government Hospital, Srinivasapura wherein the doctors advised to take him to Devaraj Urs Medical College, Kolar. At about 1:50 p.m., the doctors of Devaraj Urs Medical college hospital declared Srinivas dead. Accordingly, the complaint was filed.

3. Based upon the first information lodged by Sub-Inspector of Police, Srinivasapura Police Station, has registered Crime No.372/2023. After completion of the investigation, the charge sheet is submitted against accused for the aforesaid offences in Spl.SC.IPC & SC.ST.No.3/2024.

4. The accused No.6 and 7 have come up with separate bail applications on the grounds that;

On 23.10.2023 at about 2.15 p.m the Srinivasapura police registered a criminal case in Crime No.372/2023 under Section 302, 307, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code and took up investigation. The First information report

was registered as against accused No.1 to 4 and three unknown persons. The name of the present accused No.2 was not found a place in the FIR. Thereafter, the investigation was transferred to the CID police for further investigation. The COD in continuation of the investigation recovered a Thalvar from accused No.7 under mahazer and conducted identification parade. Despite its special case under the SC/ST Act case cannot be investigated by an officer below the rank of Dy SP, the entire investigation including the recording of statements of the witness, accused, conducting spot mahazar and collection of evidence is done by a police officer with a rank of Police inspector as such the entire investigation is bad in law.

4.1) The Complainant in the written complaint dated 23.10.2023 very clearly mentioned that Venugopal was not in the place of incident, the only persons allegedly identified by the complainant are Chandan, Revanth and Goutham and 3 others. However, the CID police on the pressure of the deceased wife and relatives and politically motivated with an unrealistic investigation fixed as many as 9 accused who are not at all connected to the incident. The complainant police have failed to investigate and record the statement of Rajesh who was

alleged to stand at the entrance gate whose statement was very important and the complainant repeatedly mentioned the name of Rajesh, this would clearly demonstrate that the police have fixed the accused as per their convenience without proper investigation of the truth. The complainant police have failed to collect the call details of the each of the accused named in the charge sheet to find out the nexus between each of the accused and filed the charge sheet without collecting the proper investigation materials as such the entire investigation is only to fix the accused who are unconnected to the alleged incident. The complainant police have failed to recover anything from the other accused except the alleged recovery from accused No.7 which would demonstrate that there is no proper investigation in the matter and the accused are unnecessarily fixed. There are contradictions in the names of the accused in the investigation process as well as the accused named in the charge sheet which is a great lapse on the part of the investigation team and this would demonstrate the accused are unnecessarily fixed. The statement of E.Krishana who was the alleged eye witness recorded on 27.10.2023 under section 161 (3) of CrPC is very important who says "at about 12.15 p.m., three persons on a pulsor bike, two person on a star city

bike totally 5 persons parked their vehicles near the compound and among them one person came to Srinivas and told how are uncle by shaking his hand and called others come will introduce all of you to uncle, so they vacated the chairs as they are known persons to Srinivas and went behind during that time one person took out the spray bottle from his pocket and sprayed to the face of Srinivas who got up from the chair by closing his face, they also tried to spray on the others who ran away from the place, accused No.1 jumped from the compound with a weapon and attacked on Srinivas, the others who had come in the bikes also attacked on him with weapons, thereafter he called Rajesh by the time he could come all of them ran away on the bikes on which they came. This entire statement is contrary to the complaint given by Amarnath as such this witness is implanted subsequently. However, the same E.Krishna given a statement under section 164 (5) of Cr.P.C., before the Magistrate which is contrary to the earlier statement which finds a place of improvement as well as contradictions and omissions. This would demonstrate that E. Krishna is implanted by the police who was the relative of the deceased only to fix the accused in the crime.

4.2) The statement of complainant was also recorded under section 164 (5) of Cr PC before the Magistrate which is contrary to the earlier complaint/ statement which finds a place of improvement as well as contradictions and omissions. In this statement he speaks that after the alleged incident he went back to home, thereafter Sampath Kumar a constable from Srinivasapura police station came to his house thereafter he went along with him and lodged the alleged complaint. By reading this statement definitely a doubt will arise as to when he had called everyone why he did not call the police and inform about the incident. In the complaint he was very specific that Rajesh was standing near the gate, however, he says that he called and informed Rajesh. This would demonstrate that that complainant is implanted by the police who was working under the deceased only to fix the accused in the crime. The statement of Rathana Paraja who was the alleged eye witness recorded on 28.10.2023 under section 161 (3) of Cr.P.C., is very important who tried to repeat the statement of E.Krishna who is also not a reliable witness as the entire statement is contrary to the complaint given by Amarnath as such this witness is implanted subsequently. It is most respectfully submitted that by reading the entire averments in the charge sheet and the

statements recorded under section 161 as well as under section 164 of Cr.P.C. would definitely demonstrate the accused are fixed in the crime who have no other criminal antecedents either present or past except the implication in the above crime. It is submitted that the Hon'ble Apex court in catena of cases has held that in deciding the bail application the nature of offence is not important it is only to see the prima facie case from the face of the statements. It is also equally settled that in deciding the bail application it cannot be held pretrial to find out prima facie case. It is submitted that the accused are unnecessarily undergoing pre-conviction imprisonment and by considering the entire charge sheet the possibility of conviction of the accused is very less. The accused are not involved in the alleged incident and innocent of the crime and they are unnecessarily fixed without proper investigation. The wife of the deceased also preferred a writ petition before Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru in W.P.No.24630/2024 challenging the lapses in the investigation. Further, it is respectfully submitted that prima facie the Hon'ble High court also accepted that the lapses in the charge sheet and ordered for handing over the investigation to CBI. Hence, the accused are entitled for the bail. It is respectfully submitted that the investigation the above

matter is completed and charge sheet is filed as such the accused are not required for any further investigation. The accused being an innocent of the crime are in judicial custody. The alleged allegations very vague and bald and supported any material evidence and the same is nothing but harassment to the accused. The accused are having deep roots in the society and having dependent family including minor children and aged parents. The accused are ready to give any acceptable surety to ensure their presence and undertake that they will not indulge directly or indirectly in any crime or threaten any prosecution witnesses. The accused are permanently residing in the address mentioned in the petition. They are the sole bread earning members of the family. The accused are not required for any custodial interrogations and continuity of the judicial custody of the accused amounts to pre-conviction imprisonment. Hence, the accused No.6 and 7 pray for allowing the applications.

5. The learned Special Public Prosecutor has filed objections filed to the bail application filed by the accused No.6 and 7 by reiterating the charge sheet averments and contended that the Crime was registered with Srinivaspura Police Station on 23.10.2023 by CW.1,

thereafter the Investigation officer attached to Srinivaspura Police Station continued the investigation till it was transferred to CID, H & B Wing, Bengaluru on 27/11/23. The Investigating Officer completed the investigation and filed charge sheet against nine accused persons for the offence punishable U/S 120B, 109, 212, 307, 302, 201, r/w 149 IPC and u/s 3(2)(v), 3 (2)(va) of SC.ST Act. It is submitted that in response to Para Nos. 1 to 5 in the bail petition there is no objection as they are the brief facts of the present case. It is submitted that in response to para No.6 of the bail petition that the investigation of the case in hand was done by the Dy.S.P. after the provisions of the SC/ST (POA) Act was invoked. It is also submitted that, in response to para No.7 of the bail petition that, it is evident that accused No.6 and 7 are hand in glove with accused No.1 as in the said para accused No.6 and 7 are trying to mask the role of accused No.1. The de-facto complainant (CW1) nowhere in his complaint positively stated that accused No.1 not being at the place of incident, on the other hand all the eye witnesses including CW1 stated that accused No.1 being at the place of incident. The allegations against them are accused No.6 and 7 apart from being part of the conspiracy, were also physically present at the spot at the time of commission of the offence and

instigated the assailants to commit the murder of the deceased. Their role also extended to actively aiding the accused No.2 and 3 by causing disappearance of evidence by way of hiding the talwars used by accused No.2 and 3 in the murderous assault on the deceased. It is submitted that in response to Para No.8 of the bail petition that, the said Rajesh is none other than CW.17 whose statement was recorded on the date of incident during Inquest. This clearly shows that accused No.6 and 7 are trying to mislead and trying to make mockery of the court proceedings. It is submitted that in response to Para No. 9 of the bail petition that the call details have been collected and sent for call detail analysis by the experts as a part of further investigation, hence the ground is not sustainable. It is submitted that in response to Para No.10 of the bail petition it is again evident accused No.6 and 7 are trying to mislead the court as there is discovery of facts and recovery not only from the accused No.7, but also from the other accused persons. It is submitted that in response to para No.11 of the bail petition, the said ground is very vague with no details, shortcomings in Investigation does not become a ground for grant of bail. It is submitted that in response to para Nos. 12 to 15 of the bail petition the contention that there are improvements and contradictions in the

statements of witnesses cannot become a ground for grant of bail, while considering the bail application the court is not required to have a mini trial by appreciating the quality or veracity of materials placed on record. In response to para No.16 of the bail petition that it is nothing but a misleading statement as to correct position of law. The nature and gravity of the offence is a crucial fact to be noticed and considered in bail proceedings. Further, while in para No.16 of their bail petition it is stated that a court cannot hold a 'pretrial' and must only see the prima facie case, this statement is betrayed by the preceding para No.12 to 15 of the same of their petition. It is submitted that, in response to paras No.18 of the bail petition filed by the accused No.6 and 7 that there are materials to show the involvement of the accused persons in the said incident, as answered in para No.10 of this statement of objections. Hence, the contention in para No.18 does not hold any water. In response to para No.18 and 19 of the bail petition filed by the accused No.6 and 7 that, it is WP.No.24360/2024 not WP.No.24630/2024 as stated their petition. The wife of the deceased has filed the Writ petition seeking investigation at the hands of CBI as the State police are pressurized by some force who has committed the offence along with the accused persons named by the State

police and it is the specific contention in the Writ petition that accused No.6 and 7 along with other accused persons were given supari by the said forces to do away with the life of the deceased. The said Writ petition does not challenge the charge sheet in toto or in respect of materials collected against the persons already arraigned as accused persons, but only asks for further investigation and to rope in all guilty parties. Hence, what is urged in para No.20 is only an attempt to mislead this court by distorting facts, and the same cannot aid accused No.6 and 7 for the relief sought.

5.1) It is submitted that, in response to para No.20 of the bail petition filed by the accused No.6 and 7 that, the above said Writ petition which prays for further investigation remains pending before the Hon'ble High Court, hence, the contention of accused No.6 and 7 does not hold water. In response to para No.21 of the bail petition that the same is a vague, unsubstantiated and general ground that does not aid accused No.6 and 7 as they have to make out special grounds to be granted bail U/s.439 of Cr.P.C. The accused No.6 and 7 were arrested on 24.10.2023, a day after the commission of the offence. It is submitted that, accused No.5, 8 and 9 on 10.11.2023 in the presence of independent witnesses

Cw.24, Cw.25 and Cw.26 led the police party to the first place of conspiracy, i.e., SLV Bar where accused No.2 to 9 on 22.10.2023 conspired to kill the deceased as per the instruction of accused No.1. The accused No.5 on 10.11.2023 in the presence of independent witnesses Cw.24, 25, and 26 led the police party to one house owned by Ms.Jyothi, relative of accused No.1, where the accused No.2, 4, 6 and 7 stayed prior to the day of the incident and the above accused were dropped by accused No.5 and other remaining accused after the conspiracy at SLV Bar on 22.10.2023.

5.2) It is submitted that, accused No.5, 8 along with accused No.9 on 10.11.2023 in the presence of independent witnesses Cw.24, 25 and 26 led the police party to the first place of conspiracy, i.e., SLV Bar where accused No.2 to 9 on 22.10.2023 conspired to kill deceased as per the instruction of accused No.1. It is submitted that accused No. 1, 2 along with accused No. 3 on 17.11.2023 in the presence of independent witness CWs. 27, 28 and 29 lead the police party to the place of conspiracy, where all the accused on 23.10.2023 conspired to kill deceased as per the instruction of accused No.1. It is submitted that, the case is based on eyewitnesses testimonies, hence there is all chances that

the accused No.6 and 7 if enlarged on bail would, in collusion with the other accused persons, threaten the witnesses and tamper with them. It is submitted that, the accused No.6 and 7 have been identified by Cw.1 to 3 in their respective Test Identification Parades. The accused No.6 and 7 have consented for polygraph test which is pending as a part of further investigation. If they are released on bail, there is every possibility of their absconding and frustrating this part of the further investigation. It is submitted that, the applications of accused No.2 to 5, 8 and 9 have been rejected by this court and the bail petitions of accused No.5 and 8 have been rejected by the Hon'ble High Court. Since the accused No.6 and 7 stand on the same footing as these other accused persons, they too are dis entitled to the same relief. It is further submitted that, if accused No.6 and 7 enlarged on bail, would flee from the jurisdiction of the court in fear of punishment. The prosecution submitted that the accused No.6 and 7 are facing an accusation of murder which is punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The charge sheet materials are strong enough to prove that, the accused No.6 and 7 have committed the offence which is punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Hence, prays to reject the bail application filed by the accused No.6 and 7.

6. Heard the arguments. The learned Special Public Prosecutor has filed memo with following citation of judgments;

1. (2022) 8 SCC 559 (Deepak Yadav V/s.State of UP).
2. (2010) 14 SCC 496 (Prasanta Kumar Sarkar V/s.Ashis Chattergee).
3. (2008) 3 SCC 775 (Gobarbhai Singala V/s.State of Gujarat).
4. (2023) 13 SCC 365 (Balu Khalde V/s.State of Maharashtra).
5. (2022) 9 SCC 321 (Jagjeet Singh V/s.Ashish Mishra).
6. (2019) 14 SCC 522 (Sangitaben Datanta V/s.State of Gujarat).
7. 2025 SCC Online SC 1702 (State of Karnataka V/s. Sri.Darshan

Perused the same.

7. The points that arises for consideration are: -

1. Whether accused No.6 and 7 are entitled to be enlarged on bail under Section 439 of Cr.P.C.?

2. What Order?

8. The answer to the above points as follows;

Point No.1 : In the Negative

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

REASONS

9. POINT NO.1:- This Court has carefully gone through the charge sheet and the materials placed on record. It is alleged that due to vengeance between the deceased Srinivas and the accused No.1, accused No.1 with other accused conspired to eliminate the deceased Srinivas and murdered him by brutally assaulting with talwar. The counsel for the accused No.6 and 7 has sought bail on the ground that the accused are innocent of the crime and they are in judicial custody from past 2 years and there are contradictions in the names of the accused in the investigation process as well as the accused named in the charge sheet, which is a great lapse on the part of the investigation team and this would demonstrate the accused are unnecessarily fixed in this

case. It is also further submitted by the counsel for the accused No.6 and 7 that they are unnecessarily undergoing pre-conviction imprisonment and by considering the entire charge sheet, the possibility of conviction of the accused is very less. Further, it is also contended by the learned counsel for the accused No.6 and 7 that, the wife of the deceased herself has preferred a Writ Petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Bengaluru in Writ Petition No.24630 of 2024 challenging the lapses in investigation. Further, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in Writ Petition No.24630/2024 has ordered that the investigation in Crime No. 372/2023 of Sreenivaspura Police is placed at the hands of the CBI to conduct de-novo investigation. As the State themselves and the wife of the deceased herself stated that the investigation done by the CID is not just and proper and it clearly shows that the accused involved in this case are fixed in this case. Therefore, they are entitled for grant of bail. Further, as they are behind the bars, their right of personal liberty has been curtailed. The counsel for the accused has also submitted that the eyewitness to this case has stated the names of Chandan/accused No.5, Revanth/accused No.9, Gautam/ accused No.8 and they have not stated the names of these accused persons i.e., accused No.6 and 7.

These accused have been fixed in this case by the people who are politically influenced having animosity against these accused and they are common man belonging to poorer strata of the society.

10. The counsel for the accused No.6 and 7 has argued that when the wife of the deceased herself has appealed before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, submitting the falsity of the investigation conducted by the CID and prays for handing over the same investigation to the CBI, the prosecution has failed to prove that there is a prima facie case on behalf of the accused No.6 and 7, when such being the case, the accused are entitled for bail.

11. The learned Special PP has genuinely contended that, it is candid that the wife of the deceased has approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka for transferring the investigation to the hands of CID. The Special PP has submitted that the wife of the deceased has sought for transfer of investigation to the hands of CBI as the earlier investigation is not focused on some persons who has been behind this attack. Further, he also contends that the charge sheet which has been filed against the present accused persons are intact and

unaltered. As they have to unearth further in the investigation, the investigation is not finalized and therefore the wife of the deceased has sought for further investigation to be drawn by the CBI. Therefore, the learned Special PP submits that since they have approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka for handing over the investigation to CBI, it cannot be the end in itself and that cannot be read into this case and the bail cannot be sought on that ground. As the counsel for the accused has to confine for the investigation of the charge sheet which is filed against these accused. Further, the learned Special PP has also contended that, the accused No.5, 8 and 9 who had approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka for grant of bail, the bail have been rejected in favour of accused No. 5, 8 and 9. The learned Spl.PP has brought to the notice of this court,an unique feature of this case is that, as soon as the incident had taken place, immediately the wife, the son had been informed within a jiff of a moment. So, they cannot be considered as hear-say witness. In the eye of law, those witnesses are as good as an eye witness, as Res -gestae comes into existence.

12. Further while granting bail under Section 439 the conditions laid down under Section 437(1) clause i.e.

sine que non for non granting of bail even under Section 439. Therefore, the nature and gravity of acquisition, the severity of punishment, the danger of the accused absconding, fleeing from justice and reasonable apprehension of witnesses being influenced, the danger of cause of justice being thwarted by grant of bail, as all to be looked into.

13. On perusal of the entire records before this Court and also hearing both the sides in length, this Court observes that at this stage, what the court has to observe that, whether it is the genuine case against the accused and that whether prosecution will be able to produce prima-facie evidence in support of the charge made against the accused, and it is not expected at this stage to have the evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. On perusal of the records before this court, it is found that, the deceased being the Counselor of Sreenivaspura was also attacked prior i.e., on 13.05.2023 when he was traveling in his friend's Car and he was attacked from behind by pouring petrol on the Car and lit fire, wherein he had escaped from the spot. Therefore there was an attempt of prior attack on the deceased which was failed. However, the attempt which was made on the day of the alleged

incident was a daylight murder and they had succeeded in the murder of the deceased Sreenivas. Even though the counsel for the accused has submitted that many people had enmity against the deceased he being the Counselor of Sreenivasapura, the accused mentioned in the present charge sheet are the innocent people and hence they are entitled for bail. However, in the present case on hand, as the offence concerned against the death of the deceased Sreenivasa is a daylight murder, further from the prosecution story it reveals that the deceased was attacked earlier also wherein the attempt was not succeeded, and even that attack as per the records tend to show that the car in which the deceased was traveling, kerosene/ diesel was poured and the attempt went in vain. That incident is also scary. However, the attempt on 23.10.2023 was succeeded and he was murdered with multiple injuries and also it is forthcoming that the prosecution papers that, the talwar was recovered from the accused No.7 and also it is forthcoming that, after the commission of murder, the accused No.6 and 7 were given the weapon of offence to their hands and to disappear the evidence of offence, the accused No.6 and 7 had thrown the talwar into the bush thereby they shared the common intention to commit murder of deceased Srinivasan. Further, as there are eyewitnesses to this

case, and the prosecution story shows that, the accused had attacked prior to 23.10.2023 in such situation if the accused are let on bail, there will be threat to the witnesses and also hindrance for the further investigation.

14. Therefore, while granting the bail, the question of grant of bail concerns both liberty of individual undergoing criminal prosecution as well as the interest of the criminal justice system in ensuring that those who commit crimes are not afforded the opportunity to obstruct justice. In the present case on hand, the acquisition levelled against the accused persons are severe in nature and the gravity of acquisition is very heinous and irreversible. In the present case on hand the nature and manner in which the murder has taken place shows the gravity of offence, If the accused No.6 and 7 are let on bail, there are likelihood of the offence being repeated and there are reasonable apprehension to the witnesses and as still the case is under investigation, the letting of the accused persons on bail do not seem feasible.

15. However, the grant of bail though being a discretionary order, it calls for the exercise of such a

discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. In the present case on hand, the accused No.6 and 7 had disappeared the weapon used for the commission of offence whereby caused hindrance for the investigation of the offence whereby shared common intention for the completion of crime. Therefore, looking into the gravity and severity of the acquisition levelled against the accused persons, the prosecution has prima facie proved that the charges leveled against the accused. Further, Even though the counsel for the accused has submitted that the case is still under investigation from past 2 years, this has affected the personal liberty of the individuals who are behind bars. However, this court observes that as per the prosecution story, the acquisition levelled against the accused is severe in nature and the liberty means is the liberty which has to be maintained by responsible freedom. Freedom is not the right to do as you please. It is the liberty to do as you ought. Therefore, at this stage granting of bail to the accused No.6 and 7 does not seem feasible. Hence, letting these accused on bail will hamper the trial and will create chaos in the society. It will shake the faith of the public in the judiciary. It will send a wrong signal to the society and it will increase the crime in the society.

16. The alleged offence under Section 302 of IPC is punishable with death or life imprisonment. Looking to the complaint averments and the charge sheet contents. As such, the court cannot pre-determine the non existence of nexus between the use of dangerous objects and injuries without full fledged evidence. This case is involving the serious and heinous offence to be tried against all the accused. The trial of the case is yet to be commenced. However, without prejudice to the merits of the case and proof of the same, at present the charge sheet is containing prima-facie incriminating materials to prima-facie constitute the alleged offences against the accused. Under these circumstances, in the interest of justice, if at all the accused No.6 and 7 are enlarged on bail, there are every chances of they threatening the complainant, tampering the witnesses and hampering the trial. Therefore, under all these circumstances, I am of the opinion that it is not fit case to grant regular bail to the accused No.6 and 7. Accordingly answer point No.1 in the **Negative.**

17. POINT No.2:- In view of findings on point No.1 this court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The application filed by the accused No.6 and 7 under Section 439 of Cr.P.C., is rejected.

(Dictated to Stenographer Grade-I directly on Computer, computerized by her revised, corrected by me and then pronounced in the open Court on this the **6th day of October 2025**)

(DIVYA P.K.)

II Addl. District & Sessions Judge, Kolar.