



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF MAY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 2577 OF 2026

(439(Cr.PC)/483(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

MR. AMITH CHOUHARI @ MIRINDA,

S/O. SOUBIR SINGH,

AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,

R/AT NO.9/9, SHASTRI NAGAR,

MEERUT, UTTAR PRADESH.

PIN CODE – 250 004.

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. RENY SEBASTIAN., ADVOCATE)

AND:

STATE OF KARNATAKA

BY SHESHADRIPURAM POLICE STATION,

REPRESENTED BY THE

STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,



HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BENGALURU – 560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. CHANNAPPA ERAPPA., HCGP)

THIS CRL.P FILED U/S 439 CR.P.C (U/S 483 BNSS) BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON BAIL IN SC.NO.1621/2025 ARISING OUT OF CR.NO.123/2025 OF SHESHADRIPURAM P.S., FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 351(4), 308(3), 61(2), 3(5), 238 OF BNS, 2023, U/S 3 AND 25(1B)(A) OF INDIAN ARMS ACT, PENDING BEFORE THE LXVII ADDL. CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE (CCH-68) AT BENGALURU.

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON 29.04.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF JUDGMENT, THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH



CAV ORDER

1. The petitioner/accused No.2 is before this Court seeking grant of regular bail in S.C. No.1621/2025 pending on the file of LXVII Addl. City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru, arising out of Crime No.123/2025 registered by the respondent – Police, for the offences punishable under Sections 351(4), 308(3), 61(2), 238 r/w 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and sections 3, 25(1B)(A) of Indian Arms Act, 1959 (for short, 'the Act').

Brief facts of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant was doing plywood business in the name of 'Vishal Plywoods'. On 08.07.2025 at about 8.55 p.m., it is alleged that his father had received a WhatsApp call. The person who called through WhatsApp introduced himself as 'Lawrence Bishnoi' and he demanded a ransom of Rs.1,00,00,000/- (Rupees One Crore only) from his father. It is further alleged that, if the said amount is not paid, the complainant would be kidnapped. Immediately, the father of the complainant disconnected the phone call.



3. On the same day, at about 8.56 p.m., once again his father had received a call from the same number and the person who called his father demanded amount of Rs.1,00,00,000/- again. Being aggrieved by the said extortion, the complainant being a son of the father who received the threat call lodged a complaint before the respondent police.
4. Based on the said complaint, the respondent police registered a case in Cr.No.123/2025 against the petitioner and conducted investigation. After completion of investigation, the charge sheet was submitted.
5. Heard Smt. Reny Sebastian, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Channappa Erappa, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State.
6. It is the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences and he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner was not named in the FIR or in the original complaint. Implication of accused No.2 is only during investigation



which is yet to be proved during trial. Moreover, there are no eyewitnesses to the alleged threatening calls.

7. It is further submitted that call records (CDR) are not sufficient to hold that the petitioner had called the father of the complainant, unless voice samples are sent to the FSL for identification.
8. It is further submitted that the charge sheet has already been filed and the petitioner is not required for any interrogation. Now, he has been in incarceration since 12.07.2025. Therefore, he may be enlarged on bail by imposing suitable conditions. He would abide by the conditions to be imposed by this Court in the event of his release on bail. Making such submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner prays to allow the petition.
9. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State vehemently submitted that the petitioner and others were involved in a ransom case. They were demanding Rs.1,00,00,000/- from the father



of the complainant by stating that they belonged to the gangster, by name Lawrence Bishnoi.

10. The petitioner and other accused were having pistol and live magazine to threaten the father of the complainant. Since, they had involved in a heinous offence like extortion, it is not appropriate to grant him bail. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail, there may be chances of threatening the prosecution witnesses. Making such submissions, learned HCGP prays to reject the petition.
11. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and on perusal of the averments of the charge sheet, it appears from the record that the complainant filed a complaint stating that his father was threatened to give Rs.1,00,00,000/- as ransom. If he fails to give the said amount, the complainant would be kidnapped. The complainant being the son of person who received the phone call, on behalf of his father, lodged a complaint.
12. It appears that the Investigating Officer had collected all the materials relating to the case and submitted the charge sheet. On going through the contents of the



charge sheet, the gravity of the offence can be seen.
Having considered the gravity and also the nature of the
offences, it is not appropriate to grant him bail.

13. Hence, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The Criminal Petition stands ***rejected.***

Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE

JS/-