



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF MAY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 11628 OF 2025

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

BETWEEN:

SRI.VINAY REDDY V
S/O VENKATEREDDY,
AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS,
R/AT BESIDE OM SHAKTI TEMPLE,
RUPENA AGRAHARA, N G R LAYOUT,
16TH CROSS, NEAR REDDY SCHOOL,
BENGALURU – 560 068.
PERMANENT RESIDENT OF
GUNDLAHALLI, MANCHENAHALLI HOBLI,
GOUDIBIDANUR TALUK,
CHIKKABALLAPUR DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SUNIL KUMAR S, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY AMRUTHAHALLI PS



BENGALURU CITY,
REPRESENTED BY LD.
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BENGALURU – 560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. VIJAYAKUMAR MAJAGE, SPP-II)

THIS CRL.RP FILED U/S 439 OF THE CR.P.C, 1973
PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON REGULAR BAIL IN
CR.NO.175/2024 REGISTERED BY THE BOMMANAHALLI P.S.,
NOW PENDING BEFORE THE LEARNED LVI ADDL. CITY CIVIL
AND SESSIONS JUDGE AT BENGALURU (CCH-57) IN
S.C.NO.1492/2023 FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S 302,120-B,
109,201 R/W SEC.34 OF IPC.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON
24.03.2026 AND COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF
ORDER, THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING, THIS DAY, THE
COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S RACHAIAH



CAV ORDER

1. This criminal petition is filed by the petitioner who is arrayed as accused No.3 seeking regular bail in Crime No.186/2023 on the file of the respondent – Police for the offences punishable under Section 302, 120(b), 109, 201, read with 34 of I.P.C., and Section 25(1)(b) of Arms Act,1959.

Factual matrix of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant is the Senior Manager working at Arionics Pvt. Ltd., and one Mr. Panindra Subramanyam who was working as the Managing Director and one Mr. Vinay who was working as the Chief Executive Officer of Arionics Pvt. Ltd. Prior to this Mr. Panindra Subramanyam and Mr. Vinay were working with accused No.4 as Chief Executive Officer and Human Resource Manager respectively. It is alleged that both Panindra Subramanyam and Vinay left the job of accused No.4 and started an independent company. Therefore, accused No.4 had developed enmity with the deceased. Accordingly, accused No.4 approached other accused and conspired to eliminate the deceased. In



furtherance of their common intention, accused Nos. 1 to 3 entered into the Company of the deceased and assaulted indiscriminately and committed the murder of Panindra Subramanyam and Vinay Kumar. Accused No.3 after committing murder in order to conceal the incident, removed his T-shirt and threw the said T-shirt and other materials near Lulu Mall situated at Rajajinagar and thereafter, all of them had escaped from the scene of occurrence. Initially, a complaint came to be registered by the Senior Sales Manager against accused Nos.1, 2 and 3 who are unknown persons and accused No.4 is Arun Kumar. Based on the said complaint, the respondent Police have registered a case and conducted investigation. After completion of investigation, the charge sheet was submitted.

3. Heard Sri. Sunil Kumar S., learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri.Vijay Kumar Majage, learned Special Public Prosecutor – II for respondent.

4. The submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences. The name of the accused has not been mentioned in



the FIR and the petitioner is unknown person. However, identification parade has not been conducted to identify the petitioner. The identification parade has not been conducted and he has been identified only through CCTV, that cannot be considered as one of the essential modes of identification.

5. It is further submitted that 126 persons are cited as witnesses. Under such circumstances, it would be very difficult to complete the trial at the earliest. Therefore, the petition may be allowed and the petitioner may be enlarged on bail by imposing suitable conditions. The petitioner 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.

6. Per Contra, learned State Public Prosecutor-II for respondent-State vehemently submitted that it is a heinous offence committed by accused Nos.1 to 3. His presence has been noticed through CCTV footages that have been collected by the Investigating Agency. As per the said footages, the Petitioner was very much present and he has actively participated in the murder of the deceased. Such being the



fact, it cannot be said that he was not at all present at the time of committing the murder.

7. It is further submitted that there are 6 eyewitnesses to the incident. A brutal murder had taken place for gain. Accused Nos.1 to 3 are the supari killers. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail, certainly serious impact would be caused to the society at large. Therefore, it is not appropriate to grant bail. Making such submissions learned Special Public Prosecutor – II prays to reject the petition.

8. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the averments of the charge-sheet which would indicate that the petitioner is arrayed as accused No.3. It is alleged that he along with other two accused persons after obtaining the supari to kill the deceased had entered into the Company by name "Arionics Pvt. Ltd.," and committed murder of Panindra Subramanyam and Vinay Kumar. The charge sheet would indicate that there are eyewitnesses to the incident and it is a gruesome murder committed by the petitioner and others. The manner in which the petitioner and others had committed murder, really affects the society at-



large. In the interest of the eyewitnesses and also in order to protect them to depose before the Court, without fear or favour, it is appropriate to reject the bail. Contract killing or supari killing is required to be regulated in order to give a strong message to the society that the Courts are more vigilant in respect of such criminal activities.

9. In the light of the observations made above, it is appropriate to reject the bail.

10. Ordered, accordingly.

Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE

NM

List No.: 1 Sl No.: 2