



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.SRISHANANDA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 105403 OF 2025 (482(CR.PC)/528(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. SRI KEMAPPA S/O DEVAPPA SANGANAL
AGE. 60 YEARS, OCC. LABOURER,
R/O. KALAMALLI TANDA,
TQ. KUSHTAGI, DIST. KOPPAL. PIN 583277.
2. SMT. SHEETAMMA W/O KEMAPPA SANGANAL
AGE. 50 YEARS, OCC. LABOURER,
R/O. KALAMALLI TANDA, TQ. KUSHTAGI,
DIST. KOPPAL. PIN 583277.
3. ASHA D/O KEMAPPA SANGANAL
AGE. 27 YEARS, OCC. LABOURER,
R/O. KALAMALLI TANDA,
TQ. KUSHTAGI, DIST. KOPPAL. PIN 583277.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. D.V. PATTAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA DHARWAD BENCH,
THROUGH TAVARAGERA POLICE STATION,
KOPPAL PIN 583279.
2. SMT. RATNAVVA W/O GOKULA SANGANAL
AGE. 30 YEARS, OCC. LABOURER,
R/O. KALAMALLI TANDA,
TQ. KUSHTAGI, DIST. KOPPAL. PIN 583277

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. KIRTELATA R. PATIL, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. BASAVARAJ N. PATIL, ADVOCATE FOR R2)





THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED U/S 482 OF CR.P.C. (U/S. 528 OF BNSS, 2023) SEEKING TO QUASH THE PROCEEDINGS IN CC NO 416/2020 PENDING BEFORE I ADD CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, KUSHTAGI, KOPPAL AND CONNECTION WITH CRIME NO. 8/2020 REGISTERED BEFORE TAVARAGERA POLICE STATION FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE U/S 498A, 323, 504, 506, 420, 342, 354, 354A, 34 OF IPC 1860 AND U/S 3 AND 4 OF DOWRY PROHIBITION ACT, 1961 SO FAR AS PETITIONERS ARE 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 D.V. Pattar, learned counsel for the petitioners; Smt.Kirtilata R. Patil, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent No.1; and Sri Basavaraj N. Patil, learned counsel for respondent No.2.

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short, 'Cr.P.C.') with the following prayer:

"WHEREFORE, the petitioners/accused Nos.2 to 4 most respectfully prays that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.416/2020 pending before Hon'ble I Addl. Civil Judge and JMF, Kushtagi, Koppal, and connection with Crime



No.08/2020 registered before Tavaragera Police Station for the offence punishable U/S 498A, 323, 504, 506, 420, 342, 354, 354A, 34 OF IPC 1860 And U/S 3 And 4 Of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 So Far As Petitioners Are Concerned, in The Interest Of Justice."

3. The brief facts necessary for disposal of the present petition are as under:

Respondent No.2 filed a complaint with the Rural Police Station, Tavaragera, Kushtagi Taluk, Koppal District, stating that she married accused No.1-Gokul Sanganal, on 19.10.2018 as per Hindu rites and customs.

4. It is her case that from the very beginning of the marriage, she was not treated properly by her husband and the petitioners herein, who are close relatives of accused No.1, namely, his parents, brother, and sister. All of them allegedly joined accused No.1 in subjecting respondent No.2 to mental and physical harassment.

5. She further came to know that accused No.1 had contracted a second marriage with another woman, and a



photograph of the said marriage was forwarded to the brother of respondent No.2.

6. When the harassment and the alleged second marriage were brought to the notice of the elders in December 2019, a reconciliation meeting was held in the thanda. The elders advised accused No.1 to mend his ways. However, accused No.1 failed to adhere to their advice and continued to assault and harass respondent No.2.

7. It is further alleged that the accused demanded additional dowry of Rs.1,00,000/- and a gold chain weighing two tolas.

8. Based on the complaint, the police registered a case in Crime No.08/2020 for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 323, 504, 506, 420, 342, 354, 354A read with Section 34 of the IPC, 1860, and under Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. After conducting a thorough investigation, they filed a charge sheet.

9. Upon receipt of the charge sheet, the jurisdictional Magistrate took cognizance of the offences and



issued process against the accused. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners (accused Nos.2 to 4) have approached this Court.

10. Sri D.V. Pattar, learned counsel for the petitioners, reiterating the grounds urged in the petition, contended that the petitioners, who are accused Nos.2 to 4 in the charge sheet, have no direct or indirect nexus with the alleged incident and that a false case has been foisted against them.

11. He further contended that they were not residing together with accused No.1. Therefore, initiation and continuation of proceedings against them amount to abuse of the process of law. Accordingly, he sought quashing of the proceedings.

12. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.2, as well as Smt.Kirtilata R. Patil, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent No.1, opposed the petition.



13. They submitted that necessary material evidence has been collected during investigation, including statements of witnesses, which *prima facie* disclose the involvement of accused Nos.2 to 4. Therefore, they sought dismissal of the petition.

14. Having heard the arguments of both sides and perused the material on record meticulously, this Court finds that the marriage between respondent No.2 and accused No.1 is not in dispute.

15. Accused Nos.2 and 3 are the parents-in-law of respondent No.2, and accused No.4 is the sister-in-law of respondent No.2.

16. The material collected during investigation and reflected in the charge sheet *prima facie* indicates their involvement in the alleged harassment of respondent No.2. Statement of charge sheet witnesses amply indicate that the alleged harassment.

17. At this stage, it would be premature for this Court to conduct a mini-trial to ascertain whether the



statements recorded by the investigating agency are correct or whether accused Nos.2 to 4 had no nexus with the alleged offences.

18. Accordingly, reserving liberty to the petitioners to urge all available defence before the trial Court, including filing an appropriate application for discharge if no material is found against them, the following order is passed:

ORDER

The petition is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(V.SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE

AC
CT-CMU
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 56