



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.SRISHANANDA
CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 100005 OF 2026
(438(CR.PC)/482(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

KALLAPPA S/O CHIDANAND PATTANASHETTI
AGE. 40 YEARS, OCC. AGRICULTURE,
R/O. DHAVALESHWAR VILLAGE 587116,
TQ. MUDHOL, DIST. BAGALKOT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PRASHANT S. KADADEVAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
R/BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
DHARWAD BENCH IN MAHALINGAPUR POLICE
STATION.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. P.N. HATTI, HCGP)



THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 482
OF BNSS, 2023, PRAYING TO ALLOW THE PETITION AND GRANT
ANTICIPATORY BAIL TO THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED IN
MAHALINGAPUR PS CRIME NO. 79/2025 FOR OFFENCE P/U/SEC.
118(2), 127(2), 351(2), 76, 85 OF BNS, 2023 IN THE INTEREST
OF JUSTICE.



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

ORAL ORDER

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.SRISHANANDA)

1. Heard Sri. Prashant S. Kadadevar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri. P. N. Hatti, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State.
2. Petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nyaya Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with the following prayer:

"Wherefore, the petitioner most humbly prays that the Hon'ble Court may be pleased to allow the petition and grant Anticipatory Bail to the Petitioner/Accused in Mahalingapur PS Crime No.79/2025 for the offence punishable 118(2), 127(2), 351(2), 76, 85 of BNS, 2023 in the interest of justice."

3. Wife of the petitioner is the complainant alleging the commission of the offences punishable under Sections 118(2), 127(2), 351(2), 76 and 85 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.



4. Gist of the complaint averments would reveal that the petitioner being the husband of the complainant, picked up the quarrel and tied her hands and legs with a rope after derobing her and assaulted with a stick on the hands and thighs.

5. After registration of the case, the petitioner is not available for the investigation.

6. The request of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail is rejected by the learned District Judge. Thereafter, the petitioner is before this Court.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that a trivial incident and minor differences between the petitioner and the complainant has been blown out of the proportion and a false case has been registered and therefore, sought for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader respondent-State would oppose the bail grounds by



contending that the petitioner is most cruel person who has derobed his own wife, tied her with ropes and then assaulted her with stick on her thighs and other parts of the body and that too in the presence of grown-up children which establishes that he is not a law-abiding citizen and therefore, he is not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail.

9. Taking note of the rival contentions of the parties, it is noted that since 20.11.2025 the petitioner is not available for investigation. As such, investigation has crippled.

10. Eyewitnesses according to the prosecution are children of the couple. Their statements have already been recorded. Therefore, directing the petitioner to join the investigation and proceed with the further investigation would meet the ends of justice by allowing the limited custodial interrogation.



11. Accordingly, the following:

ORDER

- (i) The petition is ***allowed***.
- (ii) Petitioner is directed to join the investigation by appearing before the Investigation Officer on ***16.02.2026*** at 10.00 a.m.
- (iii) Investigation Officer is at liberty to take him to custody and conclude the custodial interrogation on the same day before 06.00 p.m. and thereafter, enlarge the petitioner on bail on taking a bond in a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the Investigation Officer.
- (iv) Petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation in all respects.



(v) Petitioner shall attend the Court regularly.

(vi) Petitioner shall not threaten the prosecution witnesses in any manner.

(vii) Petitioner shall not leave the jurisdiction of Bagalkote District without prior permission.

Violation of any one of the conditions would entitle the prosecution to seek for cancellation of bail.

Sd/-
(V.SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE

SMM
CT:CMU
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 13