



CNR: KAHC010528162026

NC: 2026:KHC:47264
CRL.A No. 1312 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 31ST DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1312 OF 2026 (U/S 14(A) (2))

BETWEEN:

1. ANJAN KUMAR H. R.,
S/O. RAMCHANDRA H,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.39/A,
1ST FLOOR, 5TH CROSS,
BEHIND ARAVINDA ELECTRICALS,
M. S. LAYOUT, CHANNAYAKANAPALYA,
BENGALURU NORTH,
BENGALURU - 560 073.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. PRABHAKARA T. C., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY MADANAYAKANAHALLI
POLICE STATION.
REP. BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. MANOJ D. L,
S/O. LAKSHMANNA,



CNR: KAHC010528162026

NC: 2026:KHC:47264
CRL.A No. 1312 of 2026

AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
RESIDING AT
HEGGADADEVANAPURA VILLAGE,
MAKALI, ALURU ROAD,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,
BENGALURU - 562 162.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. S. JAVEED., HCGP FOR R1;

SRI. H. P. HONAKHANDE., ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRL.A IS FILED U/S 14(A)(2) OF SC/ST (POA) ACT
BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE APPELLANT/S PRAYING TO
ENLARGE THE APPELLANT ON BAIL IN CR.NO.628/2026,
REGISTERED BY MADANAYAKANAHALLI P.S., FOR THE
OFFENCES P/U/S 115(2), 118(1), 352, 351(2), 351(3), 74 OF
BNS, U/S 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(1)(w), 3(2)(va) OF SC/ST (POA)
ACT, 1989 AND ETC., PENDING BEFORE THE II ADDL.
DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, BENGALURU RURAL
DISTRICT, AT BENGALURU AND ALSO DIRECT THE
RESPONDENT NO.1 POLICE TO RELEASE THE APPELLANT ON
BAIL IN THE EVENT OF HIS ARREST,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH



CNR: KAHC010528162026

NC: 2026:KHC:47264
CRL.A No. 1312 of 2026

ORAL JUDGMENT

1. This appeal is filed by the appellant/accused seeking to enlarge him on bail in Cr.No.628/2026 of respondent police pending on the file of learned II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 352, 351(2), 351(3), 74 of BNS,2023 and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(1)(w), 3(2)(v-a) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, 'SC/ST (POA)' Act).

Factual matrix of the case is as under:

2. It is the case of the prosecution that the complaint came to be registered by one Mr. Manoj D.L., son of Laxman, stating that he was working as an Executive in the Paytm Company and he is residing along with his wife and children at Nelagadaranahalli. The appellant came in contact with the complainant and was maintaining a restaurant at Heggadedevanapura. One day, the appellant requested the complainant to lend him a loan.



CNR: KAHC010528162026

Even though the complainant tried to secure the loan for him, he could not do so. Later, the complainant requested a loan of Rs.45,000/- from the accused. The accused arranged the loan and paid the same to the complainant. When the accused demanded repayment, the complainant paid Rs.15,000/- and requested time to pay the balance. On 23.03.2026, the accused called the complainant over the phone, but the complainant did not receive the call. Therefore, the accused trespassed into the house of the complainant, abused and assaulted him by naming the caste of the complainant. Hence, the complaint.

3. Based on the said complaint, the respondent – Police registered a case, conducted investigation and submitted the charge sheet.
4. Heard Sri. Prabhakara T.C., learned counsel for the appellant, Sri. S. Javeed, learned HCGP for respondent No.1 – State and Sri. H.P. Hanakhande, learned counsel for respondent No.2.



CNR: KAHC010528162026

5. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant has been implicated in a false case. In fact, the appellant had lent an amount of Rs.45,000/- to the complainant, but the complainant did not repay the same. Therefore, there was an altercation between the complainant and the appellant, during which some words were exchanged between them. However, taking advantage of the fact that he belongs to a Scheduled Caste, the complainant made baseless allegations against the appellant.
6. It is further submitted that the appellant is running a Restaurant and is the sole earning member of his family. If he is arrested by the respondent-police, it would cause severe harm to his reputation. Therefore, he may be enlarged on bail by imposing suitable conditions. He will abide the conditions imposed by this Court in the event of his arrest. Making such submissions, the learned counsel for the appellant prays to allow the appeal.
7. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader vehemently submitted that the averments of the



CNR: KAHC010528162026

NC: 2026:KHC:47264
CRL.A No. 1312 of 2026

complaint clearly indicate that the ingredients of the provisions under the SC/ST Act are attracted; therefore, anticipatory bail is not maintainable. Making such submissions, learned High Court Government Pleader for Respondent No.1 - State prays to dismiss the appeal.

8. Similarly, the learned counsel for respondent No.2 prays to dismiss the appeal by adopting the arguments addressed by the learned High Court Government Pleader for the Respondent No.1 State.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and on perusal of the averments of the complaint, it makes clear that the ingredients of the provisions of SC/ST (POA) Act, would attract on the given set of facts, Therefore, the appeal is not maintainable. Accordingly, the appeal stands ***dismissed***.

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

JS/-
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 26