



**IN THE COURT OF VI ADDL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, TUMAKURU.**

:: PRESENT ::

**Smt.SHILPA K.S, B.A.L, L.L.M.,
VI Addl District & Sessions Judge,
Tumakuru.**

DATED THIS THE 15th DAY OF JUNE 2026

Crl. Misc.Pet.No.842/2026

PETITIONER:-

Lavakumar.Y.M, S/o Mohan,
A/a. 33 years, R/at Ontigudda Kaval Village,
Doddakunchavu Post, Halekote Hobli,
Holenarasipura Taluk, Hassan District.
Now R/at. C/o. Ganganna, Coffee Katte,
Hebbur Village, Hebbur Hobli,
Tumakuru Taluk & District.

(By Sri. G.S.R.S., Advocate)

V/s

RESPONDENT:-

State by Hebbur Police Station,
Tumakuru Taluk.

(By learned Public Prosecutor)

**ORDERS ON REGULAR BAIL PETITION FILED BY THE
PETITIONER/ACCUSED No.1 U/S 483 OF B.N.S.S.**

The petitioner/accused No.1 has filed this petition under
Section 483 of B.N.S.S. by seeking regular bail orders relating to
Cr.No.129/2026 in his favour in the interest of justice and equity.



2. The learned P.P have filed objections stating that the accused has committed grievous offence and he is required for further investigation and requested the court to reject the petition, in the interest of justice and equity.

3. Heard both sides on bail petition.

4. On the basis of above pleadings, the following points that arise for my consideration are:

1. Whether the petitioner/accused No.1 has made out grounds to grant regular bail orders in his favour ?

2. What Order?

5. My answers to the above points are as follows:

Point No.1 :- In the affirmative

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

∴ REASONS ∴

6. **Point No.1:-** The respondent police have registered Cr.No.129/2026 against the accused for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 109(1), 115(2), 118(1), 351(2), 352 of



B.N.S. The offence U/Sec.109 of B.N.S. is punishable with life imprisonment and fine and triable by the Sessions Court. The petitioner/accused No.1 is in J.C since from the date of arrest.

7. It is the case of the prosecution that, on 25.5.2026 one Kiran, Cashier had called the complainant and informed the accused without giving the money has purchased the alcohol. Hence the complainant came to the shop and when questioned the accused at about 8:30 p.m., the accused had abused him in filthy words and also caused hurt with beer bottle with an intention to kill him and also gave life threat. Hence this complaint.

8. Based on his information, a case came to be registered for the aforesaid offence and submitted FIR to the jurisdictional Magistrate. The learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is innocent of the offence alleged against him and he has been falsely implicated in the instant case. He has argued that prima-facie there are no reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioner has committed the offence alleged against him and the



allegations made in the complaint do not attract. Further, he has argued that the petitioner has not committed the alleged offence and intentionally Section 109 of B.N.S. is included at the instigation of the complainant. The accused is not having habit of consuming alcohol and hence the question of purchasing the alcohol from the shop of accused does not arise at all. The petitioner was involved in this case only out of enmity. He is the only bread earner to the family and poor person. There is no prima-facie material to connect the petitioner with the alleged incident.

9. It is the further case of the prosecution that after registration of case, the accused was traced and he was arrested and remanded to judicial custody. The investigation is pending. The counsel for petitioner submitted that the accused is innocent and he is in judicial custody from the date of arrest. The accused has no bad antecedents and he will abide by any conditions for his release and prays to release him on bail.



10. After hearing both side it is true that no doubt, the prosecution papers prima-facie indicates the commission of the alleged offence. It is also true that the investigation is pending. But the complainant had admitted to the hospital and got discharged from the hospital. Even the major investigation is completed and presence of petitioner is not required for any purpose.

11. Hence at this stage having regard to the nature and gravity of accusation levelled against the petitioner and nature of case, I am of the view that the petitioner is entitled for bail. So far as the apprehension of prosecution that if the petitioner is granted bail, he will tamper the prosecution evidence, threaten the prosecution witnesses and flee away from justice etc., is concerned, the same can be met with by imposing stringent conditions on the petitioner. Accordingly, I answered the point No.1 in **affirmative**.



12. **Point No.2** :- In view of my above finding I proceed to pass the following :-

ORDER

The bail petition filed by the petitioner/accused No.1 U/s 483 of B.N.S.S. is allowed.

The petitioner/accused No.1 shall execute personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety for likesum with the following;

:: CONDITIONS ::

1. He shall appear before the court on all hearing dates regularly.
2. He shall not threaten or tamper the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
3. He shall appear before the I.O. as and when called for.
4. He shall not leave the jurisdiction of the court without prior permission till disposal of the case.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-I directly on computer, typed by her, corrected by me and then pronounced in the open Court on this the 15th day of June 2026.)

(SHILPA. K.S)
VI Addl District and Sessions Judge,
Tumakuru.