



CNR: KAHC010292672026

NC: 2026:KHC:36750
CRL.A No. 749 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JULY, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 749 OF 2026 (U/S 14(A) (2))

BETWEEN:

MR. PUTTEGOWDA,
S/O LATE KARIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
R/AT MAKAVALLI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI, K.R.PETE TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT- 571 426.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. B KESHAVA MURTHY., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE REP. BY,
SHO, KIKKERI POLICE,
MANDYA DISTRICT.
REP. BY SPP,
HIGH OF KARNATAKA,
BANGALORE - 560 001.
2. MRS. SUNITHA L.C,
W/O MR.RAMESH,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
R/AT MAKAVALLI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
K.R.PETE TALUK,

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



CNR: KAHC010292672026

NC: 2026:KHC:36750
CRL.A No. 749 of 2026

MANDYA DISTRICT - 571 426.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. M. V. ANOOPKUMAT., HCGP FOR R1;
R2 IS SERVED)

THIS CRL.A FILED U/S 14(A)(2) OF SC/ST (POA) ACT BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE APPELLANT/S PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 08.04.2026 PASSED BY THE V ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, MANDYA, IN CRL.MISC.NO.253/2026 AND CONSEQUENTLY ALLOW THE ABOVE APPEAL BY GRANTING ANTICIPATORY BAIL TO THE APPELLANT HEREIN IN CR.NO.44/2026, REGISTERED BY KIKKERI P.S., NAGAMANGALA SUB-DIVISION, MANDYA DISTRICT, FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(1)(za)(c) OF SC/ST (POA) AMENDMENT ACT.

THIS CRIMINAL APPEAL HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON 30.06.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF JUDGMENT, THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH



CNR: KAHC010292672026

NC: 2026:KHC:36750
CRL.A No. 749 of 2026

CAV JUDGMENT

1. The appellant is before this Court seeking anticipatory bail in Crime No.44/2026 being aggrieved by the order dated 08.04.2026 passed in Crl.Misc.No.253/2026 on the file of V Additional District and Sessions Judge, Mandya.

Factual matrix of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 09.03.2026 at about 10.00 a.m., the complainant had been to Siddaramalingeshwara and Lakshmi Devi Temple situated in her village upon the invitation of one Sri. Nagesh S/o Kalingegowda to participate in a pooja programme. When the complainant entered into the temple premises to receive prasadam, the appellant herein approached her, abused her in a filthy language by naming her caste and restrained her from taking prasadam. Further, he made her to go away from the temple premises. The said incident had occurred in public premises in presence of many people gathered near the temple. Hence, the complainant lodged a complaint against the appellant before the respondent – Police. The respondent –



Police registered a case, conducted investigation. The investigation is under progress.

3. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent of the alleged offences. Even on reading the averments of the entire complaint, it would not disclose the commission of offence under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. Such being the fact, bar under Section 18(A) of the Act does not applicable to the case on hand. Therefore, anticipatory bail may be granted.

5. It is further submitted that Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *catena* of judgment held that the averments of the complaint, if it does not disclose *prima-facie* case, the anticipatory bail can be granted under such circumstances. The appellant is aged about 62 years and working as an agriculturist and he will 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 appellant prays to allow the appeal.



CNR: KAHC010292672026

6. *Per Contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent – State vehemently opposed the grant of bail and submits that the ingredients of the offences under Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act are made out in this case. The appellant knowingly that the complainant is belonged to Scheduled Caste, insulted in front of the public and made her to go away from the temple premises. The act committed by the appellant is on the ground that the complainant belonged to Scheduled Caste. Therefore, there is a bar under Section 18(A) of the Act. Therefore, it is not appropriate to grant the relief as prayed for. Making such submissions learned High Court Government Pleader prays to reject the appeal.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and on perusal of the averments of the complaint, the averments of the complaint would indicate that she had been humiliated and degraded in a public place. The legislative intent seems to be clear that every insult or intimidation for humiliation of a person would not amount to an offence under the provision of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes



**NC: 2026:KHC:36750
CRL.A No. 749 of 2026**

(Prevention of Atrocities) Act, unless, of course such insult or intimidation is targeted at the victim because of he/she being a Member of the particular Scheduled Caste or Tribe. No doubt, eradication of caste based insults requires legal, systematic and cultural transformations. It is also important to promote inter-caste bonding, encourage social integration and also it requires abolish stigmatized labor roles.

8. Be that as it may, in the present case the complainant had been humiliated on the ground that she belonged to Scheduled Caste. *Prima-facie*, the test of applicability of Section 18 and 18(A) of the Act gets attracted. Therefore, I am of the opinion that this criminal appeal deserves to be dismissed.

9. Ordered accordingly.

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

NM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 2