

KARN010000212026



**IN THE COURT OF THE III ADDL. DIST & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
RAMANAGARA**

**PRESENT:**

**Smt. M. Panchakshari, M.Com.,LL.B,  
I Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge, Ramanagara.  
C/c III Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge, Ramanagara.**

**Dated this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026**

**Crl.Misc.No.6/2026**

Petitioners/  
A1 & 2 : 1. Smt. Sheetal Siddarama Sollapuri,  
D/o. Late Siddaramu,  
Aged about 38 years,  
R/at Belakodu Village,  
Chikkodi Taluk, Belagavi District.  
**Now R/at No.9/1, 3<sup>rd</sup> Cross,  
Pukaraja Layout, D.G.Road,  
Bengaluru.**

2. Sri. Ravinayak,  
S/o. Chinnanayak,  
Aged about 35 years,  
R/at No.21, Bachhahallidoddi  
Village, Kasaba Hobli,  
Kanakapura Taluk,  
Bengaluru South District.

**(By Sri.T.G., Advocate)**

Vs.

Respondent/ : The State of Karnataka,  
Complainant By Ramanagara CEN Crime Police.

**(By P.P., Ramanagara)**

\*\*\*\*\*



**ORDER**

The petitioners/accused No.1 & 2 had filed this petition U/Sec.482 of BNSS-2023 seeking an anticipatory bail with respect to Cr.No.109/2024 (C.C.147/2025) of Ramanagara CEN Crime Police, for the offences punishable under Sec.336, 338, 238 of BNS and Sec.66, 66(C) & 66(D) of Information Technology Act.

2. The petitioners by reiterating the contentions in the first information report has contended that, the petitioners are innocents and they have not committed the alleged offence. The petitioners had been falsely implicated in the present case to conceal the negligence and misconduct of the Labour Inspector. The alleged offences are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. The petitioners hails from respectable family and the allegations made in the complaint are far from truth. Petitioners are the permanent residents of the address shown in the cause title, having both movable and immovable properties and there is no chance of absconding or avoiding the trial. So, if at all the petitioners are enlarged on bail they will co-operate with the trial, they will not tamper the prosecution witnesses. The petitioners will appear before the Court on all hearing



dates and they are ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this Court. On the above grounds, prayed for allowing the petition.

3. The learned Public Prosecutor had opposed the bail petition and filed objections wherein brief summary of complainant's case had been narrated. It is contended in the objections that, the petitioners are habitual offenders and other two similar criminal cases have also been registered in crime No.158/2024 by Kanakapura Police and Cr.No.272/2024 by Bengaluru Urban Police and Cr. No.110/2024 by Ramanagara CEN Police, thereby antecedent of petitioner is considerable fact at this stage. Since this type of Cyber crime is going to loss the state exchequer the security regarding official data is also considerable fact at this stage. The respondent police have completed the investigation and submitted the charge sheet against the petitioner and another in C.C.No.147/2025 for the offences punishable under Sec.336, 338, 238 of BNS and Sec.66, 66(C) & 66(D) of Information Technology Act, before the Addl. Senior Civil Judge & JMFC., Ramanagara. As the matter is on probe the involvement of other culprits while hacking official website cannot be ruled out as it is collective crime by personality of well versed in technology thereby the presence of petitioner before the police is



in need for further probe. Subsequent to place the final report the petitioner has been summoned by the trial court, thereby there is no option left to him expect to answer to the process issued for his appearance. As the petitioner has been summoned by the Court and the petitioner served with the police notice as endorsed in final report, there is no apprehension of arrest. On the above grounds, prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and also the learned Spl. Public Prosecutor for the State.

5. The following points arise for court consideration;

1) Whether the petitioners/accused No.1 & 2 made out sufficient grounds to exercise discretion under section 482 of BNSS, to grant anticipatory bail in their favour?

2) What order?

6. The findings of this court on the above points are as under;

Point No.1:- In the Negative.

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

### **REASONS**

7. **Point No.1**:- On going through the documents produced by the petitioners, it clearly shows that the



respondent police have registered the case against the petitioners for the offence punishable under Sec.336, 338, 238 of BNS and Sec.66, 66(C) & 66(D) of Information Technology Act and after thorough investigation, the respondent police had filed the charge sheet against the petitioners and other accused persons.

8. The allegation against the petitioners are that, the complainant/Labour Inspector of Channapatna Circle, namely B.T.Munilinggowda lodged complaint against the petitioners/accused No.1 & 2 that, the petitioners and others forged document pertaining to Registration Fee and Challan of his shop, Z.M. Traders, Channapatna by hacking software pertaining to Labour Department called E-Karmika website by confirming this wrongful act of petitioners.

9. Ramanagara CEN Crime Police had filed charge sheet against accused No.1 and 2 for the offence punishable under Sec.66, 66(C) & 66(D) of Information Technology Act and Sec.336, 338 and 238 of BNS. If the allegations in the charge sheet is taken into consideration whereby accused No.2 by assuring CW20 and CW21 that pharmacy license will be secured had received an amount of Rs.12,00,000/- and also hacked the official website. Petitioner No.1



Sheetal Siddarama Sollapuri is said to be presently residing in Pukaraja layout, D.G.Road, Bengaluru and permanent resident of Belakodu Village, Chikkodi Taluk, Belagavi District. Accused No.2 is the resident of Bachhahalli Doddi Village, Kanakapura Taluk, Bengaluru South. It is the contention of the petitioners that the averments in the complaint are all false and no private complaint had lodged the complaint, 4 years back documents are created by the complainant. Only with an intention to brush aside the mistake of Labour Inspector, false complaint is filed against petitioners. Petitioners have produced the certified copy of the order sheet in Crime No.110/2024, where accused No.1 Ravi Nayaka and accused No.2 Sheetal Siddarama Sollapuri were also the petitioners herein were arrested and produced before the Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC., Ramanagara on 31.10.2024. In the said case, they are enlarged on bail as per the order dated 07.11.2024, the offence alleged therein is under Section 336 & 338 of BNS and Sec.66 of I.T. Act, this is the other case which is registered in Cr.No.109/2024. It is also contended by the Learned Public Prosecutor in the objection that subsequent to placing the final report the petitioners had been summoned by the trial Court, so there is no option left except to answer the process issued. So, charge sheet having already filed summons is also issued to the



accused persons. So, as the offence alleged is punishable less than 7 years imprisonment in view of charge sheet having filed, the petitioners can very much appear before the concerned Court and seek bail. The offence alleged against the accused/petitioners are not punishable with imprisonment for more than 7 years. So, the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **2022(1) SCC (Crl.) 153. Sathendra Kumar Antil Vs. CBI & another** is applicable to the case on hand. In the very same case later reported in **2023 Live Law SC 233 decided on 21.03.2023, the Hon'ble Apex Court** had framed guidelines and given specific instructions to the Magistrate as well as the prosecuting agency with regard to dealing of the cases which are punishable with less than 7 years imprisonment. As per the reported judgment of the **Hon'ble Apex Court in (2014) 8 SC 273 in Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar & another**, there is clear guidelines stating that accused persons cannot be unnecessarily arrested in offences which are punishable with less than 7 years imprisonment. So in the circumstance, here in this case as the offence alleged against the petitioners are all triable before the Court of Magistrate and not punishable with imprisonment not more than 7 years as now summons being served on petitioners as stated in objection of learned Public Prosecutor, petitioners



can appear before concerned Court and seek bail and guidelines in **Sathendra Kumar Antil Vs. CBI & another** has to be made applicable. Hence, as one more similar case is also registered against the petitioners herein as pre-arrest bail petition filed on behalf of accused No.3 in Crl.Misc.No.425/2025 having rejected as per the order dated 30.05.2025, I hold the above point in the Negative.

9. **Point No.2**:- In view of the discussions made supra, this court proceeds to pass the following;

**ORDER**

The bail petition filed by the petitioners/ accused No.1 & 2 under section 482 of BNSS-2023 is hereby dismissed.

(Dictated through Aadalath AI, thereafter transcribed by Stenographer Grade-I and after corrections, printout taken and then pronounced and signed by me in the open Court, on this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026)

(M. Panchakshari)  
C/c III Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge,  
Ramanagara.