



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 16154 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRINIVAS @ JADU SEENA
S/O LATE NAGARAJU,
AGED 30 YEARS,
R/AT NO.11, 1ST CROSS,
INDIRANAGAR, BIDADI,
RAMANAGARA-562 109

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HARI PRASAD N., ADVOCATE)

AND:

STATE BY
JNANABHARATHI POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU CITY.
REPRESENTED BY
SPECIAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. JAGADEESHA B.N., ADDL. SPP)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 439 CR.P.C (U/S 483 BNSS)
PRAYING TO ENLARGE HIM ON BAIL IN CRIME NO.263/2024
(S.C.NO.1447/2025) FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER
SECTION 120(B), 302, 201 READ WITH 34 OF IPC, ON THE
FILE OF JNANABHARATHI POLICE STATION, PENDING ON THE
FILE OF VI ADDITIONAL CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE AT
BENGALURU.



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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ

ORAL ORDER

This is the third successive bail petition preferred by the petitioner, seeking to enlarge him on bail in Crime No.263/2024 of Jnanabharathi Police Station, Bengaluru, wherein, charge sheet is filed for the offence punishable under Section 120B, 302, 201 r/w 34 of IPC and the case is pending in SC No.1447/2025 before the Sessions Court, Bengaluru.

2. This Court vide order dated 24.02.2025, considering the nature and gravity of the offence, dismissed Crl.P. No.305/2025. Further, Crl.P. No.12205/2025 preferred by the petitioner was disposed of vide order dated 10.11.2025, reserving liberty to the petitioner to move the Sessions Court afresh.



3. The petitioner has approached the Sessions Court subsequent to disposal of the above petition, and his bail application has been rejected by the LXIV Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge (CCH-65) at Bengaluru vide order dated 18.11.2025.

4. It is the contention of the learned counsel that the Petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the case. He was arrested on 17.06.2024, whereas the statements of the alleged eyewitnesses are recorded on 19.06.2024. In their statements, the eyewitnesses have not named the petitioner. Accused was also not shown to them. Hence, it is contended that the petitioner is entitled for bail, as he is in custody for one and a half year.

5. Learned Additional SPP contended that CW2 to CW4 are the eye witnesses and there are CCTV footages of the incident and therefore, there is a prima facie case against the petitioner. He further contented that the petitioner has criminal antecedents, wherein he is involved



in 10 more cases, which he has suppressed while filing the petition.

6. Relying on a judgment of the Apex Court in the case of ***Munnesh v. State of Uttar Pradesh*** reported in ***2025 SCC Online SC 1319***, learned Additional SPP contended that if the antecedents or the previous involvement of an accused is not disclosed, that itself could be considered as a ground for dismissal of the petition.

7. This Court while disposing of Crl.P.No.305/2025 has taken into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case. CWs.2 to 4 are the eyewitnesses to the incident. Their statements reveal that accused armed with a chopper came in a vehicle and assaulted the deceased indiscriminately, consequent to which he succumbed to the injuries. As per post mortem report there are 20 injuries noticed on the dead body.



8. Learned Additional SPP submits that the blood stained clothes are recovered from the petitioner and even the blood stained chopper has been recovered in this case.

9. In view of the nature and gravity of the offence, material on record and criminal antecedents, petitioner is not entitled for bail. There are no changed circumstances made out to once again consider the prayer for bail.

10. Petitioner is at liberty to move the Sessions Court for bail after examination of CWs.2 to 4.

Petition is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(MOHAMMAD NAWAZ)
JUDGE