



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 2680 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

1. NEELAMMA. S
W/O LATE. V. MADESH
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
R/AT CHIKKANAHALLI, SOLURU HOBLI,
MAGADI TALUK, RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127.
2. VINODA @ VINOD KUMAR A,
S/O ASHWATHAIAH
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 131, SINGAPURA MAIN ROAD,
M.S. PALYA, VINAYAKANAGARA
BENGALURU - 560 097.
3. PUTTAIAH
S/O SANNARANGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
R/AT NO.11, CHIKKANAHALLI,
SOLURU HOBLI, MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127.
4. RAJESH P.
S/O PUTTAIAH
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
R/AT CHIKKANAHALLI, YANNEGERE,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127.
5. YOGESH P @ PAPANNI
S/O PUTTAIAH





AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS,
R/AT NO.10, CHIKKANAHALLI,
SOLURU HOBLI, YANNEGERE MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127.

6. GEETHA R.
W/O RAJESH P,
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
R/AT CHIKKANAHALLI,
SOLURU HOBLI, MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127.

7. LAKSHMAMMA
W/O V. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS,
R/AT LAKKENAHALLI GRAMA PANCHAYATH
CHIKKANAHALLI, YANNEGERE,
MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. MANJUNATH M.R, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY
BY KUDUR POLICE STATION, RAMANAGARA.
REP. BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. SRINIVASA
S/O LATE BETTAIAH
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
R/AT CHIKKANAHALLI, SOLURU HOBLI,
MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. RAHUL RAI, HCGP)



THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 482 OF CR.PC (FILED U/S 528 BNNS) PRAYING D TO QUASH THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN C.C.NO.7311/2024 FOR AN OFFENCE P/U/S 189(2), 115(2), 118(1), 74, 352, 351(2), 190 OF BNS REGISTERED BY KUDUR P.S. RAMANAGARA DIST. PENDING ON THE FILE OF ADDL.CIVIL JUDGE AND J.M.F.C MAGADI, RAMANAGARA DISTRICT.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

Learned High Court Government Pleader has brought to the notice of this Court that the present petition is not the first in point of time. The petitioners had earlier approached this Court in Crl.P. No.11099/2025 seeking identical relief and this Court, upon considering the merits of the matter, had declined to interfere with the proceedings pending before the jurisdictional Magistrate. It is therefore contended that the present petition, being a successive one, is not maintainable.

2. This Court finds considerable force and substance in the preliminary objection raised by the learned HCGP. It is a settled principle of law that once this Court, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., has examined the matter and declined to quash the proceedings, a second



petition seeking the very same relief on substantially identical grounds would not be maintainable, unless there are subsequent developments or change in circumstances warranting reconsideration. The petitioners, having suffered an adverse order at the hands of this Court, cannot be permitted to reagitate the very same issue by filing a successive petition, as such a course would amount to abuse of process of Court and would defeat the principle of finality attached to judicial orders.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would, however, contend that the principal grievance now urged is that, owing to the pendency of the criminal proceedings, respondent No.2/complainant along with certain villagers is allegedly interfering with the petitioners' possession over the land claimed by them. In that regard, this Court deems it appropriate to clarify that pendency of criminal proceedings or the refusal of this Court to quash the same does not, in any manner, curtail or extinguish the petitioners' right to seek appropriate relief before a competent civil Court. If there exists a genuine property dispute or any interference with possession,



the petitioners are at liberty to avail such civil remedies as are available in law, including seeking declaratory and injunctive relief. The continuation of criminal proceedings or filing of charge sheet by the prosecution cannot be construed as creating any legal impediment for the petitioners to approach the civil Court for protection of their alleged rights.

4. In the earlier order passed in Crl.P. No.11099/2025, this Court had categorically declined to quash the proceedings pending in C.C. No.7311/2024 before the trial Court. In the absence of any subsequent event or new circumstance brought on record, the present petition, which is essentially an attempt to re-agitate the very same relief, cannot be entertained.

Accordingly, the criminal petition stands ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE**