



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 1472 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

RAVIKUMAR P.
SON OF LATE NARAYANAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.5, 4TH CROSS,
BANAGIRINAGAR,
PAPAIAH GARDEN,
BANASHANKARI-3RD STAGE,
BANGALORE - 560 085

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NAGARAJA K.R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT., GEETHA GURUDEV,
WIFE OF SRI. GURUDEV,
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
R/A NO.620, 3RD CROSS,
16TH B MAIN, KORAMANGALA,
3RD BLOCK,
BANGALORE - 560 034

...RESPONDENT





THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482(FILED U/S.528 BNSS) CR.P.C BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING THAT THIS HONOURABLE COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO QUASH THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN C.C.NO.44935/2025 (PCR NO.19323/2025) ON THE FILE OF THE XIX ADDL CJM, BENGALURU FOR THE OFFENCE P/US/ 138 OF NI ACT.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA**

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner is before this Court calling in question the proceedings in C.C.No.44935/2025 registered for offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ('the NI' Act for short).

2. Heard Sri. Nagaraja K.R., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

3. The petitioner and the respondent are said to have had a transaction. In furtherance of the said transaction, the petitioner is said to have issued a cheque for Rs.15,00,000/-.



The cheque when presented gets dishonoured. The dishonouring of the cheque leads the complainant to the concerned Court for register a complaint for offence punishable under Section 138 of the NI Act. The petitioner calls in question the entire proceedings after it having travelled to certain extent on the score that the complainant and the brother-in-law of the petitioner have entered into a settlement by drawing up agreement, that once the brother-in-law of the petitioner, who was then in judicial custody gets released would hand over the cheque. In the meantime, the cheque has been presented and it has been dishonored.

4. All these factors would be in the realm of disputed questions of facts. This Court in excise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. would not entertain a petition, which is shrouded with seriously disputed questions of facts. All the contentions that the petitioner now wants to project before this Court would require evidence in the least. Therefore, the petitioner is at liberty to urge all the contentions before the concerned Court at the appropriate time. It is needless to



observe that the concerned Court would answer all such contentions.

5. With the aforesaid observation, the petition stands ***disposed.***

**Sd/-
(M.NAGAPRASANNA)
JUDGE**

JY
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 54