



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

:: PRESENT ::

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

DATED THIS THE 12th DAY OF JUNE 2026

Crl. Misc.Pet.No. 854/2026

- PETITIONERS:-**
1. Govindappa.G, S/o Govindappa,
A/a 52 years, R/at Sapthagiri Badavane,
Z.P.Police behind, Sira Town,
Sira Taluk, Tumakuru District.
 2. Sowmy Lakshmi.L, W/o Govindappa.G,
A/a 38 years, R/at Sapthagiri Badavane,
Z.P.Police behind, Sira Town,
Sira Taluk, Tumakuru District.
 3. Adilakshmi, W/o Prashanth.B.L,
A/a 37 years, R/at Sapthagiri Badavane,
Z.P.Police behind, Sira Town,
Sira Taluk, Tumakuru District.
 4. Shanthakumari.K.R, W/o Vijaya
Kumar B.L,
A/a 33 years, R/at Sapthagiri Badavane,
Z.P. Police behind, Sira Town,
Sira Taluk, Tumakuru District.



5. Ramesh, S/o Obalappa, A/a 32 years,
R/at Sapthagiri Badavane, Near Forest
Office, Sira Town, Sira Taluk.
 6. Vijaya Kumar.B.L, S/o Lakshmana,
A/a 42 years, R/at Sapthagiri Badavane,
Sira Town, Sira Taluk, Tumakuru District.
 7. Prashanth.B.L, S/o Lakshmana,
A/a 43 years, R/at Sapthagiri Badavane,
Near Forest Office, Sira Town,
Sira Taluk, Tumakuru District.
- (By Sri. T.O.H., Advocate)

V/s

RESPONDENT:-

State by Sira Police Station,
Tumakuru District.

(By learned Public Prosecutor)

ORDER ON PETITION FILED U/Sec.482 of BNSS.

The petitioners/accused No.1, 2, 4 to 8 have filed this petition U/sec.482 of BNSS seeking anticipatory bail in Cr.No.615/2025 (C.C.No.694/2026) registered by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable U/sec. 74, 115(2), 351(2), 352 r/w 3(5) of BNS.



2. It is the case of petitioners that they are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they have been falsely implicated by the respondent police. They have undertaken to obey the conditions that may be imposed on them in the event of granting bail.

3. The learned P.P has filed objections pleading the facts and stating that prima-facie there are reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioners have committed the offences alleged against them. Further investigation of the case is completed and charge sheet is filed. That if the petitioners are granted bail, they are likely to abscond and thereby the trial would suffer. Even there are chances of threatening the prosecution witnesses and destroy the prosecution evidence. Accordingly, the prosecution has prayed to reject the bail petition.

4. Having heard and perused the materials placed on record, the following point that arise for my determination:



1. Whether the petitioners/accused No.1, 2, 4 to 8 are entitled for anticipatory bail U/sec.482 of BNSS as prayed for ?

2. What order ?

5. My answer to the above points are as under :-

Point No.1 :- In the **affirmative**

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

REASONS

6. **Point No.1** :- It is the case of prosecution that, on 21.12.2025 at about 5.00 p.m., the accused with common intention have damaged to the compound wall and when it was questioned by the husband of the complainant the accused have abused the complainant and her family with filthy words and attempted to trespass into the house. That when the daughters of the complainant tried to pacify it, the accused have also dragged them and caused hurt and also gave life threat. The accused have also took the gift given to the grandson of the complainant. Hence this complaint.



7. Based upon her information, a case came to be registered for the aforesaid offences and submitted FIR to the jurisdictional Magistrate. The learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and they have been falsely implicated in the instant case. He has argued that prima-facie there are no reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioners have committed the offences alleged against them and the allegations made in the complaint do not attract. Section 74 of BNS is not attracted against the petitioner No.2 to 4 as they are ladies. The petitioners were not at all present at the place of incident and in order to cause harassment to the petitioners, a false complaint is filed. The complainant gave complaint against accused without any reason and there are no prima-facie materials to connect the petitioners with the alleged incident. Accordingly, he prays for granting the bail.



8. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor has argued that prima-facie there are reasonable grounds for believing that the petitioners are involved in the commission of offences alleged against them. They have argued that the petitioners gave threat to the complainant. Further, investigating officer has also drawn mahazar at the place where the accused have quarreled with complainant and as such there are prima-facie material to suggest the involvement of petitioners herein in commission of the offences alleged against the petitioners and has prayed to dismiss the bail petition.

9. The record shows that the alleged offences are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life but triable by the Sessions Court. It is true that several allegations are made by the complainant against the accused. It is true that Section 74 of BNS is a sessions triable and on this ground only the bail could not be rejected. Moreover already investigation is completed and charge



sheet is filed and the prosecution has to prove the alleged outrage of modesty against the accused. As investigation is completed, the presence of the petitioners is not required and they could be secured for trial. The petitioners are stated to be the permanent residents of the address mentioned in the cause title of the petition. So, having regard to the nature and gravity of accusation levelled against the petitioners and their antecedents, I am of the view that the petitioners are entitled for bail.

10. So far as the apprehension of prosecution that if the petitioners are granted bail, they 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 petitioners. Accordingly, I answered the point No.1 in the **affirmative**.

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

**ORDER**

The petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S. is allowed.

Consequently, the petitioners/accused No.1,2, 4 to 8 are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing personal bond for Rs.50,000/- each with one surety each for like sum to the satisfaction of Investigation Officer or the Magistrate concerned in Cr.No.615/2025 of Sira Police Station, pending on the file of learned Sr. Civil Judge and JMFC, Sira, with the following terms;

1. They shall not tamper with prosecution witnesses in any manner.
2. They shall appear before the concerned court on all the effective dates of hearing without fail.
3. They shall not leave the jurisdiction of the court without prior permission.



4. If the petitioners fail to abide by any conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(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 **12th June 2026.**)

(SHILPA. K.S.)

VI Addl District and Sessions Judge,
Tumakuru.