

KABC010178362026



Presented on : 24-06-2026
Registered on : 24-06-2026
Decided on : 08-07-2026
Duration : 0 years, 0 months, 14 days

**IN THE COURT OF LXVI ADDL CITY CIVIL & SESSIONS
JUDGE, BENGALURU CITY (CCH-67)**

PRESENT

SRI. JAYAPRAKASH A.

B.A.L., L.L.M.,

LXVI Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru (CCH-67)

Dated this the 8th day of July 2026

CrI.Misc.No.6240 of 2026

PETITIONER/S:-

Ramu @ Ramachandran,

S/o Ramanathan,

Aged about 35 years,

R/at No.27/4, 5th Cross,

Near Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Bhavan,

Dayananda Nagar, Shrirampura,

Bengaluru.

(Accused No.2)

(By Sri.T.K.Suresha, Advocate)

V/s.

RESPONDENT/S:-

STATE OF KARNATAKA,

By Sadashivanagara Police Station,

Bangalore.

(Rep. by Public Prosecutor)

**ORDER ON BAIL PETITION FILED UNDER
SECTION 483 of BHARATIYA NAGARIK SURAKSHA SANHITA**

This petition is filed under Section 483 of Bharathiya
Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, praying to enlarge the

petitioner/accused No.2 on bail in Crime No.61/2026 registered by the respondent Sadashivanagara Police for the offence punishable under Sections 61(2), 123, 109(1), 308(2), 351(2), 3(5) of Bharathiya Nagarika Sanhita and Sections 66(E) of IT Act.

2. It is the contention of the petitioner that he is innocent of the offences leveled against him and he has been falsely implicated in the case. The financial and civil dispute is converted into criminal case and with false allegations the complainant has filed the alleged case against him. The entire allegations of the complaint is against accused No.1. The complaint FIR and remand application are very clear that he is no way concerned or connected to the alleged crime. The informant kept quiet almost six years and filed present complainant. He was arrested on 18/6/2026 and he was in police custody for 5 days. There is no specific overt act attributed against him. The origin of the case has been suppressed and all together a different case has been projected with malafide intention. There is no prima facie case made out against him. He is permanent resident of Bengaluru having deep roots in the society. He is ready to furnish surety and abide by the conditions that may be imposed on him by this Court. Therefore, the petitioner has prayed for allowing the petition and to grant regular bail.

3. The notice of this petition is given to the learned public prosecutor on behalf of the respondent police and the learned public prosecutor has filed objections to the petition along with the report of Investigating Officer submitting that the petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts of the case. The contentions of the petitioner put forth in the petition are false. The investigation of the case is in progress. There are chances of petitioner absconding if petitioner is released on bail. There are also chances of tampering with the prosecution witnesses. Hence, for the reasons mentioned in the objections, the learned public prosecutor has prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned public prosecutor on the petition. Perused materials on record. On going through the materials, the points that arise for my consideration are:-

1. *Whether the petitioner has made out sufficient grounds for grant of regular bail as sought for?*
2. *What order?*

5. After hearing the arguments of both the parties and on considering the relevant materials on record, my findings on the above points are as hereunder.

Point No.1:- In the Negative

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

REASONS

6. **Point No.1:-** Brief facts of case according to the prosecution is that the informant Udaykumar Reddy is a practicing advocate since 1999 and also doing real estate business. One Srinivasareddy is known to him and he is his client. During 2019 3-4 cases were registered against Srinivasareddy allegedly to have created fake marks cards and wife of Srinivasareddy Smt.Vasuki Ramaswamy had contacted him to file vakalath in favour of Srinivasareddy, and he had filed his vakalath and after obtaining bail Srinivasa reddy was released from jail and thereafter Smt.Vasuki Ramaswamy was in his contact and used to meet him occasionally. During 2021 Smt.Vasuki Ramaswamy called him and asked him to come near Conrer House Ice Cream shop situated on 80 feet Rod near M.S.Ramaiah Hospital, when he went there Vasuki told him that she wanted to talk to him personally and asked him come to her home alone and sent a car. When he went to house of Vasuki in the car sent by her. She offered coffee in her house and after consuming coffee he felt semi conscious and he went out from her house after two hours. After the said incident said Vasuki Ramaswamy started to blackmail him that she has recorded the pornographic video with him and if he refuses to act as per her

wish she would release the said video in the social media and started to call him to her house and also to hotel and he used to go to the place where she use to call him and each time Vasuki has taken money from him and forcefully she has become partner in his business transactions. Prior to 8 months an unknown person called him and threatened him to murder him. ON suspicion when he enquired with Vasuki she told that he has to transfer the property measuring 1 acre in Sy.No.31/8 of Kothanur to her name and he has to come out of the partnership project in RCPL Enna of RMC Plant company situated at Bagaluru and Penukonda, Andrapradesh and she demanded for 2 crores. He became panic for the demands made by Vasuki and refused to her demands and he started to keep distance form her. But Vasuki used to threaten him by saying that she would upload the prone video and defame him and used him for her personal interest and benefits. She also hacked her phone and collected mobile data and used to mix dangerous drugs in coffee, ice cream and other fluids and tried to murder him. He drivers also used to assist her in committing the said acts. Hence, the informant filed a complaint before the police. A case came to be registered against the petitioner and others. Petitioner was arrested in the alleged crime and he is in judicial custody now. He has filed application seeking to enlarge him on regular bail.

7. The contention of the petitioner is that he is innocent of the offences alleged against him and not committed any offences as alleged in the complaint. The petitioner has produced copy of F.I.R and complaint. It can be gathered from the objection statement filed by the learned Public Prosecutor that investigation of the case is in progress and police have registered case against the petitioner in Cr.No.61/2026 for the offence punishable under Sections Sections 61(2), 123, 109(1), 308(2), 351(2), 3(5) of Bharathiya Nagarika Sanhita and Sections 66(E) of IT Act. Therefore, it is not desirable on the part of this court at this stage to come to a conclusion that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and hence, any of the contentions of the petitioner that he is innocent of the offences alleged against him does not merit consideration at this stage.

8. In so far as nature and gravity of offence is concerned, the averments of the complaint indicates that the petitioner along with others administered some stupefying, intoxicating or unwholesome drug with intent to cause harm to the informant. There is prima facie case against the petitioner for the alleged offence. The offence alleged against the petitioner is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extended to 10 years. Therefore the gravity of offence alleged against the petitioner is high.

9. I have perused the objection statement and the report of the investigating officer which indicates that the informant was admitted to Tie Life Hospital for treatment. During his discharge the doctor has made the following observation.

“ Present with complaints of an episode of imbalance while walking with slurring of speech/difficulty in produced words of lasted or 30-40 minutes on March 21/03/2026, Evaluated outside MRI brain with MRA, Holter monitoring present started one DAPT for 3 week. Since then complaints of mild slurring of speech, no weakness/sensory loss.”

10. On perusal of the above it indicates that the informant is suffering from imbalance while walking and slurring of speech which may be due to administration of unknown drug and the investigating office has to unearth the facts in this regard. Apart from the above the observation of the doctor indicates some serious effect on the health of the informant and it has to be ascertained whether there is any danger to the life of the informant. There is also allegation in the complaint that the petitioner along with others by administering attempted to commit murder of informant. It is also stated in the report of IO that the petitioner along with others administered drug due to which the informant is suffering from multi organ failure and therefore prima facie it indicates slow poisoning. It appears that

the petitioner being the driver of Vasuki Ramaswamy actively involved with her in administering the drug to the informant. Therefore, there are no grounds to release the petitioner at this stage since the investigation is under progress.

11. The report of investigating officer indicates that some blank stamp papers have been recovered from the house of the petitioner and the investigating officer has to ascertain as to from which source the petitioners secured the drug. In order to ascertain the same it requires thorough investigation and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for release on bail at this stage. The available materials indicates that if the petitioner is released on bail there are chances of her absconding which may hamper the investigation. Therefore, there are no grounds to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage since investigation is not completed. Therefore, this court is of the considered opinion that it is not just and proper to release the petitioner on regular bail at this stage. Therefore it is not a fit case to exercise jurisdiction under Section 483 of BNSS. Therefore, point No.1 is answered in the **Negative**.

12. **Point No.2:-** From the discussion made herein above, it is clear that this petition deserves to be rejected. In the result I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Snahita is hereby rejected.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-I online, typed by her directly, corrected and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this 8th day of July 2026)

(JAYAPRAKASH. A)

LXVI Addl. City Civil & Sessions
Judge, Bengaluru

Orders pronounced in open Court
vide separate order with following
operative portion:

ORDER

The petition filed by the
petitioner under Section 483 of
Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha
Snahita is hereby rejected.

LXVI Addl. City Civil & Sessions
Judge, Bengaluru