



CNR: KAHC010495182019

NC: 2026:KHC:49397
CRL.P No. 7917 of 2019

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.7917 OF 2019

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. A N KRISHNAPPA
S./O LATE NANJUNDAPPA
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
R/AT NO.540/2, MRF BLDG.
MYSORE MAIN ROAD
KENGERRI
BANGALORE-560060
2. SRI D MAHADEVAIAH @ MAHADEVA
S/O LATE DASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT CHANNASANDRA VILLAGE
UTTARAHALLI HOBLI
BANGALORE-560098

Digitally signed
by DEVIKA M
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. RADHIKA K, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. THIMMEGOWDA N, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
RAJARAJESHWARINAGAR POLICE STATION
KENGERRI GATE SUB DIVISION
BANGALORE CITY
REP BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BANGALORE-560001



NC: 2026:KHC:49397
CRL.P No. 7917 of 2019

CNR: KAHC010495182019

2. SRI MEGHARAJA RAO M
S/O LATE N TULAJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS
R/AT NO.202, SKANDA SHREE-06
SLV LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560039

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI SUHAS GOWDA M, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SRI K S RAGHURAM, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482 OF CR.P.C PRAYING TO
QUASH THE FIR IN CRIME NO.142/2019 REGISTERED BY THE
1ST RESPONDENT POLICE I.E., RAJARAJESHWARI NAGAR
POLICE AND ETC.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

This matter is listed for admission. Heard the learned
counsel appearing for the respective parties.

2. The relief sought in this petition invoking Section
482 of Cr.P.C is to quash the FIR registered in Cr.No.142/2019
for the offences punishable under Sections 384, 447, 341, 506
read with Section 34 of IPC.



CNR: KAHC010495182019

3. Having perused the contents of the complaint dated 17.08.2019, it discloses that a specific allegation is made that on 02.08.2019 at 10.30 a.m. the accused/petitioners came near the site. When the complainant was cleaning the site, accused persons claimed that the land belongs to them and demanded an amount of Rs.50,00,000/- and also caused the life threat. Once again, on 12.08.2019 at 04.30 p.m. when the complainant went near the site, again accused persons came and caused the life threat. Being afraid of the same, complainant left the place and lodged the complaint and for delay in lodging the complaint also stated the same in the complaint. The police have registered the case based on the complaint dated 17.08.2019 and invoked the offences punishable under Sections 384, 447, 341, 506 read with Section 34 of IPC.

4. While exercising the power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, the Court has to take note that whether the contents of the complaint disclosed that the offences are committed or not. If the offences are prima facie discloses in the contents of the complaint, the Court should not venture to stay the further



investigation and also should not come in the way of investigating the matter. The law is settled to that effect is concerned. The Court has to only see that whether contents of the complaint discloses invoking of ingredients of the offences which have been invoked.

5. Having considered the contents of the complaint, it discloses that the ingredients of the offences under Sections 384, 447, 506, 341 appears to be rightly invoked. The very contention of the counsel for the petitioners is that there was a civil dispute between the parties and suit was also filed and the same came to be decreed. But the same cannot come in the way in proceeding against the petitioners and only the IO has to examine the allegations and if allegations are not proved, then the IO is going to file a B-report. Hence, No ground is made ought to stall the investigation when the complaint discloses the ingredients of the offences which have been involved.

6. The counsel appearing for the State also would submit that the specific date and time is also mentioned regarding causing of threat as well as demanding money and it



NC: 2026:KHC:49397
CRL.P No. 7917 of 2019

CNR: KAHC010495182019

is a case of extortion and matter has to be investigated. Hence, there is a force in the contention of the counsel appearing for the State. Hence, no ground is made out to quash the FIR.

7. In view of the discussions made above, I pass the following:

ORDER

The petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(H.P.SANDESH)
JUDGE

SN