IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 12932 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SHEKAR
S/O MUNINARAYANAPPA
AGED 34 YEARS,
RESIDING AT DASANAYAKANAHALLI VILLAGE,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. KIRANKUMAR H.K, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SHO BAGALURU PS, BENGALURU CITY
REPTD. BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU - 560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. K.NAGESHWARAPPA, HCGP)

Digitally signed by SHARADAVANI B
Location: High Court of Karnataka

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 439 OF CR.PC (FILED U/S 483 BNNS) PRAYING TO ENLARGE THE PETITIONER IN SPLIT UP SC.NO.53/2021 (CR.NO.43/2014 IN CC.NO.2125/2014 (SC.NO.25/2015) FOR ALLEGED OFFENCES P/U/S. 376, 306 R/W 34 OF IPC, PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE 6TH ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, BENGALURU RURAL.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA

ORAL ORDER

None appears for the petitioner.

2. The petition came to be filed on 06.09.2025. Till today, objections are not complied with.

3. On perusal of the material on record, it is noticed that the petitioner was admitted on bail earlier. But soon after the charges were framed in the trial Court in S.C.No.25/ 2015, the accused jumped bail, and he remained absent for a continuous period of five years, which not only delayed the disposal of the pending sessions case but also left the victim at large. Offences against the accused are under Sections 376 and 306 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), which are heinous in nature.

4. Thereafter, on persistent issuance of non-bailable warrant, the presence of the accused was secured, and he failed to offer fresh bail and to pay the bond amount.

5. Later on, his application filed seeking bail application was rejected by the Learned Sessions Judge.

6. Taking note of the fact that the accused had jumped bail and was continuously absent for a period of five years and failed to make the payment of the earlier bond amount, and this Court, despite granting sufficient opportunity, found that office objections were also not complied with and the counsel for the petitioner consistently remained absent, the petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

Sd/-
(V SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE

GJM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 3