HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:63378
CRL.P No. 12193 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010551702026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.12193 OF 2026 (482(Cr.PC) /528(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. M. N. RAJU
S/O LATE NANJUNDAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
R/AT #123/1, MAGADI MAIN RAOD,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
MACHOHALLI, BENGALURU NORTH,
VISWANEEDAM POST,
BENGALURU - 560 091.

2. SRI. MADHUSUDAN. D. C (AS PER AADHAAR CARD)
SRI. MADHU (AS PER FIR)
S/O CHIKKANNA,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS,
R/AT DASHARATHAPURADA HATTY,
SAMPIGE HOSAHALLI POST,
DANDINASHIVARA HOBLI,
TURUVEKERE TALUK,
TUMKUR DISTRICT - 572 225.

3. SRI. MOLAGAMUDI SUBRAMANYAM (AS PER AADHAAR CARD)
SUBRAMANI (AS PER FIR)
S/O GOVIND,
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
R/AT #2/144, HARIJANAVADA,
GAJULAMANDYAM,
RENIGUNTA, CHITTOOR DISTRICT,
ANDHRAPRADESH - 517 520.

...PETITIONERS

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

(BY SRI. GOVARDHAN. S, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY MADANAYAKANAHALLI POLICE STATION,
   REP. BY THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
   HIGH COURT BUILDING,
   BENGALURU – 560 001.

2. SMT. PREMA
   W/O CHENDREGOWDA,
   AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
   R/AT NO.10, 2ND CROSS, PRAGATHI LAYOUT,
   JANAPRIYA TOWNSHIP, DASANAPURA,
   BENGALURU - 562 130.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. NAGHARISH G S, HCGP FOR R1)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED UNDER SECTION 482 CR.PC (FILED U/S 528 BNNS) PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR IN CRIME NO.736/2026 REGISTERED BY MADANAYAKANAHALLI POLICE STATION FOR THE OFFENCES PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 115(2), 118(1), 352 R/W SECTION 3(5) OF BHARATIYA NYAYA SANHITA, 2023, PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE (JR.DN) & J.M.F.C COURT NELAMANGALA, BENGALURU DISTRICT, AT ANNEXURE-A, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE; AND ETC

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

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

CNR: KAHC010551702026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

ORAL ORDER

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned HCGP appearing for respondent No.1.
2. This petition is filed to quash the Crime No.736/2026 registered on 03.08.2026 by Madanayakanahally Police Station.
3. The offences alleged under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 352 read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that there is an inordinate delay of four days in lodging the complaint and delay is not properly explained and the complaint could not have been lodged and the FIR would not have been registered.
5. It is the further submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners that, according to the complainant, she had reported the incident to the police on 29.07.2026. However, no FIR came to be registered on that date. Referring to the said statement, it is urged that, in case

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

the incident had taken place, the police would have registered FIR on 29.07.2026.

6. Learned HCGP appearing for respondent No.1 would submit that the complaint discloses the commission of cognizable offences and that the matter requires investigation.

7. The Court has considered the allegations made in the complaint.

8. It is stated by the mother of the victim that the accused assaulted her son with a pipe and also assaulted on her legs, back, thigh, head and chest. It is also alleged that the victim was kicked by the accused and was given a life threat. The complainant also alleges that the signature of the victim was obtained on a file.

9. The complainant further states that she informed the police helpline and the son was admitted to the hospital and a medico-legal case was registered.

10. The Court is of the view that merely because the police did not register the FIR on the very same day on which the complainant approached them, by itself, cannot be a ground to quash the complaint. The allegations made in

digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

the complaint require investigation. Accordingly, no ground is made out to quash the complaint.

11. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would also submit that the petitioners have produced CCTV footage of the place where the alleged incident has taken place. It is the submission that the alleged incident is not captured in the said CCTV footage. The police shall also consider the said CCTV footage and file appropriate report.

12. The Court is of the view that the matter requires investigation. Merely because there is a delay of four days in lodging the complaint, it cannot be said that the allegations made in the complaint are false or that the FIR is liable to be quashed.

13. Whether the alleged incident has taken place or not is a matter to be ascertained during the course of investigation, more so, in a situation where the complainant states that her son was taken to the hospital and was treated and that a medico-legal case was registered.

14. Accordingly, the petition stands ***dismissed***.

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

15. Pending interlocutory applications, if any, stand disposed of.

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)
JUDGE

VMB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 18