

**IN THE COURT OF VI ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS
JUDGE, BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU.**

Dated this the 16th day of April, 2026

PRESENT

Sri. Devananda B.Com., LL.M.
VI Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.

Crl.Misc.No.621/2026

Petitioner: Shri. Vinod
C/o Subramani,
Aged about 47 years,
R/at No.8, 8th street, ground floor,
Bank Avenue, Babusapalya,
Bengaluru – 560 043.

(Rep. By Siji Malayil, Advocate)

-Vs-

Respondent: State by Avalahalli
Police Station.

(By learned Public Prosecutor)

ORDER

This petition is filed by the petitioner/accused U/Sec.482 of BNSS seeking a direction to respondent-Police to release him on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.90/2026 registered by the respondent-police for the offences punishable U/sec. 190, 316(2), 318(4) of BNS.

2. The facts averred in the complaint preferred by the complainant that, on February 27, 2026, Manjunath, a 39-year-old software engineer residing at Prestige Tranquility Apartments, Budigere Cross, Bengaluru, filed a formal complaint regarding a major financial fraud. The complainant alleged that Pooja Bhagavati, a resident of the same apartment complex, along with several associates (Vinod, Manjula, Kaleshwari, Vijay, Bhavani, Vetri, and Raghupathi), claimed they could provide gold jewelry, household items, vehicles, and electronics at significant discounts. They claimed these items were sourced through their involvement as members of a Christian Charity/Missionary. Believing their claims, the

complainant transferred money to various accounts (including "Fourstar Travels" and "Fourstar Account") as instructed by the accused. Approximately ₹2.5 Crores (collected from the complainant, his family, and friends). Payments were made in multiple installments between August 2023 and June 2024. While the complainant did receive some items, they did not match the value of the investment: 245 grams of gold, 5 two-wheelers, and ₹2.5 lakhs worth of electronics (TV, refrigerator, earbuds, etc.). For an Alto K10 car, the accused only provided ₹4 lakhs; the complainant had to pay the remaining ₹3.5 lakhs himself. The promised luxury cars and the remaining gold jewelry were never delivered. The accused promised to refund the money until January 15, 2026, but have since switched off their mobile phones. Pooja Bhagavati has also vacated her apartment and her current whereabouts are unknown. The complainant has submitted bank account details and mobile numbers of the accused to the police for investigation.

3. Based on the said information, the respondent-Police have registered the FIR against the accused for the

above said offence. Now, the petitioner who is accused of commission of offence alleged, apprehending his arrest at the hands of respondent-Police, has filed this petition seeking pre-arrest bail on the following amongst other grounds: The Petitioner claims the complaint is entirely false and that they have been falsely implicated by the Respondent Police to cause harassment. It is stated that the Petitioner was never involved, directly or indirectly, with the complaint at any time. The Petitioner alleges the police intentionally named them as an accused with an ulterior motive. There is an unexplained delay of nearly 3 years in filing the complaint, which the Petitioner argues raises doubts about the genuineness of the allegations. The offences mentioned in the FIR carry a maximum punishment of seven years and are triable by a Magistrate. Since the case is based on documentary evidence (such as bank transactions), the Petitioner argues that custodial interrogation is unnecessary. The Petitioner is a permanent resident and a law-abiding citizen from a respectable family with deep roots in society. The Petitioner asserts that an arrest would cause humiliation,

torture, and damage to their public image. The Petitioner maintains they have no reason to believe they are guilty and is ready to cooperate with the investigation. There is a stated readiness to provide surety and abide by any conditions imposed by the Court for enlargement on bail. The Petitioner has requested leave from the Court to present additional grounds during arguments. Based on the aforesaid grounds he seeks for allowing of the petition.

4. The bail petition was opposed by the learned Public Prosecutor for state by filing his objections. It is mainly contended that, the petitioner has not assigned the valid reasons and he denied the facts alleged. The concerned police have registered the case against the petitioner. It is urged that, in the event of releasing of petitioner on pre-arrest bail, he may cause threat or intimidate the complainant or the witnesses and preventing him to depose evidence before the court and he will engage in committing of similar offence and causing threat to the prosecution witnesses. In the event of releasing of petitioner on pre-arrest bail he may destroy the evidence or proof and may prevent the witnesses to depose evidence.

He may repeat the similar offence. Based on the aforesaid grounds of objections, the prosecution seeks for rejection of anticipatory bail petition.

5. Heard arguments on both sides. Perused the records.

6. The following points that arise for consideration of this court are:

1. Whether the petitioner has made out sufficient grounds for grant of anticipatory bail?
2. What order?

7. The finding of this court on the above said points are as under:

Point No. 1: In the Affirmative.

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

REASONS

8. **POINT NO.1**: The petitioner along with petition has produced certified copies of FIR, information, remand

application, requisition, arrest report and copy of Adhaar card.

9. The petitioner is accused of commission of offences punishable U/S. 190, 316(2), 318(4) of BNS. As the offences U/S.190, 316(2), 318(4) of BNS is cognizable, apprehension of accused-petitioner of his arrest is well founded. As such, he can maintain this petition.

10. The learned counsel for petitioner urged that, the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the informant. The informant has lodged false information against the petitioner. On the other hand, the learned PP submitted that, there is prima-facie case against the petitioner. If he is released on bail, there are chances of petitioner giving threat to the witnesses, destroying of evidence, abscond permanently and derail the investigation process.

11. On examination of over all materials placed before the court by the investigating agency through

prosecution as well as by the petitioner, it could be ascertained that the offences alleged against the accused is not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Further, there are no previous criminal antecedents found against the accused/petitioner. As for as the allegations made against the accused/petitioner are concerned, the contents of complaint discloses that there are monetary transactions in respect of movable properties. It is for the year 2023 till the beginning of 2026 the alleged transactions held between the complainant and the accused. Certain goods were also delivered to the complainant. Both parties having respective documents in support of their claim and it could be produced before the investigating agency for the purpose of investigation. The investigating agency can proceed with investigation on the basis of documentary evidence. The presence of this accused petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation for the purpose of investigation by concerned police. The accused/petitioner claims to be the permanent resident of the address mentioned in the cause title. The chances of him absconding is too remote and the chances

of him causing interference with the prosecution witnesses and to the complainant are also appears to be too remote. In respect of apprehension expressed by prosecution and by virtue of quantum of amount involved in the case on hand imposing of one of the conditions to furnish cash security amount of Rs.1,00,000/- by accused petitioner along with other conditions will fulfill the object under the facts and circumstances of this case. Therefore, this court is of the opinion that the petition preferred by the petitioner merits the consideration of this court and deserves to be allowed in the interest of justice as the petitioner has made out sufficient grounds to consider this petition and hence, this court hereby answers the point no.1 in the **Affirmative**.

12. **POINT NO.2:** In view of the discussions and findings to above said point no.1, this court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Petition filed by petitioner/accused
U/Sec.482 of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, in the event of arrest of petitioner/accused in Crime No.90/2026 of Avalahalli Police Station, he is ordered to be released on bail, on his executing personal bond for a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- and with a surety for like-sum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Police Officer and to furnish cash security amount of Rs.1,00,000/- in the office of this court on the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer on or before one month from the date of this order and in that event Investigation Officer to take bond and to release him.
2. He shall appear before investigating officer as and when called upon and to extend fullest co-operation in the investigation.
3. He shall not cause threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
4. He shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner.

(Dictated to the Stenographer transcribed by her and transcript, corrected by me and then pronounced in open Court on this the **16th day of April, 2026**)

(Devananda)

VI Addl. District & Sessions Judge.,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru

Order pronounced in open court
(vide separate order sheet)

ORDER

Petition filed by
petitioner/accused U/Sec.482
of BNSS is hereby allowed.

Consequently, in the
event of arrest of
petitioner/accused in Crime
No.90/2026 of Avalahalli
Police Station, he is ordered
to be released on bail, on his
executing personal bond for a
sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- and
with a surety for like-sum to
the satisfaction of the
Investigating Officer/Police
Officer and to furnish cash
security amount of
Rs.1,00,000/- in the office of
this court on the following
conditions:

1. The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer on or before one month from the date of this order and in that event Investigation Officer to take bond and to release him.

2. He shall appear before investigating officer as and when called upon and to extend fullest co-operation in the investigation.

3. He shall not cause threat to the prosecution witnesses in any manner.

4. He shall not indulge in similar offences in any manner.

VI Addl. District & Sessions Judge.,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru