



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.SRISHANANDA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.105159 OF 2025 (482(CR.PC)/528(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

SRI RAVIKUMAR S/O VEERANNA KAMBAR
AGE 53 YEARS,
OCC. BILL COLLECTOR PATTANA PANCHAYAT
OFFICE KANAKAGIRI GANGAVATHI
AT MADDIPETA RAICHUR, TQ DIST RAICHUR-584101.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NEELENDRA D. GUNDE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
LOKAYUKTHA POLICE STATION KOPPAL
R/BY THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT BUILDING DHARWAD 580001.
2. SRI SHARANABASAPPA S/O SHANKRAPPA KALAKERI
AGE 59 YEARS, OCC. AGRICULTURE
R/O. 2ND WARD GOUDRA ONI,
KANAKAGIRI TQ KANAKAGIRI 583283 DIST KOPPAL.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ANIL KALE, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
NOTICE SERVED TO R2)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED U/SE. 482 OF CR.P.C. (U/S. 528 OF BNSS, 2023) SEEKING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED A 25/07/2025 AND ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS IN THE ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE KOPPAL (SITTING AT GANGAVATHI) IN SPL.C.(PC) NO-1/2025 THEREBY TAKING COGNIZANCE FOR THE OFFENCES PUNISHABLE U/S. 7(a) OF PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION ACT-1988(AMENDMENT ACT-2018). AND ALLOW THE ABOVE CRIMINAL PETITION AS AGAINST ACCUSED/PETITIONER_IS CONCERNED IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.





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

ORAL ORDER

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

1. Heard Sri.Neelandra Gunde, learned counsel appearing for petitioner and Sri.Anil Kale, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1-Lokayukta.

2. This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with the following prayer:

Wherefore, it is most respectfully submits that the petitioner/accused seeking to quash the order dated 25.07.2025 and all further proceedings in the Addl.District and Sessions Judge, Koppal (sitting at Gangavathi) in Spl.C.(PC) No.1/2025 thereby taking cognizance for the offences punishable under Section 7(a) of Prevention of Corruption Act-1988(Amendment Act-2018) and allow the above Criminal Petition as against accused/petitioner is concerned in the interest of justice.

3. Facts of the case are as under:

3.1. The petitioner, being a First Division Assistant working in Pattan Panchayath, Kanakagiri, was processing the application of the complainant for issuance of Form No.3 in respect of release of the balance sites developed in the land



belonging to the complainant. In that regard, the petitioner said to have demanded illegal gratification. The complainant was not interested in parting away with the said amount and therefore approached the Lokayuktha Police.

4. The Lokayuktha Police, in order to ascertain the veracity of the allegations made against the petitioner by the complainant, sent a voice recorder along with the complainant, and the demand allegedly made by the petitioner was recorded in the voice recorder.

5. Thereafter, an FIR came to be registered and was sent to the jurisdictional Special Judge in a sealed cover. The Investigation Agency made two attempts to trap the petitioner, one on 14.06.2023 and again on 07.07.2023. On both occasions, the trap failed.

6. Thereafter, only on the basis of the alleged demand made by the accused, which was recorded in the voice recorder, the police, after thoroughly investigating the matter, filed the charge sheet for the offence punishable under Section 7(a) read with Section 13(1)(a) and Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'). The learned



Special Judge has taken cognizance of the aforesaid offence and is proceeding with the matter.

7. The petitioner questioned the validity of issuance of process, contending that solely on the basis of the conversation allegedly recorded on the voice recorder, petitioner cannot be proceeded with the pending trial and sought for quashing of pending proceedings.

8. Per contra, Sri.Anil Kale, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1 supports the issuance of process, submitting that the *prima facie* materials collected by the Investigation Agency depict the commission of the offence punishable under Section 7(a) of the Act and therefore, sought for dismissal of the petition.

9. Having heard the arguments of both sides, this Court perused the material on record meticulously.

10. On such perusal of the material on record, it is noted that work of the complainant was pending with the accused in the Patan Panchayath Office at Kanakagiri.

11. According to the prosecution, there was a demand of illegal gratification, which is flatly denied by the petitioner herein.



12. Whether at all the conversation recorded in the voice recorder makes out all ingredients to attract the offence under Section 7(a) of the Act or not, cannot be decided by this Court at this stage, as it would amount to holding a mini trial.

13. It is for the trial Court to conduct a full-fledged trial and thereafter arrive at a proper finding. Therefore, it is too premature for this Court to form an opinion that the petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him and to quash the pending proceedings at this stage.

14. Accordingly, the following order:

ORDER

- (i) The petition is ***dismissed***.
- (ii) All defences available to the petitioner are kept open to be urged in the pending trial in accordance with law.

**Sd/-
(V.SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE**