



CNR: KAHC010104132022

NC: 2026:KHC:49460
CRL.P No. 2069 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 2069 OF 2022 (482(Cr.PC) /
528(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

RAVIRAJ @ RAVI
S/O NARAYANA RAO,
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
R/AT NO.64,
ABOVE RAKSHA DIAGNOSTIC,
SAINT, 2ND FLOOR, 2ND MAIN ROAD,
NAGAPPA BLOCK,
NEAR SRIRAMPURA METRO STATION,
DEVAIAH PARK,
SRIRAMPURA,
BENGALURU - 560 021.

...PETITIONER

Digitally signed
by DEVIKA M
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

(BY SRI. MOHAN KUMARA D., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SHIVAJINAGAR POLICE STATION,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT COMPLEX,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. SHAILA K R
D/O RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,
R/AT NO.8, MOTAPPA BUILDING,



NC: 2026:KHC:49460
CRL.P No. 2069 of 2022

CNR: KAHC010104132022

BEHIND SHIVA TEMPLE,
MANGAMMANA PALYA,
BENGALURU - 560 102.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. M. DIWAKAR MADDUR, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. SURESH M CHARAMAGOL, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482 OF CR.P.C BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING TO A)QUASH THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN C.C NO.53067/2020 FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTION 341, 417, 420 AND 506 OF INDIAN PENAL CODE PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE LEARNED XXIX ADDL. CHIEF METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE AT MAYOHALL, BENGALURU CITY. B)CALL FOR THE RELEVANT RECORDS IN C.C NO.53067/2020 PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE LEARNED XXIX ADDL. CHIEF METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE AT MAYOHALL, BENGALURU CITY.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH

ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri Mohan Kumara D., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Sri M.Diwakar Maddur, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent No.1 and Sri Suresh M. Charamagol, learned counsel for respondent No.2.

2. This petition is filed praying this Court to quash the entire proceedings in C.C.No.53067/2020 for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 417, 420 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, pending on the file of the learned XXIX



Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at Mayohall, Bengaluru City.

3. There is a specific allegation in the complaint that CW.1 had made an allegation that the petitioner had promised to marry her and that both of them were in love with each other and consequent upon their love, an engagement was also performed. Subsequently, he did not come forward to marry her and when the complainant insisted upon the same, he caused a life threat.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there is no dispute that there was an engagement between the petitioner and the complainant. However, the same, by itself, would not attract the offences under Sections 417 and 420 of IPC. The learned counsel would also submit that insofar as the offence under Section 506 of IPC is concerned, the necessary ingredients of the said offence are not made out. Hence, the continuation of the criminal proceedings against the petitioner is nothing but an abuse of the process of law.



5. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent-complainant and also the learned counsel appearing for the State would oppose entertaining the petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., in view of the allegations made in the complaint and also the charge sheet and the witnesses who have been examined during the course of investigation, their statements to be tested during the course of trial.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and also the learned counsel appearing for the respondents, there is a specific allegation in the complaint and the police have also investigated the matter and filed the charge sheet, citing CWs.4 to 11 as eyewitnesses to the engagement ceremony. In the complaint, specifically, CW.1 has made an allegation that the petitioner had promised to marry her and both of them were fell in love with each other and consequent upon their love, an engagement was also performed. Subsequently, he did not come forward to marry her and when the complainant insisted upon the same, he caused a life threat. When such allegations are made in the complaint as well as in the statement of the complainant and other



CNR: KAHC010104132022

NC: 2026:KHC:49460
CRL.P No. 2069 of 2022

witnesses, the same is a matter of trial. This Court cannot consider such disputed questions of fact at the stage of consideration of a petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. and the same requires to be tested during the course of trial. Hence, I do not find any grounds to exercise the power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. and, hence, the petition is ***dismissed***.

The observations made by this Court shall not influence the Trial Court while considering the matter on merits.

Sd/-
(H.P.SANDESH)
JUDGE

AM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 41