



IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT &
SESSIONS JUDGE, UDUPI AT UDUPI.

PRESENT

Sri K.S. Gangannavar, B.Com., LLB., (Spl.)
Principal District & Sessions Judge, Udupi

Dated this 20th day of June, 2026

Crl. Misc. No.234/2026

Petitioner Ashoka S. Poojary
 S/o Dejappa Poojary,
 Aged about 47 years,
 R/at. 4-115/45/1, ,
 Sri Raghavendra Nilaya,
 Arya Marga Road, Malemar,
 Derebail, Konchady,
 Mangaluru Taluk,
 Dakshina Kannada District.

(By Sri Akil B. Hegde, Advocate)

/Vs/

Respondent : The State through
 S.H.O., Udupi Town Police Station,
 Udupi District.

(By Learned Public Prosecutor, Udupi)

ORDER ON PETITION U/s 482 of B.N.S.S.

Accused facing allegations of the offences
punishable under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 329(4),
351(2), 352 of BNS in Crime No.69/2026 of Udupi Town
Police Station, has filed this petition.



2. According to complainant–Muralidhara, since 20 years, he is running ‘Pooja Bakery’ in the ground floor of ‘Sagar Ganga’ building near Karavali Bypass at Moodanidamburu Village. Accused is running ‘Krishna Bakery’ in the adjacent shop since one year. On 23.05.2026 at about 12.30 p.m. accused came in front of complainant’s shop and started shouting abusive words and challenged him to come out of the shop alleging that complainant is causing hindrance to his business. When complainant replied that he has not troubled his business in any way, accused trespassed into Pooja Bakery, held the complainant by shirt collar, slapped on his cheek and neck with hands, kicked him pushing to a ground. When complainant got up, petitioner stabbed on his chest and neck with knife causing simple injuries. Hence sought for action.

3. In support of the relief, the petitioner has contended that, he is innocent and has been falsely implicated on account of earlier minor disputes. Now



this complaint is filed to drive the petitioner away from his shop. In fact, petitioner did not use any kind of verbal abuse or assault, rather used language to intimidate his clients. There are no materials to establish either criminal trespass or assault with deadly weapon. Petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Petitioner is permanent resident of the given address having deep roots in the society. His custodial interrogation is not required. He is ready and willing to abide by the conditions and to furnish substantial surety for his release on bail. Hence, sought to allow the petition.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor filed objections with the I.O. Report. In his detailed objections he has contended that investigation is not yet completed. Incident in question is clearly recorded in CC Camera. Petitioner has used knife to commit assault. Petitioner has no regard for law. If the petitioner is released on bail, he is likely to repeat the offence, he may not cooperate in the investigation and may threaten the



prosecution witnesses and destroy the evidence and may abscond during the trial. Hence, sought to reject the petition.

5. Heard both sides. Perused the materials.

6. Point that arise for consideration is:

“Whether the petitioner is entitled for anticipatory bail?

7. Above point is answered in the affirmative for the following:

REASONS

8. Complainant and petitioner/accused are neighbours with rival business. The competition among themselves causing prejudice cannot be overlooked. However, competition is expected to bring the best of their talent and not the crimes.

9. Petitioner is young in age. However, the heated exchanges and the assaults have also referred to the weapon involved therein, is the tool of their business which is unfortunate. Requirements of the petitioner for any investigation is not found. Detaining the accused hinders the running business. On the



other hand, petitioner undertakes to abide by the conditions in releasing him on bail and is willing to offer satisfactory surety. Hence, it is found proper to release the petitioner on bail subject to certain conditions as will safeguard the interest of the prosecution.

10. Accordingly, above point is answered in the affirmative. Hence, the following:

ORDER

The petition U/Section.482 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

In the event of arrest of the petitioner in Crime No.69/2026 of Udupi Town Police Station, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:

- (1) Petitioner shall execute bail bond for the value of Rs.1,00,000/- with one surety for like sum.
- (2) Petitioner shall cooperate with the Investigating Officer in the investigation and shall attend the trial regularly.
- (3) Neither petitioner nor anybody on his behalf shall tamper or induce, try to tamper or try to induce the prosecution witnesses or to withhold



Crl. Misc. No.234/2026

from disclosing such facts of the offence either to the court or to the Investigating Officer.

- (4) Petitioner shall not involve in any criminal activities during the pendency of this case.
- (5) Petitioner shall appear within 15 days of this order before the Investigating Officer, if not, this order stands lapsed.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-I, transcript revised/corrected, then pronounced in the open court on 20th day of June, 2026)

(K.S. Gangannavar)
Principal District & Sessions Judge
Udupi