HC-KAR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF MAY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 7425 OF 2026
[(482(Cr.PC) / 528(BNSS)]

BETWEEN:

SRI. C. RAMACHANDRA NAIDU
S/O LATE MUNISWAMI NAIDU,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
R/AT NO.329, CQAL/CIL LAYOUT,
SAHAKARANAGARA, BENGALURU-560092.

ALSO AT NO.001, VASANTHAPURAM,
PASUMANDA, CHITOOR,
ANDHRA PRADESH-517132.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VINAYAKA P. V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

Digitally signed by HEMALATHA J
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY KODIGEHALLI POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU CITY,
REPRESENTED BY THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT COMPLEX,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560001.

2. SRI. MANJUNATH A. S.
S/O A. C. SHIVANNA,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
A.D.L.R., YELAHANKA TALUKA,
BENGALURU,

R/AT NO.174, BV RAMAN NAGAR,
HUNSMARANAHALLI
BENGALURU-562157.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. M.R. PATIL, HCGP FOR R1;
V/O DATED 29.05.2026, NOTICE TO R2 IS D/W)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S. 482 OF CR.PC (FILED U/S. 528 BNSS) PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR IN CRIME NO.181/2026 AND COMPLIANT REGISTERED BY KODIGEHALLI POLICE STATION, BENGALURU CITY FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SEC. 192(A) OF THE KARNATAKA LAND REVENUE ACT, 1964 AND SEC.318(2), 336(3), 340(2) OF BNS 2023, PRESENTLY PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE HON'BLE 7TH ACJM COURT, BENGALURU CITY IN SO FAR AS THE PRESENT PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.5 IS CONCERNED APPENDED AT ANNEXURE A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner is therefore before the Court seeking quashing the FIR registered in Crime No.181/2026 registered by the respondent No.1 for offences punishable under Sections 192(A) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act

and under Sections 318(2), 336(3) and 340(2) of BNS, 2023.

2. It appears that respondent No.2 informed the respondent No.1 on 27.04.2026 that one Mr. Balaram N., had sought for bifurcation of Sy.No.13/1, Kothihosahalli Village, Yelahanka Hobli, Yelahanka Taluk and assignment of new survey number. Consequently, a licensed surveyor surveyed the property and recommended for reassignment of Sy.No.13/3. It was thereafter found that land in Sy.Nos.13/1 and 13/2 was owned and possessed by Mr. Y.R. Janardhan Rao and Mr. P.R. Prasad Rao, who had formed a layout of residential sites after obtaining appropriate permission from the Bengaluru Development Authority and they had also relinquished civic amenity sites and other amenities in favour of BDA. Following this, a civic amenity site was allotted to Sahakar Nagar Club. It was contented that when a spot inspection was made, it was found that the land which was bifurcated was used for a playground and there were residential buildings in it.

Therefore, he alleged that Mr. Balaram N., as well as licensed surveyor had created fraudulent documents and therefore requested respondent No.1 to initiate action against the concerned.

3. The petitioner is before this Court contending that he is not related to Mr. Balaram N., or to the property in question and that he is unnecessarily being subjected to investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterated the above contentions and submitted that, the petitioner is in no way involved in the offences alleged against Mr. Balaram N., and the licensed surveyor. He also contended that the petitioner is not interested in the land in Sy.No.13/3 and that he is unnecessarily involved in the case on the ground that he is an associate of Mr. Balaram N. Therefore, he prays that the impugned FIR as regards the petitioner be quashed.

5. Per contra, learned High Court Government Pleader for the respondent No.1 submits that the role of the petitioner is yet to be ascertained and hence, the contention of the petitioner that he is not related to Mr. Balaram N. or to the property in question, cannot be assumed. Therefore, he prays that the petition be dismissed so that the investigation could progress in the case.

6. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent No.1.

7. A perusal of the information furnished by respondent No.2 to the respondent No.1 does not disclose any involvement of the petitioner. However, the role of the petitioner is yet to be ascertained and this can happen only after a detailed investigation. The petitioner cannot evade from the clutches of law by contending that he is not related to Mr. Balaram N., or the property in question. If the respondent No.1 is satisfied that the petitioner is not

involved in any manner, respondent No.1 would surely drop the investigation against the petitioner. Therefore, there is no need to interfere with the FIR registered against Mr. Balaram N., and the licensed surveyor.

8. It is open for the respondent No.1 to investigate the offences and if it is found that the petitioner is not involved in any manner, the respondent No.1 shall take steps to exonerate the petitioner.

9. With the above observations, the Criminal Petition is ***disposed of.***

Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE

KLV
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 7