



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 17602 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI MANU M
S/O SRI MADEGOWDA, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
R/O KEMMALE VILLAGE, SATHANUR HOBLI,
KANAKAPURA TALUK, BANGALORE SOUTH DISTRICT
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT-562126

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. JNANESH KUMAR K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
THROUGH SATHANUR POLICE KANAKAPURA CIRCLE,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT-562126
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA BUILDING
BENGALURU-560001
2. CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENT
CARLTON HOUSE, PALACE ROAD,
BENGALURU 560001, REP BY SPP HIGH COURT
BUILDING, BENGALURU 01.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI RANGASWAMY R, HCGP)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 438 CR.PC (FILED U/S 482 BNNS) BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING THAT THIS HONOURABLE COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO ALLOW THIS PETITION AND GRANT ANTICIPATORY BAIL TO THE PETITIONER DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT POLICE TO RELEASE THE PETITIONER FORTHWITH ON BAIL IN THE EVENT OF THEIR ARREST IN CRIME NO .41/2024 IN SATHANUR POLICE STATION FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 120B, 408, 201,

Digitally signed
by BELUR
RANGASWAMY
NANDINI

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



419, 420, 465, 468, 471 OF IPC 149 OF IPC ON THE FILE OF THE II ADDL.DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANAGARA DISTRICT SITTING AT KANAKAPURA.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Samitha (BNSS) seeking anticipatory bail.

2. The offence raised against the petitioner is under Sections 120(B), 408, 201, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 and 149 of IPC read with Section 13(1)(A) read with Section 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

3. Admittedly, the petitioner is not a Government Servant. Hence the provisions of the Prevention and Corruption Act would not apply to the petitioner.

4. It is alleged that accused No.1, who is the bank manager in collusion with accused No.2 transferred huge money to the account of accused No.2 and thereafter, accused No.1 and 2 have withdrawn the money and misappropriated the same though the money does not belong either the petitioner



or the accused no.1. The application seeking anticipatory bail by the petitioner is rejected by the learned Sessions Judge.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that he is an agriculturist and unaware of the consequences. Accused no. 2 taking undue advantage of the cheque belonging to the petitioner which pertains to the loan account of the petitioner, might have indulged in some act to which the petitioner is not a party.

6. It is further submitted that the alleged offence according the prosecution is borne out from the records and that being the position, the custodial interrogation is not required.

7. It is also urged that the petitioner is not involved in any other offence, not convicted for any offence on earlier occasion and he is ready to abide by any of the terms and conditions to be imposed by the Court in the event of bail.

8. It is also his submission that accused no.1 is already granted default bail and that being the position, a case is made out to grant of bail to the petitioner.



9. Learned HCGP on the other hand would oppose the application on the premise that huge amount from the bank account is transferred to the account of the petitioner and thereafter, to the account of accused no.1 and both accused No.1 and 2 are involved in this crime and in case bail is granted, there is every possibility that the petitioner will destroy the evidence.

10. Thus, learned HCGP would oppose the application and would urge to dismiss the application.

11. It is submitted that bail is granted to accused no.3 on medical ground. However, said ground is not available to the petitioner.

12. The Court has considered the contentions raised at the Bar and perused the records.

13. The charge sheet is not yet filed. According to the contents of the complaint, it appears that the offence alleged is in recorded in bank transactions. Moreover, bail is granted to accused No.1.



14. No previous criminal case is pointed out against the petitioner. If there are records to show that amount is transferred to the account of the petitioner from the bank pursuant to the transactions said to have been initiated by accused No.1, the investigating agency can collect the evidence and proceed with investigation.

15. Considering the materials on record, the Court is of the view that the custody of the petitioner is not required and if the anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner on certain conditions it would help the Police to investigate the matter further.

16. Hence the following:

ORDER

- (i) The petition is ***allowed.***
- (ii) The petitioner/accused no.2 shall appear before the Investigating Officer within 15 days from the date of the receipt of the copy of the order and shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000 with two sureties for the like sum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer.



- (iii) Petitioner/accused no. 2 shall regularly appear before the Investigating Officer as and when called and if the charge sheet filed, shall appear before the Trial Court without fail, unless exempted by the Trial Court for valid reasons.
- (iv) The petitioner/accused no. 2 shall not tamper with the prosecution witness and shall co-operate with the investigation.
- (v) The petitioner/accused no. 2 shall not involve in any offence in future.

Sd/-
(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)
JUDGE

BRN
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 4