

KARN010005482026



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

PRESENT:

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

Dated this the 17th day of April, 2026

Crl.Misc.No.174/2026

Petitioner/
Accused :

Mr.Ananthraju @ Anantharaju K.A.,
S/o. Anjinappa,
Aged about 30 years,
R/at: Chikkamaluru Village,
Kodigenahalli Hobli,
Shakthinagara, Turuvekere Town,
Tumakuru District, Karnataka.

(By Sri.T.P.C., Advocate)

Vs.

Respondent : 1) The State of Karnataka,
by Kuduru P.S.,
Magadi Taluk,
Ramanagara District.

(By Public Prosecutor)

**ORDER ON BAIL PETITION FILED UNDER SECTION
483 of BNSS.**

The petitioner/accused had filed this petition
U/Sec.483 of B.N.S.S.-2023, praying to grant bail in



connection to S.C.No.31/2026 (Cr.No.335/2025) of Kudur Police Station, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1) R/W.Sec.3(5) of BNS-2023.

2. The petitioner by reiterating the contentions in the first information report has contended that, he had not committed any such offences as alleged in the complaint and he is innocent and falsely implicated in the case. In the complaint dated:07.11.2025 lodged by the son of the deceased on suspicion had expressed only against one Deepu and Muralidhar and not against the petitioner/accused. The name of the petitioner does not find in the complaint. The investigation having completed and charge sheet had been filed so, the petitioner is not necessary for further investigation and also there is no chance of the petitioner threatening the prosecution witnesses. The petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this court and not to contact the complainant, victim or any other prosecution witnesses. Hence, prayed to release him on bail by allowing the petition.

3. The Learned Public Prosecutor has filed the objections by reiterating the allegations in the prosecution's story and contended that, there are sufficient materials to show the commission of the alleged offence by the petitioner so, he is not entitled for release



on bail. The grounds urged on behalf of the petitioner is only with sole intention to obtaining the bail. So, if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every chances of he tampering the prosecution witnesses and thereby hampering the investigation. By relying on the Judgment of **Hon'ble Apex Court in Crl.A.No.1272/2015 (Neeru Yadav Vs. State of UP)**. Hence, prayed to reject the bail petition.

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

5. The following points arise for court consideration;

1) Whether the petitioner/accused makes out sufficient grounds for his enlargement on bail Sec.483 of BNSS-2023?

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 petitioner it clearly shows that the respondent police have registered the case against the petitioner for the offence punishable under Section 103(1) R/w.Sec.3(5) of BNS-2023 and after thorough investigation they have filed charge sheet against the petitioner.

It is the contention of the petitioner that, the respondent police had registered the case in Crime No.335/2025 for the offence punishable under Section 103(1) R/w.Section 3(5) of BNS., before the I Addl. Civil Judge and Senior Division JMFC. Later the case was committed to the court of Sessions by allotting it to the I Addl. District & Sessions Judge, Ramanagara. It is the contention of the petitioner that, the Renukumma and the deceased Ravikumar were working in the Chicken Farm of Muralidharan and Muralidharan had employed the petitioner in the said chicken farm, who was previously working in another chicken farm belonging to one Ramachandra near Chikkamadhugere Village, Magadi Taluk, Bangalore South District. After employing the petitioner, the deceased Ravikumar started quarreling with the petitioner/accused stating that because of him, mother of the deceased Renukumma had lost her job. As



the petitioner was taking too much leave deceased Ravikumar was angry because of availing the constant leave. On 06.11.2025 when accused returned to the work Ravikumar again picked up quarrel and again between 07.30 to 08.00 p.m., once again quarreled and later the petitioner on account of vengeance, he took a wooden stick and assaulted the deceased Ravikumar on his head, face and all over the body and committed his murder.

8. It is the contention of the petitioner that, he is innocent and he had been falsely implicated in the case and there is no any direct allegation against him. In the complaint there is suspicion expressed only with regard to Deepu and Muralidhar and not against the petitioner herein. Neither the complainant nor the wife of the deceased Renukamma had not stated anything in their complaint and the statement. So, as the investigation is already completed and the charge sheet having filed, there is no need to keep the accused in custody and he is ready to abide by any condition that would be imposed.

9. If the objection of the learned Public Prosecutor is taken into consideration, whereby it is contended that there is sufficient materials to make out the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged crime. The postmortem report makes out the injury over the dead body in 12



different places. The doctor had opined that, the “death is due to head injury sustained”.

10. It is argued on behalf of the accused that, he is in judicial custody for more than 144 days. As a deceased belong to Bhovi community, son had later lodged a complaint.

11. The petitioner had produced the certified copy of the order sheet in SC No.31/2026, which makes out the accused No.1 is in judicial custody.

12. The learned Public Prosecutor had relied on the **Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Criminal Appeal No.1272/2015 Neeru Yadav Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh**, had sought for rejection of the bail petition as the offence alleged is heinous in nature. Para No.9 of the aforesaid case law is called out in the objections which reads as follows:

- “1. Whether there is any prima-facie reasonable ground to believe that the accused had committed the offence.
2. Nature and gravity of the accusation;
3. Severity of the punishment in the event of conviction;
4. Danger of the accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail;



5. Character, behaviour, means, position and standing of the accused;
6. Likelihood of the offences being repeated;
7. Reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being influence; and
8. danger, of course, of justice being thwarted by grant of bail.”

13. Here in this case, merely for the reason that the charge sheet is filed, it will not entitle the accused for bail as there is serious allegation of coming the heinous offence alleged against the accused is U/Sec.103(1) R/w.Sec.3(5) of BNS., but if the charge sheet is perused, whereby this charge sheet is now filed only against one accused i.e., Anantharaju K.A., who is none other than the petitioner herein. So, the petitioner being the sole accused in this case. As the offence alleged is a heinous offence, by relying on the judgment of the Apex Court as held by the Learned Public Prosecutor supra. Considering the gravity of the offence and the serious allegations against the petitioner and on the other hand, the offence is punishable with capital punishment, this Court does not find any reasonable grounds to grant bail in favour of the petitioner at this stage. In the circumstances, I hold the above point in **Negative**.

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



ORDER

The bail petition filed by the petitioner/
accused U/Sec.483 of B.N.S.S.-2023, is hereby
dismissed.

(Dictated through Adalath AI, thereafter transcribed by Steno
Grade-III and after corrections, printout taken and then pronounced
and signed by me in the open Court, on this the **17th day of April,
2026**).

(M. Panchakshari)
I Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge,
Spl. Judge, Ramanagara.