



**IN THE COURT OF THE IV ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE TUMAKURU, SITTING AT MADHUGIRI**

DATED THIS THE 08TH DAY OF JUNE 2026

-: PRESENT:-

SMT. SUMANGALA S BASAVANNOUR, B.COM., L.L.M.,
IV ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, TUMAKURU-MADHUGIRI

Crl.Misc.No.5192/2026

Petitioner/ : 1. Rangappa,
S/o Mallappa,
Aged about 49 years,

2. Lakshmana @ Lakshmappa,
S/o Beerappa,
Aged about 38 years,

Both are R/o Kadagathur Village,
Kodigenahalli Hobli, Madhugiri Taluk,
Tumakuru District.

[By – P.C.K.R– Advocate]

V/S

Respondent : The State by Kodigenahalli Police Station.

[By Pubic Prosecutor]

**ORDER ON BAIL PETITION FILED BY THE
PETITIONER/ACCUSED No.1 AND 2 UNDER SECTION 482 OF
BHARATHIYA NAGARIK SURAKSHA SANHITA, 2023**

The present petition filed by the petitioner under section 482 of Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in crime No.39/2026 registered by



the respondent Kodigenahalli Police Station for the offenses punishable under section 118(1), 118(2), 352 R/w 3(5) of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The crime registered against the petitioner on the basis of first information given by Sumitha, as per first information dated 03.03.2026.

2. As per FIR and first information the allegations against the petitioner is that, on 28.02.2026 at about 8-30 a.m while the first informant's husband was going on the road which is existing besides the Sanjeevarayappa's house, at that time Rangappa and Lakshmana suddenly came and with an old enmity abused in filthy language, Rangappa assaulted on the front side of the head of first informant's husband with stone and caused bleeding injury, also assaulted with a stone on the mouth of first informant's husband, due to which her husband lost his teeth. Her villagers Nagareddy informed the same to first informant and immediately she came to the spot and took him to Kodigenahalli Government Hospital, after treatment she lodged the complaint. On the basis of the said information crime registered against the petitioners by the respondent police and proceeded with the investigation.

3. The present petition is filed by the petitioners seeking anticipatory bail in the above said crime. the petitioners



have not committed any offences as alleged by the complainant police, only on the basis of false complaint, the petitioners have falsely implicated in the crime, but the petitioners have not at all committed any offences alleged by the respondent police. The petitioners are innocent persons law abiding citizens and they have come from respectable family. Even entire averments made in the complaint are taken at its face value, the same do not constitute the essential ingredients of the offence alleged. The present petitioner No.2 by name Lakshmana had lodged a complaint against the husband of present complainant by name Shivaiah @ Shivareddy and others under section 115(2), 118(1), 3(5) of BNS 2023 the same Crime was mentioned under FIR.No.38/26 earlier to this complaint, as per said complaint the respondent police have submit a FIR against present complainant and others. After filing of FIR in Crime No.39/2026 with malafide intention with the active support of politicians again the complainant has lodged this false complaint against petitioners, it shows that the complainant has revenge and grudge towards the petitioners, hence on the prima facie of Prosecution papers shows this is a false and frivolous complaint against petitioners, hence they are entitle for bail from the hands of this court. No over act is alleged against the petitioners in the complainant, therefore the petitioners are also not required for any custodial



interrogation. Further the prosecution story looks a doubtful as there is no direct evidence against the petitioners which are not confirmative in law. As aforesaid, they are innocent as not guilty of alleged offence and the petitioners are falsely implicated in the case, except the allegations, there is no material placed by the respondent police with the alleged incident as there is no direct evidence to connect the petitioners to the alleged offence. The petitioners having reputation in the society and the Respondent police have intended to arrest the petitioners and they have apprehension from the respondent police, if the respondent police will arrest the petitioners they have lost their prestige and dignity in the society. They undertake to co-operate with the Jurisdictional police in the process of Investigation. The petitioners are permanent resident of address mentioned in the cause title and they are law abiding citizens with no criminal antecedents among them. The Commission of the offence is not attract to the case in hand, if at all the incident was happened why the complainant lodged a complaint before filing of FIR in Cr.No.38/2026, after submission of FIR intentionally, the complainant had lodged counter against the present petitioners, it shows the present complaint is false and frivolous and there is no any legal sanctity, hence the petitioners are entitle for bail from the hands of this court. The petitioners undertakes to abide



by the conditions imposed by the Court. With the above grounds prays to grant the bail.

4. The Learned Public Prosecutor opposed bail petition by filing statement of objections. He contended that the investigation of the matter is not completed. The offence alleged against the petitioners are punishable under section 118(2) of BNS is heinous one and non bailable in nature. The petitioners may commit similar offence if they are released on bail. The petitioners will not cooperate with prosecution case if they are released on bail. If the petitioners are released on bail they may tamper the prosecution witnesses. The Investigating Officer has to collect proof. The petitioners are influential persons in the society if they are released on bail they may abscond from the jurisdiction of this Court. There are no grounds to enlarge them on bail. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled to bail and prays to reject the petition.

5. I have heard the parties and perused the materials on record. The points that arise for my consideration is:-

1] Whether the petitioner/accused No.1 and 2 made grounds to grant anticipatory bail under section 482 of Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in crime No.39/2026 registered by the respondent



Kodigenahalli Police Station for the offenses punishable under section 118(1), 118(2), 352 R/w 3(5) of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, ?

2] What order, ?

6. My answer to the above said point which as under.

1. Point No.1 : In the Affirmative;
2. Point No.2 : As per final order for the following:-

:-REASONS:-

7. **POINT NO.1:-** In the case on hand, the allegations against the petitioners is that, on 28.02.2026 at about 8-30 a.m while the first informant's husband was going on the road which is existing besides the Sanjeevarayappa's house, at that time Rangappa and Lakshmana suddenly came and with an old enmity abused in filthy language, Rangappa assaulted on the front side of the head of first informant's husband with stone and caused bleeding injury, also assaulted with a stone on the mouth of first informant's husband, due to which her husband lost his teeth.

8. In the case on hand, there is a case and counter case between petitioners and first informant. There is specific allegations against the present petitioners hence custodial



interrogation of the petitioners are not necessary. The case against the petitioners are to be proved after trial.

9. Further there is no criminal antecedents against the present petitioners. The petitioners are permanent of resident of Madhugiri Taluk. If the petitioners are enlarged on bail with stringent conditions they would not flee away from the clutches of law and interest of justice would be served.

10. In the case on hand, the offences alleged against the petitioners are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life hence it is not a fit case to reject the petition filed by the petitioners. Considering all these aspects, I feel the petitioners are entitled to anticipatory bail and this petition is deserves to allow. Accordingly, I answer point No.1 in the Affirmative.

11. **POINT NO.2:-** In view of my finding on point No.1, I proceed to pass the following-

:-ORDER:-

The bail petition in Crl.Misc.No.5192/2026 filed by the petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 under section 482 of *Bharathiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita*, 2023 is herewith allowed. The



petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 is granted anticipatory bail in crime No.39/2026 registered by the respondent Kodigenahalli Police Station for the offenses punishable under section 118(1), 118(2), 352 R/w 3(5) of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. In the event of arrest of the petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 in the above said crime the arresting authority is directed to release them on bail on the following conditions.

1. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 shall execute personal bond for sum of Rs.2,00,000/- each with two sureties for like sum.
2. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 shall appear before the Jurisdictional Magistrate within 15 days from the date of this order for the purpose of execution of bail bond and sureties.
3. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 shall make themselves availability for interrogation by the Investigating Officer as and when required.
4. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 shall not leave the jurisdiction of this Court without prior permission.
5. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 and their sureties shall furnish permanent and present address proofs, both residential and official if any.



6. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 and their sureties to intimate the concerned court as well as the concerned police regarding any changes in address with proof, in the form of an affidavit.
7. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 shall not indulge in any criminal activities.
8. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 shall not threaten prosecution witnesses and tamper prosecution witnesses.
9. The petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 shall appear before the IO on every third Sunday of every month for a period of 3 months or till filing final report, whichever is earlier.
10. If any of the above conditions are violated by the petitioners/accused No.1 and 2 the bail granted now shall stand canceled without further order from the court.

*(Dictated to the stenographer, same is corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open court, on this the **08th day of June, 2026**)*

sd/-
(SUMANGALA S BASAVANNOUR)
IV Additional District & Sessions Judge,
Tumakuru, Sitting at Madhugiri