



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 1941 OF 2026 (438(Cr.PC) /
482(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. RAJU K R
S/O RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
R/O KALIDASA BADAVANE,
GONDHIHALLI ROAD, KAVALUBEELU,
KORATAGERE TOWN,
KORATAGERE TALUK,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 129,
2. SOMASUNADARA
S/O RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
R/O KALIDASA BADAVANE,
GONDHIHALLI ROAD, KAVALUBEELU,
KORATAGERE TOWN,
KORATAGERE TALUK,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 129,
3. LAVANYA
W/O SOMASUNDAR,
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
R/O KALIDASA BADAVANE,
GONDHIHALLI ROAD, KAVALUBEELU,
KORATAGERE TOWN,
KORATAGERE TALUK,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 129,

Digitally
signed by
SREEDHARAN
BANGALORE
SUSHMA
LAKSHMI
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



4. GEETHA
W/O LATE RANGANATH,
AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS,
R/O KALIDASA BADAVANE,
GONDHIHALLI ROAD, KAVALUBEELU,
KORATAGERE TOWN,
KORATAGERE TALUK,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 129,

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. R SHASHIDHARA., ADVOCATE)

AND:

STATE BY
KORATAGERE POLICE STATION,
KORATAGERE,
REPRESENTED BY SPP
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BANGALORE - 01,

...RESPONDENT

(BY SMT. ANITHA GIRISHA N., HCGP)

THIS CRL.P FILED U/S.438 (FILED U/S.482 BNSS)
CR.P.C BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING
THAT THIS HONOURABLE COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO GRANT
AN ANTICIPATORY BAIL TO THE PETITIONER IN EVENT OF
THEIR ARREST IN CRIME NO.279/2025 REGISTERED BY
KORATAGERE POLICE STATION, KORATEGERE BEFORE CIVIL
JUDGE AND JMFC COURT FOR THE OFFENCE P/US/ 76, 109,
110, 111, 112, 114, 115(1), 116, 117(1) OF BNS 2023, IN THE
INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

ORAL ORDER

1. The petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 4 are before this Court seeking for grant of anticipatory bail in Crime No.279/2025 of respondent-police for the offence under Sections 76, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115(1), 116 and 117(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

Brief facts of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that a private complaint has been registered against the petitioners herein alleging that the petitioners and the complainant are residents of the addresses as stated in their respective cause-title. It is alleged that on 01.06.2025 around about 10.30 a.m., the petitioners are stated to have trespassed into the house of the complainant and started assaulting them by using filthy languages and it is further alleged that the accused herein assaulted the wife of the complainant and also dragged her to the outside the house and assaulted her indiscriminately. Consequently, she



sustained severe injuries. As the respondent-police have not registered a case, a private complaint has been lodged by the complainant before the jurisdictional Magistrate. Then, it was referred to the respondent-police for investigation. The investigation is under process.

3. Heard Sri.R.Shashidhara, learned counsel for the petitioners and Smt.Anitha Girisha N., learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State.

4. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners that, the alleged incident had occurred on 01.06.2025 around about 10.30 a.m. However, a complaint came to be registered on 29.12.2025, after a lapse of 4 months. The allegations made by the complainant are baseless and false. The civil dispute has been converted into a criminal case. Therefore, the petitioner may be enlarged on bail by imposing suitable conditions. In fact, the petitioners are all the members of the same family and residents of Kalidasa Badavane



Koratagere Taluk, Tumakuru District. They will abide the conditions imposed by this Court in the event of their release and bail. Making such submissions, he prays to allow the petition.

5. *Per contra*, the learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State vehemently submitted that the manner in which the petitioners have assaulted the complainant would indicate the severity of the offence. She had been dragged out of the house and assaulted brutally by the petitioners. As a result of which, the complainant had sustained injuries and after obtaining the treatment, a complaint came to be registered by the complainant. Mere delay in lodging the complaint cannot take over the case of the prosecution as there are eyewitnesses to the incident. Therefore, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail. Making such submissions, she prays to reject the petition.



6. Heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the averments of the complaint. It appears from the record that the incident had occurred on 01.06.2025 around about 10.30 a.m. However, a private complaint has been lodged on 29.12.2025. Though, it is alleged that on 03.06.2025, a complaint came to be registered before the respondent-Police, the complainant did not produce any documents to substantiate the same.

7. Having considered the said aspect, it is appropriate to grant them bail by imposing suitable conditions that would take care of the apprehension of the prosecution.

8. Hence, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

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

(ii) The petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.279/2025 of respondent-police



for the offence under Sections 76, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115(1), 116 and 117(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on executing personal bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) each with one surety each for the likesum to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

(iii) The petitioners shall appear before the jurisdictional police within a period of one month from today to execute personal bond and also to furnish surety.

(iv) The petitioners shall co-operate with investigation till filing of the charge sheet.

(v) The petitioners shall not threaten or tamper the prosecution witnesses nor hamper the proceedings of the Court.



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

(vii) The petitioners shall not commit any criminal cases till disposal of the case.

In case, if the petitioners violate 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

NR/-
List No.: 1 SI No.: 22