HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:60153
CRL.P No. 6954 of 2024

CNR: KAHC010396892024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 6954 OF 2024

BETWEEN:

SRI. SRIKANTH KUMAR G.P,
S/O LATE PUTTASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/AT NO 1868/A, 5TH MAIN ROAD,
NEAR BALAMURI GANESHA TEMPLE
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT, 2ND STAGE,
J.P. NAGAR, BANGALORE - 560 078
ALSO PROPRIETOR/OWNER OF
JUNGLE TRIALZ RESORT
SITUATED AT BETTAHALLI KAVAL VILLAGE,
HAROHALLI, RAMANAGAR - 562 159

...PETITIONER

Digitally signed by PANKAJA S
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

(BY SRI. PRADEEP C.S, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. AKSHAY RAJ B.R, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
HAROHALLI POLICE STATION
REPRESENTED BY SPP,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
BANGALORE - 560 001.

2. SMT. NIRMAL
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS

W/O VENKATESH
R/AT NO. 139, 1ST MAIN,
10TH CROSS,
OPP. TO LISSY INDUSTRIES KALANAGAR,
KAMMAGONDANAHALLI,
JALAHALLI, BANGALORE - 560 015.

3. SRI. NARENDRA E
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
S/O. E. GURANATHA REDDY,
RESIDING AT NO.142, B-2,
MIG SURYA CITY PHASE-3, JIGALA,
ANEKAL, BENGALURU - 562 107

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MAHESHA P, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. C. MURALIDHAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
SRI. GIRISH KUMAR R, AVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482 OF CR.P.C PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR AND COMPLIANT THE C.R.NO.143/2024 VIDE ANNEXURE A AND B FILED BY THE RESPONDENT/HAROHALLI POLICE STATION AGAINST THE PETITIONER FOR THE OFFENCE P/US/ 304, 337 OF IPC PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE PRINCIPAL CIVIL (Jr.Dn.) AND JMFC COURT, KANAKAPURA RAMANAGARA.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C to quash the proceedings in Crime No.143/2024 filed by Harohalli Police, Ramanagar District, against the petitioner and others for the offenses punishable under Section 304 and 337 of IPC, currently pending on the file of Prl. Civil Judge and JMFC Kanakapura.

2. Abridged facts of the case are that complainant-respondent No.2 filed a complaint before respondent No.1 Police stating that she was working as a staff nurse, and on 19.05.2024, she and her colleague, the deceased Ranjini, visited the Jungle Trialz Resort at Harohalli Betthalli Kaval. She alleged in the complaint that while playing a zip-line game at the resort, due to the negligence of the resort management, Ranjini fell, sustained severe injuries, and succumbed to the same on the way to the hospital. Based on the complaint, the Police registered Crime No.143/2024, and during the investigation, respondent No.1 Police implicated the

petitioner as Accused No.1. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has preferred this petition.

3. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently submits that the petitioner, being the owner of Jungle Trailz Resort, was neither present at the scene of the incident nor had any direct involvement in the incident resulting in the death of deceased Ranjini. According to him, accused No.2 was in charge of the trainer and adventure activities, whereas accused No.3 was the Manager of the said resort. In such circumstances, the petitioner cannot be held vicariously liable for the death of the deceased. It is further submitted that the concept of vicarious liability is alien to criminal law. Accordingly he prayed to allow the petition.

4. However, the prayer is opposed by the learned HCGP and learned counsel for respondent No.2 on the ground that the investigation is at a nascent stage. They submit that the petitioner, being the owner of the resort,

failed to implement adequate safety measures at the resort.

5. I have perused the FIR, the charge-sheet material and the other materials available on record.

6. As could be gathered from records, no doubt, the petitioner is the owner of the resort. However, the question of his liability requires consideration in the light of the material collected during the course of investigation. Since the investigation is at nascent stage, I am of the opinion that, the petition can be disposed of by reserving appropriate remedy to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is ***disposed of*** by reserving liberty to the petitioner to approach the Investigating Officer and place the documents relied upon in the present petition in support of his defence, within two weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

8. Upon production of such documents, the Investigating Officer shall consider the same in accordance with law before filing the final report.

9. In the event, a charge sheet is filed against the petitioner, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to approach this Court for appropriate relief.

10. It is made clear that no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner until the filing of the final report.

SD/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE

TMP
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 2