



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. 3102 OF 2026

(439(Cr.PC) / 483(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. SHRIDHAR K
S/O KUPPASWAMY P
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
R/AT.NO.51, 2ND A CROSS,
3RD MAIN,
NEAR AYYAPPA TEMPLE,
SINGAYANA PALYA,
BENGALURU NORTH,
BENGALURU -560 048.

(NOW IN JUDICIAL CUSTODY)

Digitally
signed by
PAVITHRA
N

Location:
High
Court of
Karnataka

(BY SRI. PRAKASH T, ADVOCATE)

...PETITIONER

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY MAHADEVAPURA P S
REPRESENTED BY



PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BANGALORE – 560 001.

2. PRAJWAL
S/O LAKSHMI NARAYAN REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
R/AT. NO.163, 5TH CROSS,
GURAPPA REDDY LAYOUT,
VIGNANAGAR MAIN ROAD,
BENGALURU – 560 075.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. ANITHA GIRISH N., HCGP FOR R1
SRI UDAY N., ADVOCATE FOR DEFACTO COMPLAINANT)

THIS CRL.P FILED U/S 439 CR.P.C (U/S 483 BNSS)
PRAYING TO GRANT BAIL TO THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.1
IN CR.NO.69/2026, FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S 108 OF BNS,
2023, PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE 29TH ACJM, AT MAYO
HALL, BENGALURU.

THIS CRL.P, 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 No.1 is before this Court seeking regular bail in Crime No.69/2026 filed by the respondent-police, for the offence under Section 108 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNS').

Brief facts of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that the brother of the victim / deceased filed a complaint stating that the marriage between the petitioner and the deceased had taken place on 20.04.2017. After the marriage, the couple were residing at Singayyanapalya, Bengaluru. The petitioner had called the complainant over phone and informed him that on 02.02.2026 at about 03.20 p.m., the petitioner rang the doorbell, however, no response from inside of the house and the deceased did not open the door. Hence, the door was broken open and he found that the deceased was found hanging to the ceiling fan. Immediately, the deceased was shifted to hospital where she was declared as brought dead.



3. Based on the said complaint, the respondent police registered a case and the investigation is under progress. During investigation, the facts of the case have been unfolded in such a way that the petitioner was chatting with another woman and he had kept obscene photos of other girls and women and those photos were shown to the deceased. Consequently, the deceased was upset. In the meantime, the mother-in-law and father-in-law were insulting the deceased and that she was sitting idle as a result of which, she became fat and not able to beget a child.
4. It is further stated that the deceased was, on one or other pretext, unhappy and she was being subjected to cruelty and harassment not only on account of demanding additional dowry, however, she was being ill-treated by all the family members, as a result of which, the victim had taken extreme steps to commit suicide.
5. Heard Sri. Prakash T, learned counsel for the petitioner, Smt. Anitha Girish N, learned counsel for respondent No.1



– State and Sri. Uday N, learned counsel for the *defacto-complainant*.

6. The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner is innocent of the alleged offence. The marriage between the petitioner and the deceased had taken place nine years ago. The couple had no children. *In fact*, the deceased was in the habit of attempting to commit suicide and she was repeatedly threatening the petitioner and his family members that she would end her life.
7. It is further submitted that on 05.10.2025, she attempted to commit suicide by consuming tablets which was supposed to be given to the diabetic patient. Immediately, she was shifted to KIMS Hospital. Her statement was recorded by the jurisdictional police. In the said statement, she has not whispered anything about the cruelty and harassment. Such being the fact, implicating the present petitioner in this case is baseless. Therefore, the petitioner may be enlarged on bail by imposing suitable conditions. He would 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.

8. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State vehemently submitted that the petitioner being the husband of the deceased was chatting with other women and he had shown some obscene photos of other woman to the deceased. As such, the deceased was quarrelling with the petitioner on many occasions.
9. It is further stated that she was being insulted and abused by the family members including the petitioner that she was so fat and eating more etc. It is further stated that the Petitioner got her administered the medicines which made her to not bear the child. As the deceased was not able to bear the continuous harassment meted out to her, she committed suicide. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for any relief, as prayed for, in the petition. Making such submissions, learned High Court Government Pleader prays to reject the petition.



10. Learned counsel for the *defacto* - complainant/respondent No.2 has adopted the arguments advanced by the learned HCGP and prays to reject the petition.
11. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the averments of the complaint and also other documents appended to the petition.
12. Learned counsel for the petitioner made available some documents which disclose that the deceased had attempted to commit suicide on three previous occasions and she made a statement before the competent jurisdictional police that she was suffering from stomach ache and head ache. Nowhere in the said statement, she had made complaints against the husband and in-laws in respect of cruelty and harassment. The statement was given by the deceased on 05.10.2025. However, on 02.02.2026, she has committed suicide in her matrimonial home. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, *prima-facie* I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a



case to grant him bail. 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.69/2026 of respondent-police for the aforesaid offences on executing personal bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) with one surety for the likesum to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

(iii) The petitioner shall not threaten or tamper 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 activities, till disposal of the case.



NC: 2026:KHC:16648
CRL.P No. 3102 of 2026

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

JS/-
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 63