



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.SRISHANANDA
CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 100012 OF 2026
(438(CR.PC)/482(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. PRAVEEN S/O NARAYAN TALAWAR @ MADAR
AGE. 40 YEARS OCC AGRICULTURE,
R/O SOPPADLA, TQ. YARAGATTI,
DIST. BELAGAVI 591129.
2. SANJAY S/O NARAYAN TALAWAR @ MADAR
AGE. 40 YEARS, OCC. AGRICULTURE,
R/O SOPPADLA TQ YARAGATTI,
DIST. BELAGAVI 591129.
3. NARAYAN S/O DUNDAPPA TALAWAR
AGE. 60 YEARS OCC. AGRICULTURE,
R/O SOPPADLA TQ YARAGATTI,
DIST. BELAGAVI 591129.
4. YALLAVVA S/O NARYAN TALAWAR
AGE. 55 YEARS, OCC. HOUSEHOLD,
R/O SOPPADLA TQ. YARAGATTI,
DIST. BELAGAVI 591129.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. PRIYANKA PAWAR, ADVOCATE FOR SRI. INGALE ADIVEPPA
KALLAPPA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
THE SHO MURGOD POLICE STATION,
R/O MURGOD TQ YARAGATTI, DIST. BELAGAVI.
REPRESENTED BY HCGP THE HIGH COURT OF
KARNATAKA
DHARWAD BENCH AT DHARWAD.

...RESPONDENT

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





THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 482 OF BNSS (U/S 438 OF CR.P.C.), PRAYING TO ALLOW AND THE PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.1, 2, 4 AND 5 MAY BE ENLARGED ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL EVENT OF THEIR ARREST IN MURGOD P.S. CRIME NO 313/2025 FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTION 189(2), 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 115(2), 118(2), 137(2), 133, 308(8), 352, 351(2), R/W 190 OF BNS, 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)

Heard Smt.Priyanka Pawar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sri.Ingale Adivappa Kallappa, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri.P.N.Hatti, learned High Court Government Pleader for the respondent/State.

2. Petitioners are accused persons in Crime No.313/2025 of Murgod Police Station. They have approached this Court with a prayer for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

3. Facts in the nutshell which are utmost necessary for disposal of the petition are as under:

3.1. In respect of financial transaction, accused No.1 used to blackmail the complainant and when he failed to heed to the



illegal demand on 06.10.2025, he filed a police complaint against the complainant herein. Thereafter, complainant had been followed by the accused persons and they used to abuse him repeatedly.

3.2. When the matter stood thus, when complainant was near Ratna Sangama Hotel, accused Nos.1 to 3 came in a car bearing No.KA-25/MC-0163 and intercepted free movement of the complainant by holding his shirt collar and abused him and assaulted him.

3.3. Accused Nos.1 and 3 assaulted him with the iron rod and squeezed his private part and thereafter, he was tied to an electric pole. It is at that juncture, accused Nos.4 and 5 came there and assaulted the complainant with chappal and stick.

3.4. When the mother of the complainant arrived and requested him to release, all the accused persons demanded Rs.5,00,000/- otherwise, complainant would be killed by putting him on fire by pouring the petrol.



3.5. Incident was reported to the Police Sub-Inspector of Murgod Police Station and he came there and rescued the complainant and shifted him to the hospital.

3.6. When he was taking treatment in a Yaragatti Hospital, accused Nos.1 and 2 visited the hospital and tried to take away the life of the complainant and therefore, complainant went to 'S4' hospital and he was taking treatment.

3.7. Complaint came to be registered when he was taking treatment in 'S4' hospital and thereafter, investigation is being carried on.

3.8. Approach made by the petitioner to obtain an order of grant of bail is turned out by the learned Trial Magistrate and thereafter, petitioners are before this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterating the grounds urged in the petition vehemently contended that petitioners are innocent of the offences alleged against them and as retaliation to the case filed by the accused, a false complaint has been filed and sought for grant of anticipatory bail.



5. Per contra, learned High Court Government Pleader for the respondent/State opposes the grant of bail by contending that there are eye witnesses to the incident and in fact he was tied to the electric pole for a period of two hours and was mercilessly beaten by the accused persons which has been witnessed by the villagers and there was threat to the villagers that complainant should not be rescued.

6. He would further contend that it is only after the Police Inspector arrived at the spot, complainant was rescued from the clutches of the accused persons and therefore, the custodial interrogation is utmost necessary and thus, sought for dismissal of the petition.

7. Having heard the parties in detail, this Court perused the material on record meticulously.

8. On perusal of the material on record, it is crystal clear that there was a previous enmity between the complainant and the accused party in view of the fact that accused party had filed a case against the complainant under the provisions of



Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

9. Thereafter, accused party was following the complainant wherever he went and ultimately, he was objected in a car and was assaulted and thereafter, tied to the electric pole.

10. Eye witnesses have witnessed the incident and when the villagers came to rescue, there was threat to them also. Mother of the petitioner wanted to rescue the complainant and at that juncture, there was a demand of Rs.5,00,000/- by the accused party.

11. All these factors when viewed cumulatively, offences alleged against the petitioners are grave enough and custodial interrogation is necessary to annul the truth.

12. Taking note of the fact that the incident has occurred in a broad day light and none of the villagers have come forward to rescue the complainant under the threat of the accused persons, this Court is of the considered opinion that *prima facie* accused/petitioners are not law abiding citizens and they are



required to be apprehended by the police and thereafter, they should be subjected to custodial interrogation to annul the truth.

13. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that no grounds are made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

14. Accordingly, the following:

ORDER

Petition is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(V.SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE

KAV,
CT:CMU
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 19