



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. 2670 OF 2026

(438(Cr.PC) / 482(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

SRI. SRINIVASA T
S/O THIMMASHETTY,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
R/AT NO.34-1
KIKKER HOBALI
OOGINAHALLI, MANDYA – 571 423.

INDICATED IN FIR AS:
SRI SRINIVAS T,
BAIRASHETTAHALLI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI, NELAMANGALA,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT – 562 123

...PETITIONER

(BY MR. AMAR ALEXANDER CORREA, ADVOCATE)

Digitally
signed by
PAVITHRA
N



Location:
High
Court of
Karnataka



AND:

STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY NELAMANGALA RURAL POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT - 562 123
REP BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BENGALURU - 560 001

...RESPONDENT

(BY MR. RANGASWAMY R., HCGP)

THIS CRL.P FILED U/S 438 CR.P.C (U/S 482 BNSS) BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS PETITION AND DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NELAMANGALA RURAL POLICE, TO RELEASE THE PETITIONER, ON BAIL IN THE EVENT OF HIS ARREST IN CR.NO.187/2025, PENDING ON THE FILE OF PRL. CIVIL JUDGE (JR.DN) AND JMFC COURT, NELAMANGALA, BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT, REGISTERED AND BEING INVESTIGATED FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 406, 420, 409, 464, 465, 468, 469, 470, 471 OF IPC, ARRAYING THIS PETITIONER AS THE ACCUSED THEREIN.

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 petitioner / accused, is before this Court seeking anticipatory bail in Crime No.187/2025 of respondent-police for the offences under Sections 406, 420, 409, 464, 465, 468, 469, 470 and 471 of Indian Penal Code.

Brief facts of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that, the petitioner is the Parupattedar of Shri Bailanjaneyaswamy Temple, Bairashettihalli Village, Nelamangala Taluk. He was authorized to collect donations from the devotees and the public for the purpose of development/renovation of the temple. It is alleged that the petitioner had kept a private scanner in the temple premises to facilitate donations through PhonePe, and as per the preliminary investigation, an amount of Rs.24,85,184/- was received between 04.01.2019 to 30.08.2024 and further, an amount of Rs.15,58,706/- was transferred to another private individual's account held by Renuka Prasanna. A show cause notice was issued by the office. The petitioner, though made certain statements that he has received only Rs.3,69,378/- and Rs.3,79,122/-, the fact



remains that the petitioner has committed the offences stated *supra*. Therefore, the authority has lodged a complaint against the petitioner for having committed the offences stated *supra*. The respondent - police have registered a case in Crime No.187 of 2025. The investigation is under progress.

3. Heard Mr. Amar Alexander Correa, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rangaswamy R., learned High Court Government Pleader for the respondent – State.
4. The submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences. Absolutely no case is made out against the petitioner for the alleged offences. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are baseless and bald. The alleged misappropriation or diversion of funds has not taken place. However, as per the direction of the temple authority, private scanners were kept in the temple premises to collect the funds from the donors.
5. It is further submitted that, during the period from 2019 to 2024, the petitioner was working as a Parupattedar,



however, the Executive Officer was supervising the affairs of the temple. Therefore, the alleged diversion of funds or misappropriation of funds cannot take place. The petitioner is a reputed person in the Society. He has been targeted by other groups who are rivals to the temple authority. He is a permanent resident of Mandya District. He will abide by the conditions 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 vehemently submitted that the petitioner was working as a General Administrator. He was authorized to collect donations for the development of the temple. However, he was not authorized to collect donations from the donors into any private account. The petitioner, despite such directions that he should not keep any private scanners, with an intention to deceive the temple authority and the Government, kept two separate scanners maintained by different persons and



misappropriated the amount. Hence, the temple authority has lodged a complaint against him. The investigation is under progress. Custodial interrogation is very much essential for filing a proper final report. Therefore, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Making such submissions, learned High Court Government Pleader prays to reject the petition.

7. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the averments of the complaint. It appears from the record that the petitioner was working as a Parupattedar of the temple. It is alleged that he has misused or misappropriated the funds by keeping the private scanners in the temple premises. The preliminary investigation discloses that he has misused the amount of Rs.24,85,184/- and Rs.15,58,706/-.
8. Be that as it may, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that during the period between 04.01.2019 to 30.08.2024, the Chief Executive Officer was also in charge of the said temple and the said officer was taking care of the affairs of the temple on a day-to-day basis.



Having considered the said submissions, I am of the considered opinion that it is appropriate to grant him anticipatory 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 Criminal Petition is ***allowed.***

(ii) The petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail, in the event of his arrest, in Crime No.187/2025 of respondent-police for the offences stated *supra*, on executing a personal bond in a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakh only) with one surety for the likesum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer.

(iii) The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer within a period of one month from the date of receipt of copy of this order, to execute a personal bond and also to furnish surety.



(iv) The petitioner shall co-operate with investigation as and when required, till filing of the final report.

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

(vi) The petitioner shall not tamper with the prosecution witnesses nor hamper the Court proceedings.

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