



**IN THE COURT OF II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE AT TUMAKURU**

Dated this the 11th day of June 2026.

Present : Smt. N.Narasamma., B.A.L., LLB.,
II Addl. District and Sessions Judge,
Tumakuru.

Crl.Mis.No.858/2026

Petitioners:

- 1.Manjunatha.D.S
S/o Lte Siddabharaiah,
Aged 28 Years,
2. Thimmamma
W/o Late Siddabhairaiah
Aged 56 Years,
3. Shivarajkumar.S
C/o Siddabyrappa
Aged 26 Years,
R/at Dananayakanapura
Hirehalli Post,
Tumakuru Taluk and District.

(By Sri. NK., Advocate)

- versus -

Respondent: State by Women's Police station.

(By learned Public Prosecutor).

ORDER ON PETITION FILED U/sec.482 of BNSS

The petitioners are seeking bail in anticipation of arrest U/sec.482 of BNSS in Cr.No.84/2026 for the offences punishable u/sec.85, 115(2), R/w Sec.3(5) of BNS registered by the respondent police.

2. The petitioners in the petition stated that, they are innocents and law abiding citizens and they have not committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution and the complainant has filed false and frivolous complaint against the petitioners and the petitioners hails from respectable family and having deep root in the society. The petitioners are permanent residents of their native having movable and immovable properties in their locality and there are no bad antecedents against the petitioners. The alleged offences are neither punishable with death nor imprisonment for life. The petitioners are ready to offer substantial surety to the satisfaction of this court and under take that they will not tamper with the

prosecution witnesses or investigation and abide by the conditions that may be imposed by this court. The respondent police are making hectic efforts to arrest the petitioners and parade them in public. On these grounds the petitioners prayed to allow the petition.

3. The learned public prosecutor filed objections by contending that, the bail petition is not maintainable and if the petitioners are granted bail, then there are chances of petitioners threatening the prosecution witnesses and there is every possibility of petitioners tampering with the prosecution case, jumping the bail, destroy the evidence and try to commit similar offences. There are no reasonable grounds made out to enlarge them on bail. Hence the learned public prosecutor prayed to reject the bail petition.

4. Heard the learned public prosecutor and the learned counsel for the petitioners. Perused the records available.

5. The points that arise for my consideration are :

1. Whether the petitioners are entitled for bail U/sec.482 of BNSS.?

2. What order?

6. My findings to the above points are as follows:

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

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

REASONS

7. **Point No.1**:-As per the case of the prosecution, the complainant namely Kavya came to the station and gave the complaint stating that she was married to Manjunath D.S., S/o Byrappa during 2025 at the time of marriage her parents gave gold chain, ring, bangles, wrist band, 3 sets of clothes and 4 rings in addition to that, Rs.12,00,000/- in cash was spent on the wedding and after the marriage they lived together happily only for two months. Following this, her husband developed habits of drinking and smoking which he did not have earlier and she questioned him, due to that, her husband's family members started harassing her and her

husband took away the complainant's golden jewelries and pledged it without her consent and refused to return those articles. The complainant informed this to her mother-in-law and brother-in-law, but they supported the complainant's husband instead of helping her. And they demanded more dowry and abused the complainant in filthy language and telling her to leave the house and also harassed and questioned her character and on April 21st of 2026 the complainant's husband and mother-in-law physically assaulted her and kicked her out of the house.

8. But the petitioners have denied the allegations made in the complaint by the complainant. But at this stage the court has to see whether there are any prima facie case has been made out by the petitioners to grant bail to them. Because, whether really the petitioners have committed the alleged offences or not is the matter to be adjudicated at the time of trial. The petitioners undertake to abide by any conditions imposed by this court. The alleged offences are neither punishable with death nor imprisonment for life. The

objection of learned public prosecutor can be met out by imposing stringent conditions. Hence by looking into the facts and circumstances of the case and gravity of the offences, the court feels that, by imposing the stringent conditions the petitioners may be granted bail by exercising the discretionary power of this court. Hence the petitioners have made out grounds to allow the bail petition. Hence, I answer point No.1 in the **Affirmative**.

9. Point No.2: In view of my finding on point No.1, I proceed to pass the following :

ORDER

The petition filed by the petitioners under Section 482 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

The petitioners shall be released on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest by the respondent police in Cr.No.84/2026 for the offences punishable u/sec.85, 115(2), R/w Sec.3(5) of BNS on their executing personal bond for Rs.1,00,000/- each with one surety for

the like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police, with the following:

: Conditions :

1. Petitioners shall surrender themselves before the Investigating Officer within 10 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

2. Petitioners shall not indulge in hampering the investigation or tampering with the prosecution witnesses.

3. Petitioners shall co-operate with the I.O. to complete the investigation and they shall appear before the I.O. as and when called for investigation.

4. Petitioners shall not leave the jurisdiction of the court without prior permission till the charge-sheet is filed or for a period of 3 months whichever is earlier.

5. Petitioners shall mark their attendance once in a week i.e., on every Sunday between 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. before the I.O. for a period of 2 months or till the charge-sheet is filed whichever is earlier.

If in case, the petitioners violate any of the conditions as stated above, the prosecution is at liberty to file application for seeking cancellation of bail at any stage.

(Dictated to the stenographer directly on computer, typed copy corrected and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 11th day of June 2026).

(N.Narasamma)

II Addl., District and Sessions
Judge, Tumakuru.