



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 16160 OF 2025 (438(Cr.PC) /
482(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. BHARATH S
S/O SIDDARAJU
AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS
MUKKODLU VILLAGE
THATTAGUPPE POST
UTTARAHALLI HOBLI
BANGALURU – 560 082.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI CHANDAN B K, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI PRAVEEN KUMAR R, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE BY
KAGGALIPURA POLICE BENGALURU
REP. BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BENGALURU – 560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI MOHD. AYUB ALI, ADDL. SPP)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED UNDER SECTION 438 Cr.P.C
(UNDER SECTION 482 BNSS) PRAYING TO GRANT
ANTICIPATORY BAIL TO THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED BY
DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT THE STATE BY KAGGALIPURA
POLICE STATION THROUGH THE II ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE TO RELEASE HIM ON BAIL IN THE EVENT OF HIS





ARREST IN CR.No.358/2025, REGISTERED FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 74, 76, 132, 121(1), 115(2), 352, 351, 190 OF BNS.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed by accused No.1 under Section 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail in Crime No.358/2025 of Kaggalipura Police Station registered for offences under Sections 74, 76, 132, 121(1), 115(2), 352, 351, and 190 of BNS.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional SPP for the respondent -State.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that no serious overtact is alleged against this petitioner. The allegation made in the complaint is omnibus. The alleged overtact against accused persons is that they assaulted the first informant on her cheek and held her collar of the uniform, pushed her, snatched her



mobile and gave her life threat. The said incident has been witnessed by the husband of the first informant and one Shankar. The petitioner is ready to cooperate with the Investing Officer in the investigation and abide by any conditions to be imposed by this Court. With this, he prays to allow the petition.

4. Per contra, learned Additional SPP for the respondent –State would contend that the petitioner and other accused persons were consuming alcohol in the middle of the road by playing music in their car and it obstructed the passers on the road. The first informant questioned the same. At that time, the accused was quarreled with the first informant who is woman police constable and snatched her mobile, assaulted on her cheek, held her uniform and pushed her. The said incident has been witnessed by the husband of first informant by name Satish and another by name Shankar. The petitioner has outraged the modesty of woman more so government servant while in the uniform. The petitioner is required for



custodial interrogation. With this, he prays to reject the petition.

5. Having heard learned counsels, the Court has perused the FIR, complaint and other materials placed on record.

6. The first informant is woman police constable. After finishing her duty, when she was returning along with her husband and one Shankar in the car, on the road she saw seven to eight persons were consuming alcohol in the middle of the road by playing music system in the car in high sound. The first informant asked those persons, stating that it was causing inconvenience. At that time, accused persons quarreled with her, abused her, snatched her mobile phone, held her in collar of the uniform and assaulted on her cheek. Thereafter, threw the mobile phone and gave live threat and escaped from the spot. The allegation against the petitioner is outraging the modesty of woman when she was in uniform and more so when she is woman police constable. Considering the said



aspect, the petitioner is not entitled for grant of discretionarily for anticipatory bail.

7. In the result, the petition is ***dismissed.***

Sd/-
(SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR)
JUDGE

DSP
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 12
Ct.sm