



**IN THE COURT OF THE II ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS  
JUDGE, UTTARA KANNADA, KARWAR**

**DATED THIS THE 28<sup>th</sup> DAY OF AUGUST, 2025**

**SPECIAL CASE NO. 142/2022**

**PRESENT:**

**Sri. MAYANNA. B.L.,**

***B.A., LL.B.,***

II Addl. District & Sessions Judge,  
Uttara Kannada, Karwar.

**COMPLAINANTS:**

1. The State of Karnataka  
Dandeli Rural Police Station  
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,  
Uttara Kannada, Karwar.
2. Shobha Timmappa Bhoviwadder,  
Age: 35 years,  
R/o: Mundgod Road, Yellapur.
3. Anand S/o Durgappa Bhovivaddar  
Age: 31 years,  
R/o: Ashraya Colony  
Gandhinagar, Dandeli.

**Vs.**

**ACCUSED NO.1:**

Ravichandra @ Ravi  
S/o Raju @ Rajanna Reddy  
Age: 50 years, Occ: Cook,  
R/o: Ashraya Colony,  
Gandhi Nagar, Dandeli.

(By CLADC)

**ORDER**

The Accused No.1 has filed the present bail Application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C., seeking regular bail for the

offences punishable under Section 302, 201 R/w Section 34 of IPC and Sections 3(2)(v) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015.

2. The Accused No.1 has contended that he is innocent and he has not committed any offence as stated in the Complaint. He is having good respect and strong roots in the society and so far, he has not involved in the offences. The Police have registered the FIR against the Accused persons and have filed the charge sheet against them for the above said offences. The allegations made against the Accused No.1 by the Complainant are false and frivolous. As such, the Accused No.1 moved the bail application, seeking for his release. However, the said application came to be dismissed by this Court. The Trial of the case has commenced and the material witnesses are already examined and hence, the custody of the Accused No.1 is not required for any other purpose. The Accused No.1 is in Judicial Custody from 27/08/2022. The Accused No.1 is the lone bread earner of his family. Further, he undertakes that he will remain present as and when required by the Court and also ready to abide by the terms and conditions. Hence, prayed to allow the bail Application and grant the bail.

3. The Notice issued to C.W.1, who is the daughter of the deceased, was not served and same is returned as she is not available from last two months. However, the notice issued to C.W.6, who is the son of the deceased, served and he is

present before the Court and filed his objection stating that the Accused No.1 has committed the murder of his mother, if the Accused No.1 is released on bail, there will be threat to their life and prayed to reject the bail Application.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has filed objections contending that the bail Application filed by the Accused No.1 is contrary to law and hence, same is liable to be dismissed. It is contended in the objection that on 25/08/2022 the deceased was sleeping in a room in the Nature Nest Home Stay, where she was working and around 1.45 a.m. to 2.00 a.m., the Accused No.1 entered the said room and forced her to have sexual intercourse. However, the deceased resisted the same and also told him that she will complain to its owner and hence, the Accused No.1 tied her neck with the saree and committed murder of the deceased. Thereafter, both the Accused persons suppressed the death of the deceased and tried to destroy the evidence. However, upon seeing the injuries on the body, the C.W.1 suspected the death of her mother and filed the complaint against the Accused persons. During the investigation, the Accused No.1 has confessed that he has committed the murder of the deceased. The Accused No.1, knowing the caste of the deceased, has committed the murder of women and same is heinous as well as serious in nature. The alleged offence is punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Though charge sheet is filed, the evidence of material witness is not completed. At this stage, if the Accused No.1 is released on bail, he may threaten the witnesses, he may tamper the

evidence. Further, the Accused No.1 is resident of Andhra Pradesh and hence, there is a chance of abscondence. On these grounds, the learned Public Prosecutor sought for rejection of the bail Application.

5. Heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the Accused No.1 and learned Public Prosecutor.

6. The Points that arise for consideration of the Court are as under:

1. Whether the bail Application filed by the Accused No.1 under Section 439 of Cr.PC deserves to be allowed ?

2. What Order ?

7. The findings of the Court on the above points are as under:

Point No.1: In the Negative.

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

### **REASONS**

8. **Point No.1:** Perused the bail Application, objections filed by the C.W.6 and also perused the charge sheet material. The Complainant, who is the daughter of the deceased, filed the complaint against the Accused persons alleging that on 26/08/2022 at 10.00 a.m., she received a telephone call from the Accused No.2 and wherein he informed her mother has died and upon enquiry, he told that

she died due to ill health. Immediately thereafter, she came to Dandeli Hospital and upon seeing the injuries on the neck and heels of body, she suspected her death and she filed the Complaint. Upon the investigation, the Police have filed the charge sheet against the Accused persons alleging that the deceased as well as Accused No.1, were working in the Nature nest Home Stay. On 25/08/2022 when the deceased was sleeping in a room therein, around 1.45 a.m. to 2.00 a.m., the Accused No.1 came to her room and forced her to have sexual inter course. However, the deceased has refused the same and told him that she will inform the same to its owner and also she will ask the owner to remove him from work and hence, the Accused No.1 tied her neck with the saree and committed murder of the deceased. When the deceased moved her legs, heels were got injured from the iron nails, which were in the wall. Thereafter, the Accused No.1 has narrated the incident to Accused No.2 and also informed the owner of the Home Stay that the deceased died due to ill health and thereby suppressed the truth. Thereafter, they called the ambulance and the Accused No.2 took the dead body in the Ambulance to the house of C.W.7 and told him that due to heart attack she died.

9. It is relevant to mention here that the allegation that the Accused No.1 has committed the murder of the deceased and thereafter, he tried to cause disappearance of evidence. The offence committed by the Accused No.1 is heinous and same serious in nature. The offence under Section 302 of IPC and Section 3(2)(v) of SC and ST (PoA) Act, 2015 are non-bailable

and same is punishable with death or imprisonment of life. From the material charge sheet, there is prima facie evidence against the Accused No.1 and as per the postmortem report, the doctor has opined in the postmortem report that death was caused due to strangulation and suffocation.

10. It is further relevant to mention here that though charge sheet is filed, this Court has examined the C.W.1, who is the Complainant, C.W.3 and C.W.4, who are the pancha witnesses and C.W.8 who is circumstantial witness. However, the material witnesses are not examined. The learned PP submits that the Accused No.1 is resident of Andhra Pradesh and if he is released on bail, he may abscond from the jurisdiction of the Court. It is further submitted that after committing the offence, the Accused No.1 tried to cause disappearance of evidence and if the Accused is released on bail, he may tamper the evidence and also threaten the material witnesses. The conduct of the Accused is also relevant factors while considering the bail application.

11. Further, pursuant to the issuance of notice, the notice was not served on C.W.1 as he is not available from past few months. However, the C.W.6, who is the son of the deceased, appeared before the Court and files his objection stating that the Accused No.1 has committed the murder of his mother and if he is released on bail, there will be threat to their life. In view of the above, the apprehension of prosecution as well as complainant that if the Accused No.1 released on bail, there is chance of tampering the evidence, he may threaten

the witnesses and also there is chance of absconding, cannot be ruled out. Therefore, by keeping in mind the nature and gravity of the offence and also allegation made against the Accused No.1, this Court is of the opinion that it is necessary to reject the bail Application of Accused No.1. On these observations, this Court proceeds to hold the above Point No.1 in the **Negative**.

12. **Point No.2:** For the reasons, discussed in the above point No.1, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

**ORDER**

The bail Application filed by the Accused No.1  
under Section 439 of Cr.P.C., is hereby rejected.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, typed by her, revised and corrected by me, signed and then pronounced in the Open Court on this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2025)

**(MAYANNA B.L.)**

II Addl. District & Sessions Judge,  
Uttara Kannada, Karwar.

