

KAKP010013242026



**IN THE COURT OF PRL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
AT KOPPAL.**

Present : Sri.C. CHANDRA SEKHAR, LL.M.,
Prl. District and Sessions Judge,

Dated this the 20th Day of July 2026

Crl. Misc. No.256/2026

PETITIONERS/ACCUSED Nos. 1 & 2:

1. Veeranagouda S/o Ninganagouda
Patil, Age: 33 years, Occ: Coolie, R/o
Vajape Nagar, Gajendragad, Tq:
Gajendragad, Dist: Gadag.

2. Bhimanagouda S/o Ninganagouda
Patil, Age: 29 years, Occ: Coolie, R/o
Vajape Nagar, Gajendragad, Tq:
Gajendragad, Dist: Gadag.

(Sri. B.K.D., Adv.,)

V/s

RESPONDENT : State through
Kushtagi Police Station.

(By Public Prosecutor)

ORDER

Petitioners has filed this petition U/s. 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. The Petitioners are the accused Nos. 1 & 2 in Crime No.64/2025 of Respondent Police Station for the offences punishable U/Sec. 115(2), 351, 352, 76, 85 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. In this petition seeking Anticipatory Bail, the Petitioners have urged various grounds stating that a false case has been foisted against them. They have not committed any offences. They are law abiding citizens and they are not having any bad antecedents or criminal records. There is no direct or indirect material placed before the Court to connect the Petitioners with the alleged crime. The alleged offences are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Petitioners are ready to co-operate with the Investigation and also abide by any conditions that would be laid down by this Court. Their arrest and remand to Judicial Custody would adversely affect their interest and liberty. Petitioners are residing in the address mentioned in the cause title, having movable and immovable assets and as such, fleeing from justice would not arise. Therefore, it is prayed to grant pre-arrest bail.

4. The Public Prosecutor has filed objections stating that the Petitioners after committing the alleged offences are absconding and the said conduct itself shows that there is prima-facie case against them and this is not a fit case to grant relief of bail. The Petitioners have harassed the complainant mentally and physically. Petitioners have not urged any valid grounds seeking Anticipatory Bail. If Accused/Petitioners are given bail they will tamper the prosecution witnesses and might abscond. There are also chances of committing similar offences. Therefore, the prosecution prays to reject the petition.

5. I have heard the counsel for the Petitioners and the Public Prosecutor.

6. By virtue of the above facts and circumstances, the points that arise for my consideration is:

1. Whether the Petitioners/Accused Nos. 1 & 2 have made out any reasonable or substantial grounds for grant of pre-arrest bail?

2. What order?

7. My finding on the above points are;

1. Point No.1: In the **Negative**.

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

REASONS

Point No.1:

8. The Petitioner No. 1 is the husband and Petitioner No. 2 is the brother-in-law of the victim. The complainant, who is the mother of the victim, has alleged in the FIS that after marriage, Petitioner No. 1 had started torturing her daughter both mentally and physically by coming home consuming alcohol as she gave birth to 2 female children and therefore unable to withstand the ill treatment she went to her maternal home at Kanakoppa village. It is further alleged that on 04.03.2025 at about 8-00 p.m., Petitioners went to the house of Complainant and picked up quarrel, assaulted the victim and also threatened her and the Complainant with dire consequences.

9. It is alleged in the Complaint that Petitioners had harassed the Complainant mentally and physically without any valid reasons. Prosecution has produced the Wound Certificate of injured/Smt. Renuka along with copy CD, which reflects that she has sustained injuries. The Doctor has recorded two injuries present on the body of the injured Complainant and the history of the assault recorded clearly establishes the role of the Petitioners as narrated in the complaint/FIR. It also appears that none of the Petitioners bothered to take the Complainant to the Hospital. Considering the above facts and circumstances, I am of the

opinion that there is a prima facie case made out against the Petitioners at this stage and this is not a fit case to grant bail.

10. Though the Doctor is of the opinion that the injuries are simple in nature, the allegations are grave in nature and as observed above the Complainant has suffered multiple injuries. The names of the Petitioners are specifically mentioned in the history recorded in the wound certificate. These injuries clearly corroborate the contents of FIR and the role of each Petitioner in assaulting CW-4/ Smt. Renuka. Women cannot be used as chattels and marriage cannot be only for the purpose of forcing the wife to do household chores and deliver only male children. Lack of mutual respect between the spouses lead to such matrimonial discords and assault which has to be curbed by the Courts. In the case on hand, the audacity of the Petitioners going to the maternal house of the victim assaulting and threatening her and the Complainant is highly deprecated.

11. It is not in dispute that the Petitioners are permanent residents in the address shown in the cause title. However, it is not a ground which qualifies the Petitioners to obtain bail. In case the bail application is allowed, taking advantage of the same, Petitioners might cause much more harm to the Complainant and the victim. They might also

put pressure on the prosecution witnesses. Taking note of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am of the opinion that prejudice would be caused to the prosecution, victim and the Complainant if the bail petition is allowed. Consequently, I answer point for consideration in the **"Negative"**.

Point No.2:

12. In view of the above discussion, reasons stated and finding given to Point No.1, the following is passed.

ORDER

Petition filed U/Sec. 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita seeking pre-arrest
bail is rejected.

Copy of this Order shall be forwarded
to the Jurisdictional Trial Court for
information.

(Dictated to the stenographer directly on computer,
corrected and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on
this the **20th Day of July 2026.**)

[C.CHANDRA SEKHAR]
Prl. District & Sessions Judge
Koppal.