



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 05TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 529 OF 2026 (U/S 14(A) (2))

BETWEEN:

KEERTHI RAJ D R
S/O RANGASWAMY,
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
R/A NO. 403,
DODDABIDARAKALLU,
NAGASANDRA,
BENGALURU – 560 073.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. SRIKANTH N V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY PEENYA POLICE STATION,
REPRESENTED BY
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BANGALORE – 560 001.

Digitally
signed by
SUSHMA
LAKSHMI
B S
Location:
High Court
of
Karnataka



2. SMT. VEENA M,
W/O SHASHIKUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
R/A LAKSHMAMMA NILAYA,
NEAR OLD BBMP OFFICE, 1ST CROSS,
DODDABIDARAKALLU,
BENGALURU – 560 073.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY Ms. ASMA KOUSER., ADDL. SPP FOR R1;
R2 – VEENA M, SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS CRL.A FILED U/S 14(A)2) OF SC/ST (POA) ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 26.02.2026 PASSED IN CRL.MISC.NO.744/2026 ON THE FILE OF LXX ADDL. CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND SPL. JUDGE, BENGALURU (CCH-71), AND ENLARGE THE APPELLANT/ ACCUSED NO.2 ON ANTICIPATORY BAIL IN CONNECTION WITH CR.NO.31/2026 REGISTERED FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 76, 115(2) OF BNSS ACT 2023 AND SEC.3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) OF THE PREVENTION OF ATROCITIES AMENDMENT ACT 2015 BY PEENYA P.S. WITH A DIRECTION TO RELEASE THE APPELLANT ON BAIL IN THE EVENT OF HIS ARREST IN THE SAID CRIME.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH



ORAL JUDGMENT

1. This appeal is filed by the appellant/accused No.2 seeking to set aside the order dated 26.02.2026 passed in Crl.Misc.No.744/2026 by the learned LXX Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge and Special Judge, Bengaluru (CCH No.71) and to enlarge him on anticipatory bail in Crime No.31/2026 registered by the respondent - Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 76, 115(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) (Amendment) Act, 2015.

Factual matrix of the case is as under:

2. It is the case of the prosecution in that the respondent No.2 stated in her complaint that, on 15.01.2026, around 8.00 to 9.00 p.m., she along with her son, who is aged about 6 years, had been to witness the functions of Sankramana. On account of the rush of people in the said fair, she went to the first floor of the building belonging to one Mrs. Achamma. Where she was waiting to witness the cattle to



come on the road, on account of the Sankramana festival, it is alleged that the appellant and his mother insulted, assaulted, caused injury (near eye) and threatened her with dire consequences by naming her caste. Due to the said incident, the complainant was traumatized and injured. Later, she took treatment at Nelamangala Government Hospital. On the following day, she lodged a complaint before the respondent - police. The respondent - police registered a case against the appellant and others and are conducting and investigation.

3. Heard Sri.Srikanth N.V., learned counsel for the appellant and Ms. Asma Kouser, learned Addl. Special Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1 - State.

4. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant is that the appellant is innocent of the alleged offences. The complainant was a stranger to the appellant and her caste was not known to the appellant. The incident might have occurred due to the rush on the building where people gathered to witness the cattle race; however, in order to strengthen the case, a false complaint has been lodged against the appellant in order to implicate him in the said case.



5. It is further submitted that the appellant is aged about 25 years and is permanent resident of Doddabidarakallu, Bengaluru. He will abide by the conditions to be imposed in the event of his release on bail. Making such submissions, the learned counsel for the appellant prays to allow the appeal.

6. *Per contra*, learned Addl. Special Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1 – State vehemently submitted that the ingredients of the complaint clearly disclose the commission of the offences relating to the SC & ST Act. When the averments of the complaint *prima facie* indicates the commission of offences in respect of the said caste, anticipatory bail cannot be granted in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, the appeal has to be rejected. Making such submissions, learned Addl. Special Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1 – State prays to dismiss the appeal.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and also on perusal of the averments of the complaint, *prima facie*, the ingredients of the provisions of the SC & ST Act get attracted. Having considered the said aspect, it is not appropriate to grant the relief as prayed for.



8. In the light of the observations made above, I
proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The Criminal Appeal is ***rejected***.

**Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE**

Bss
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 30