



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH
CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 567 OF 2026 (439(Cr.PC) /
483(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

TEJENDRA PRATHAP SINGH YADAV
@ ASHU YADAV
S/O. ADESH KUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 73/4, JAGRUTHI VIHARA,
MEERATH, UTTAR PRADESH-250 004.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PRABHAKARA M.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SHESHADRIPURAM,
BENGALURU,
REPRESENTED BY S.P.P.,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI.HARISH GANAPATHY., HCGP)

Digitally
signed by
PAVITHRA
N



Location:
High
Court of
Karnataka



THIS CRL.P FILED U/S 439 CR.PC (FILED U/S 483 BNSS) PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON REGULAR BAIL IN CR NO.123/2025 OF SHESHADRIPURAM POLICE STATION BENGALURU REGISTERED FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENCES P/U/S 308(3), 351(4), 61(2), 3(5), 238 OF BNS AND U/S. 3, 25(1B)(A) OF INDIAN ARMS ACT PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE 1ST ADDL.CMM COURT, NRUPATUNGA ROAD, BENGALURU CITY.

THIS CRL.P, COMING ON FOR ORDERS THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner/accused No.6 is before this Court seeking regular bail in Crime No.123/2025 of respondent-police for the offence under Sections 308(3), 351(4), 61(2), 3(5), 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 3, 25(1B)(A) of Indian Arms Act, 1959.

Brief facts of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that Sri. Vishal Kumar lodged a complaint stating that the father of the complainant has received a phone call through whatsapp and the person called through the said whatsapp and introduced



himself as Lawrence Bishnoi and extorted the amount of Rs.1.00 Crore. Further, he threatened his father that if he failed to give the amount of Rs.1.00 Crore, his son would be kidnapped. The complainant having clarified that the threat call has been given by the unknown persons, lodged a complaint before the respondent-Police. The respondent-Police registered a case and conducted investigation. After conducting investigation, submitted a charge sheet.

3. Heard Sri.Prabhakara M., learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms.Asma Kouser, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State.

4. It is the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is stated to be the one of the associate of Bishnoi gang. However, the said averment is baseless and false. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are that accused Nos.2 and 3 had purchased live bullets from this petitioner. However, no documents are produced to show that the petitioner has sold the said bullets to accused Nos.2 and 3.



5. The petitioner is the earning member of the family and is the permanent resident of Meerath, Uttar Pradesh. He will abide by the conditions to be imposed by this Court in the event of his release on bail. Making such submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner prays to allow the petition.

6. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State vehemently submitted that the petitioner is the resident of Uttar Pradesh. The Bishnoi gang used to commit various offences across India. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail, there may be chances of not only committing similar offence but also he may not be available to face the trial. Therefore, it is not appropriate to grant him bail. Making such submissions, learned HCGP prays to reject the petition.

7. Heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the averments of the complaint. The father of the complainant has received a phone call through whatsapp by unknown person, the said unknown person has allegedly demanded a sum of Rs.1.00 Crore or else his son would be kidnapped.



8. Be that as it may, the allegations against the present petitioner is that he had sold live bullets to accused Nos.2 and 3 for the purpose of committing the offence. However, the Investigating Officer had not produced any documents to indicate that the petitioner had sold the live bullets to accused Nos.2 and 3. Having considered the said aspect, it is appropriate to grant him bail by imposing suitable conditions that would take care of the apprehension of the prosecution.

9. Hence, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

(i) The petition is ***allowed***.

(ii) The petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail in Crime No.123/2025 of respondent-police for the offence under Sections 308(3), 351(4), 61(2), 3(5), 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 3, 25(1B)(A) of Indian Arms Act, 1959 on executing personal bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) with one



local surety for the likesum to the satisfaction of
the Trial Court.

(iii) The petitioner shall not threaten or
tamper with the prosecution witnesses nor
hamper the proceedings of the Court.

(iv) The petitioner shall appear before the
Trial Court on all hearing dates without fail.

(v) The petitioner shall not indulge in any
criminal cases till disposal of the case.

In case, the petitioner violates any of the bail conditions
as stated above, liberty is reserved to the prosecution to file
necessary application for cancellation of bail.

Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE