



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

PRESENT

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

Dated this the 6th day of July – 2026

Crl.Misc.No.442/2026

Petitioner/
accused No.2 : Sri.Gangarevanna,
S/o. Revanna,
Aged about 58 years,
R/at: Hombalammanapeter,
Magadi Taluk,
Bengaluru South District.

(By Smt. S.A.U., Advocate)

Vs.

Respondent/
Complainant : The State
by Magadi Police,
Magadi Town,
Bengaluru South District.

(By learned Public Prosecutor)

O R D E R

The petitioner/accused No.2 had filed this petition
U/Sec.482 of BNSS-2023, praying to grant bail in
connection to Cr.No.124/2026 of Magadi Police Station,



registered against the petitioner for the offences punishable under Secs.318(4), 335, 340(2), 336(3) of BNS-2023 and U/Sec.39 of Aadhaar (Targeted Delivery of Financial and other Subsidies, Benefits and Services) Act-2016.

2. The petitioner had sought for bail on the ground alleging that, he had not committed any such offence, he had been falsely implicated in the case and he is innocent person. He is the permanent resident of the address mentioned in the cause title, so there is no chance of absconding or avoiding the trial. He is ready and willing to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by the court and furnish surety to the satisfaction of the court and also appear before the court on all hearing dates without fail. Pleading false implication the petitioner had prayed to allow the petition by release him on Bail.

3. The Learned Public Prosecutor has filed the objections by reiterating the allegations in the first information report and contended that, there are sufficient materials to make out the commission of alleged offence by the petitioner so, if he is released there are chances of he permanently absconding from the process of court and also committing similar offence.



There are also chances of jumping the bail conditions and tampering the prosecution witnesses and it may severely affect the progress of the trial. Hence, prayed to reject the bail petition.

4. I have heard the arguments of the Learned counsel for the petitioner and the Learned Public Prosecutor and perused the records.

5. The following points arise for court consideration;

1) Whether the petitioner/accused No.2 made out sufficient grounds to exercise discretion under Sec.482 of BNSS, to grant anticipatory bail in his favour?

2) What order?

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

Point No.1:- In the Affirmative.

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 and other accused persons for the offence punishable under Secs.318(4), 335, 340(2), 336(3) of BNS-2023 and U/Sec.39 of Aadhaar (Targeted Delivery of Financial and other Subsidies, Benefits and Services) Act-2016 and taken up the matter for investigation.

Brief summary of the case is that, the complainant on 09.06.2026 at 05.00 p.m., had lodged the complaint alleging that one Sri Ramesh S/o. Late.Sanjivaiah, resident of Thippasandra Village, Thippasandra Hobli, Magadi Taluk, Thippasandra Hobli, Magadi Taluk, Bangalore South District had filed the requisition to the Taluk Office to rectify the name of his father by name Sanjeevaiah S/o.Late Gangaiah @ Motappa who was died on 12.09.2016 at Thippasandra Village, Thippasandra Hobli, Magadi Taluk, Bangalore South District, but in the death certificate his name was mentioned as Sanjeevaiah S/o.Late.Gangaiah instead of Sanjeevaiah S/o.Late Gangaiah @ Motappa, accordingly he was issued letter to the revenue inspector to submit his report along with the Mahazar. accordingly the revenue inspector submitted his report along with the mahazar and stated that, the said Sanjeevaiah S/o.Late Gangaiah was died on 12.09.2016 and his legal heirs are obtained the death certificate and they have filed the application along with notarized affidavit requesting the complainant to rectify the name of the deceased as



Sanjeevaiah S/o.Late Gangaiah @ Motappa and prays to rectify the name as per Aadhaar Card.

It is alleged by the complainant that, revenue inspector submitted his report when he verified the Aadhaar Card and other documents he came to know that the name was rectified in the Aadhaar Card and the same was doubtful, accordingly he submitted the report as per annexure 3, hence it is proved that the said Ramesha was produced the forged documents and filed the application for rectify the name of his father in the death certificate of the said Ramesh only with an intention to commit the illegal act he intend to change the name of grandfather of his father in his father's Adhaar Card as Sanjeevaiah S/o.Late.Gangaiah @ Motappa and the Aadhaar Card No.7763 1765 6558 and other documents were fake and created documents. Based on the above allegation, the complainant had sought to take action against the accused persons.

8. The Learned Public Prosecutor had filed the report of the Investigating Officer along with the case documents enclosed with the contention that, if petitioner are granted bail there are chances of they threatening and tampering the prosecution witnesses. Rest of the accused had absconded so, there are chances of petitioner also permanently absconding from the process



of the court, there are also chances of committing similar offence. The accused persons by colluding together by alteration of Aadhaar Card of Sanjeevaiah who is the father of accused No.1 and produced it before various offices and misuse the same so, documents are yet to be secured from different Government office. So in the event if he is released on bail there are every chances of he influencing the officials and destroying the evidence available against him.

9. On perusal of the IO report it makes out that initially case is registered against one accused i.e., Ramesh S/o.Ramesh, Thippasandra, Magadi. He was arrested and produced before Principal Civil Judge and JMFC., Magadi on 10.06.2026 and as the offence alleged against the accused is punishable under Secs.318(4), 335, 340(2), 336(3) of BNS-2023 and U/Sec.39 of Aadhaar (Targeted Delivery of Financial and other Subsidies, Benefits and Services) Act-2016, whereby on production of accused No.1, he was given to police custody for the purpose of investigation for a period of 1 day. After the accused producing before the Court from police custody extension of custody for a day was sought and further one day extended custody was given to the Investigating Officer, thereafter he was produced before the court and remanded to judicial custody. Further again



on 15.06.2026 the Investigating Officer had sought for further police custody of accused No.1 and again accused No.1 was handed over to the custody of the concerned police for investigation purpose from 15.06.2026 to 17.06.2026. It is submitted in the arguments addressed on behalf of the petitioner that, accused No.1 is now granted bail by the Principal JMFC Magadi.

10. It is the contention of the petitioner that, he had not committed any such offence and the complainant had not mentioned the names of any other persons in the complaint except that of accused No.1 Ramesh. Petitioner is not known to Ramesh and he is not in contact with accused No.5 & 6, but the respondent police based on the false statement of Ramesh, they have issued police notice to the petitioner. So, he apprehend his arrest as the offence alleged are non-bailable in nature. The offence alleged though being non-bailable in nature, it is neither punishable with death or imprisonment for life.

11. As per the remand application the concerned police had named 6 accused persons, whereby accused No.2 is Gangarevanna who is the petitioner herein and accused No.3 is Narendrababu, accused No.4



Hanumantaraju, accused No.5 Murthappa and accused No.6 Mahesh so, accused No. 2 Gangarevanna had now sought pre-arrest bail in this petition in apprehension of his arrest.

12. Having perused the documents produced on behalf of the petitioner and also the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, whereby it is for the Tahasildar to verify the family Genealogy and obtain the report of the Village Accountant by conducting enquiry. So, as accused No.1 had already been taken to custody for 4 days, the sufficient materials are already collected by the Investigating Officer in the process of investigation and now the name of the petitioner is invoked said to be based on the statement of accused No.1 Ramesh so, as the police notice is already issued, as the offence alleged are non-bailable in nature, the petitioner apprehends his arrest. The offence alleged though being non-bailable nature, it is neither punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Hence, if the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and co-operate with the investigation by producing necessary documents, then it will assist the Investigating Officer in the process of investigation. petitioner is the permanent resident of the address shown in the cause title, which is within Bangalore South District, there is no any criminal



antecedent against the petitioner. Hence if reasonable conditions are imposed it will meet the objections raised by the Learned Public Prosecutor. In the circumstance, I hold above point in **Affirmative**.

13. **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 No.2 under section 482 of BNSS-2023, is hereby allowed.

The jurisdictional police are directed to release the petitioner/accused No.2 in case of his arrest in Cr.No.124/2026 of Magadi Police Station, on executing their personal bail bonds for a sum of **Rs.50,000/- with one surety** for like sum to the satisfaction of IO/concerned Court subject to the following;

CONDITIONS

1) The petitioner/accused No.2 shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within 15 weeks from the date of this order and seek bail.

2) The petitioner/accused No.2 shall appear before the IO on every Monday between 10-00 a.m., to 03-00 p.m., for a period of 2 months or till filing of charge sheet, whichever is earlier.



3) The petitioner/accused No.2 shall not change the abode without prior permission of the Court.

4) The petitioner/accused No.2 shall not involve in any offence or similar offence pending disposal of this case.

5) The petitioner/accused No.2 shall not threaten or entice the complainant and other prosecution witnesses.

6) The petitioner/accused No.2 shall furnish his Adhaar Card/Election ID Card for his permanent address proof.

(Dictated through Adalath AI, thereafter transcribed by Steno Grade-III and after correction signed and then pronounced by me in the open court on this the 6th day of July, 2026).

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