



1

Presented on : 07-03-2026

Registered on : 09-03-2026

Decided on : 13-03-2026

Duration : 6 days

**IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDL DISTRICT &  
SESSIONS JUDGE, YADGIR**

**Dated: This the 13<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026**

**:Present:**

**Sri. A. EARANNA, M.Com., L.L.M.,**  
I Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge, Yadgir

**Crl.Misc.No.99/2026**

**Petitioners/Accused No.2 to 6:**

1. Mallikarjun S/o Devindrappa Rampur,  
Age:28 Years, Occ:Agri,
2. Akkamahadevi W/o Devindrappa  
Rampur, Age:50 Years, Occ:Labourer,
3. Chandappa s/o Devindrappa Rampur,  
Age:29 Years, Occ:Agri,
4. Sharanappa S/o Devindrappa Rampur  
Age:35 Years, Occ:Agri,
5. Gangamma W/o Mallikarjun Rampur,  
Age:32 Years, Ramasamudra village,  
Tq. & Dist.Yadgir.

(By Sri.G.Bheemrao, Advocate)

**Vs.**



**Respondent:**

The State through Yadgir Rural Police Station.

(By Public Prosecutor)

\*\*\*\*\*

**ORDER**

The petition is filed by the petitioners/accused No.2 to 6 under Section 482 of BNSS for an order of anticipatory bail.

2) On the strength of complaint the yadgir Rural police have registered the case in Crime No.35/2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 189(2), 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 74, 352, 126(2), 351(2) R/w 190 of BNS.

3) In the bail petition it is contended that they are nothing to do with the alleged offences and they are falsely involved in the above case. The complainant in this case, is accused No.2 in the counter case no such injuries caused to the complainant on perusal of the complaint the



3

ingredients not attracts to said offences. All the offences are not punishable with death or imprisonment for life secs.118(1), 118(2), 74 are non bailable but not punishable with death or imprisonment for life and all the offences are triable by the JMFC Court. The petitioners are ready to furnish the surety to release them on bail. On these grounds, the petitioners prays to allow of the bail petition.

4) The learned Public Prosecutor filed the objection contending that present bail petition is not maintainable, same is liable to be dismissed. If the petitioners are granted with anticipatory bail, the petitioners may threaten the prosecution witnesses and they may destroy the prosecution evidence or they may commit the similar kind of offences and the possibility of petitioners fleeing away from justice cannot be ruled out. Inter alia, on these grounds, pray to dismiss of the bail petition.

5) Heard both sides. Perused the record.



4

6) Following points arise for consideration of this Court:

1. Whether the petitioners are made out grounds to enlarge them on anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNS.S.?

2. What Order?

7) My findings on the above Points are as follows:

Point No.1:- In the Affirmative

Point No.2:- As per final order,

for the following:

### **REASONS**

8) **Point No.1:-** The counsel for the petitioners argued that petitioners have not at all committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution. They have been falsely implicated in the case and there is a land dispute in between the complainant and accused persons. Respondent police are making hectic efforts to arrest the petitioners. Therefore, he prays to allow the bail petition filed by the petitioners.

9) The learned Public Prosecutor argued that the case



5

is under investigation. If the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail, then there is chances of they may tamper and hamper the prosecution case. The alleged offences U/secs.118(1), 118(2), 74 are non bailable in nature other offences are bailable in nature and triable by the court of JMFC along with other grounds he prays to dismiss the bail petition.

10) On perusal of the records, one Sharanappa has lodged the complaint stating that he and his family is having landed property at Ramasamudra village and petitioners are their brothers. They are also having landed property at Ramasamudra. Both lands are adjacent to each other. There is a bund dispute between the petitioners and complainant for that there is an enmity in between the complainant and petitioners. On 23.2.2026 at about 9.40 a.m., complainant and his father were went to his lands. After getting the groundnut bags in the tractor they are returning from their land towards their house near by



6

the house of complainant petitioners came in their motorcycle in-front of the said tractor and stopped the said tractor and started quarrel with the complainant. In turn, complainant asked the petitioners why you are abusing both are brothers in-spite of it, petitioners abused in filthy language. Then Hanamanth has abused in filthy language and he assaulted with stick on the back and stomach of the complainant then the father of the complainant came to pacify the quarrel then one Hanamanth, Mallikarjun, Akkamahadevi, Chandappa, Sharanappa, Gangamma with an intention to commit the offence having unlawful assembled and abused in filthy language. Then Hanamanth came on motorcycle and hit to father of the complainant due to the said act father of the complainant fell down on the ground. Then the petitioners assaulted with hands and kicked. And thrown on the ground. Due to it, father of the complainant sustained injuries on right elbow. Complainant and his father making hue and cry then



7

the mother of the complainant came to pacify the quarrel. Then Akkamahadevi and Gangamma abused in filthy language. They have assaulted on stomach, back and chest of mother of the complainant. After making hue and cry persons came and pacify the quarrel. Thereafter, lodged the complaint. Based on the complaint respondent police have registered the case in Crime No.35/2026 for the aforesaid offences.

11) Counsel for the petitioners have stated in their petition petitioner No.2 is aged about 50 years. Petitioner No.1, 3 to 6 are doing agriculture work and residing in the said village. Apart from it, he has produced petitioner by name Chandappa were not at all present in the said place. He was attended exam at Bengaluru. In this regard, he has produced the one zerox copy of Hall ticket, zerox copy of train ticket that the said petitioner was not at all present. Petitioners No.2, 5 are the females. Parents of the petitioners are depending upon the petitioners as well as their spouse and children. Therefore, he prays to allow



8

the bail petition. On careful perusal of the prosecution papers petitioner No.2 has lodged the complaint in Crime No.36/2026 against the complainant and in all 11 members itself shows that there is a property dispute in between the petitioners and complainant. If the petitioners are remanded to J.C. their entire reputation will be spoiled in the society as well as in the community and no person can stand behind the bars until unless full pledged trial. Averments of the complaint itself reveals that there is a property dispute in between the complainant and petitioners. Bail is a rule jail is an exception. Considering the dictum as well as offences U/sec.118(1), 118(2), 74 of BNS are non-bailable in nature remaining offences are bailable in nature. All the offences are triable by the court of Magistrate and not punishable with death or imprisonment for life. Considering the entire facts of the case as well as reasons stated in the bail petition I am of the view that petitioners are entitled for bail. Hence, I answer Point No.1 in the **Affirmative.**



9

12) **Point No.2:** In view of my findings on Point No.1, I proceed to pass the following:

**ORDER**

The bail petition filed by the petitioners/ accused No.2 to 6 U/s 482 of BNSS, is hereby allowed;

The respondent police are hereby directed to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.35/2026 of respondent Police Station for the aforesaid offences on execution of personal bonds for Rs.1,00,000/-each with one surety for the like sum on the following conditions:

1. The petitioners shall join investigation and co-operate with I.O for investigation.
2. The petitioners shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence the prosecution witnesses directly or indirectly in any manner.
3. The petitioners shall not indulge



10

with offence of like nature.

4. In case, if the petitioners violate any of the above mentioned conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to move an application in such cases for cancellation of bail.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade II directly on computer typed by him, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in Open Court on this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026).

**(A. EARANNA)**  
I Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge,  
Yadgir.