



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2025
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.RACHAIAH
CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 105259 OF 2025
(439(Cr.PC)/483(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. RAVI NARINAL
S/O CHATRAMMA,
AGE. 24 YEARS,
OCC. STUDENT,
R/O. WARD NO-3,
BEHIND TAYAMMA TEMPLE,
TAWARAGERA- 583279
TQ. KUSHTAGI, DIST. KOPPAL.
2. SRI. PRADEEP NARINAL
S/O DURUGESH NARINAL,
AGE. 23 YEARS,
OCCP. LABOURER,
R/O. WARD NO-3,
HARIJAN COLONY,
TAWARAGERA,
TQ. KUSHTAGI- 583279,
DIST. KOPPAL.
3. SRI. MANJUNATH NARINAL
S/O CHANDRAPPA NARINAL,
AGE. 21 YEARS, OCCP. LABOURER,
R/O. WARD NO- 3,

Digitally signed
by
SREEDHARAN
BANGALORE
SUSHMA
LAKSHMI
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



HARIJAN COLONY,
TAWARAGERA- 583279,
TQ. KUSHTAGI, DIST. KOPPAL.

4. SRI. NAGARAJ NARINAL
S/O. BASAPPA @ BASAVARAJ,
AGE. 22 YEARS, OCCP. LABOURER
R/O. BASAVANNA CAMP
TAWARAGERA- 583279,
TQ. KUSHTAGI, DIST. KOPPAL.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. NEELENDRA D. GUNDE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY TAVAREGERA P.S.
R/BY THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
DHARWAD- 580001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. PRAVEENA Y. DEVARADDIYAVARA, ADVOCATE)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED U/S. 439 OF CR.P.C. (U/S. 483 OF BNSS, 2023) SEEKING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED NOS. 1 TO 4 REGULAR BAIL IN CRIME NO.78/2025 OF TAVAREGERA PS, REGISTERED FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/SEC. 103(1), 61(1), 49, 3(5) OF BNS, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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



ORAL ORDER

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.RACHAIAH)

1. The petitioners / accused Nos.1 to 4 are before this Court seeking for grant of regular bail in Crime No.78/2025 of respondent-police for the offences under Sections 103, 61(1), 49, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

Brief facts of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that, the families of the complainant and the accused were having strained relationship in the background of property dispute. There were several cases lodged against each other in Tavaregera Police Station.

3. It is stated that, accused No.1 Sri Ravi Narinal was proclaiming that he would kill someone in the family of the complainant. It is further stated that, on 31.05.2025, at about 10 p.m., accused Nos.1 to 4, in furtherance of their common intention, stated to have attacked Channappa, the brother of the complainant with choppers and long choppers and committed his murder near Sindhanoor Circle, Tavaregera. At about 02.00 a.m. on 01.06.2025, the complainant Durgappa s/o Hussainappa Narinal / the brother of the deceased, lodged a written complaint by naming four accused.



4. Based on the said complaint, the respondent - police have registered a case and conducted investigation. During investigation, the involvement of other accused was also noticed and their names also found in the charge sheet. There are 11 accused stated to have been involved in the said murder. The present petitioners are arraigned as accused Nos. 1 to 4. They are seeking for regular bail.

5. Heard Sri Neelendra D. Gunde, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Praveena Y. Devaraddiyavara, learned High Court Government Pleader for the respondent - State.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent of the alleged offences. They have been falsely implicated in this case on account of enmity existing between the family of the complainant and accused.

7. It is further submitted that, the overt-act attributed against the petitioners are baseless and false. The alleged eyewitnesses are stated to have seen the incident. However, the recovery of the weapons was not effected as per the say of the eyewitnesses. Hence, the petitioners may be enlarged on bail by imposing suitable conditions. The petitioners are the members of the



same family. They will abide the conditions imposed by this Court in the event of their release on bail. Making such submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners prays to allow the petition.

8. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader vehemently submitted that the petitioners were having a grudge / enmity with the family of the complainant relating to civil dispute. There are several eyewitnesses stated to have seen the incident. If the petitioners are enlarged on bail, certainly, it would cause irreparable injury to the family of the complainant and also in the interest of eyewitnesses. Hence, it is not appropriate to grant them bail. Making such submissions, learned High Court Government Pleader prays to reject the petition.

9. Having heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and on perusal of the averments of the charge sheet, it appears from the record that, as per the version of eyewitnesses, accused Nos.1, 3 and 4 and also a child-in-conflict of law had assaulted the deceased and committed his murder. No doubt, *prima facie*, it appears that, it is a gruesome murder, which had taken place in front of a bakery near Sindhanoor Circle during daytime and several eyewitnesses have witnessed the said incident.



10. However, on reading the entire charge sheet, it does not disclose the overt-act of the accused No.2. Having considered the same, I am of the considered opinion that, the petitioner No.2 / accused No.2 may be enlarged on bail, on imposing suitable conditions, that would take care of the apprehension of the prosecution.

11. Hence, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

(i) The Criminal Petition is *allowed-in-part*.

(ii) The petitioner No.2 / accused No.2 is ordered to be enlarged on bail in Crime No.78/2025 of respondent-police for the offences stated *supra*, on executing personal bond in a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs only) with two sureties for the likesum to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

(iii) The petitioner No.2 / accused No.2 shall not threaten or tamper the prosecution witnesses nor hamper the proceedings of the Court.



(iv) The petitioner No.2 / accused No.2 shall appear before the Trial Court on all hearing dates without fail.

(vi) The petitioner No.2 / accused No.2 shall not involve in any criminal cases / offences till disposal of the case.

(vii) The petitioner No.2 / accused No.2 shall not leave the jurisdiction of the Court till disposal of the case.

(viii) In case, if the petitioner No.2 / accused No.2 violates any of the bail conditions as stated above, liberty is reserved to the prosecution to file necessary application for cancellation of bail.

(ix) As regards the other petitioners are concerned, the Criminal Petition stands *rejected*.

Sd/-
(S.RACHAIAH)
JUDGE