HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:64729
CRL.P No. 16165 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010719612026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 16165 OF 2026**

**(482(CR.PC) / 528(BNSS))**

**BETWEEN:**

SRI. MANJUNATHA
S/O CHIKKANNA,
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
R/A KARPENAHALLI,
DODDERI HOBLI,
MADHUGIRI POST,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 112.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. THEJAS M.R., ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA BY
BANASHANKARI PS,
REPRESENTED BY
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTER,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU - 560 001

2. SMT. ANJUMALA T. NAYAK,
W/O MAHESHA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENT (CID),
DR. A. KRISHNA RAO ROAD (NORTH),
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
SAMPANGI RAMA NAGAR,

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

CNR: KAHC010719612026

BENGALURU - 560 001.
(THEN POLICE INSPECTOR,
WOMEN AND NARCOTICS DIVISION,
CCB, BENGALURU CITY)

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. M.V. ANOOP KUMAR, ADDL. SPP, FOR R1)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 482 CR.PC (FILED U/S 528 BNNS) PRAYING TO A) QUASH THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN S.C. NO. 1449/2025 (SPLIT UP FROM S.C. NO. 584/2022), ARISING OUT OF CR. NO. 270/2021, CURRENTLY PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE XLV ADDI. CITY CIVIL & SESSIONS JUDGE (CCH-46), BENGALURU, FOR THE OFFENCES PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTIONS 3, 4, 5 AND 7 OF THE IMMORAL TRAFFIC (PREVENTION) ACT, 1956 AND SECTION 370 OF THE IPC, THE SPLIT-UP CHARGE SHEET PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-C, THE ORDER SHEET PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE - E AND ETC.,

THIS CRL.P, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

CNR: KAHC010719612026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

**ORAL ORDER**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned HCGP appearing for respondent No.1.
2. This petition is filed to quash the proceedings on the ground that the other accused, have been acquitted, after the trial.
3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that, the petitioner could not appear before the Court as he could not furnish the surety pursuant to the bail order granted.
4. It is the further submission that, since he was not appearing before the Court for four years, the charge sheet was split up and trial was held against the remaining accused.
5. It is the submission that the evidence led by the witnesses against the remaining accused have been considered by the Trial Court and Trial Court found that

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

the accused are to be acquitted. Accordingly, the other accused have been acquitted by the Trial Court.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the allegations against the present petitioner are the same and the witnesses before the Trial Court have not stated anything about the petitioner's involvement in the alleged offence. Thus, it is contended that the petition has to be allowed and the proceedings are to be quashed.

7. The learned Additional SPP appearing for respondent No.1 would submit that the petitioner has not complied with the bail conditions and has evaded from the process of the Court for four years and is not entitled to any indulgence.

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

9. The charge sheet materials would prima facie warrant the trial. The allegations are to be established. The petitioner who was absconding for four years cannot rely upon the evidence that, is led against the remaining accused. The

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

evidence that may be adduced against the petitioner when he faces trial cannot be assumed or presumed at this juncture.

10. The case against the petitioner has to be considered on the basis of the evidence that may be led before the Trial Court in the proceedings against him.

11. Hence, the petitioner cannot seek quashing of the proceedings by taking shelter under the judgment rendered in favour of the remaining accused. Hence, the petition stands ***dismissed***.

12. It is also noticed that the petitioner having obtained bail, failed to appear before the Court and the hearing of the case was deferred because of the petitioner not participating in the proceeding for a considerable period. Now all the witnesses are to be summoned and they have to be examined again. Hence, the petitioner is directed to pay a cost of Rs.5,000/- to the District Legal Services Authority.

13. In the event of failure to pay the amount, same shall be recovered as if it were a decree of the Court.

Digitally signed by Justice
ANANT RAMNATH HEGDE

14. The petitioner shall appear before the Trial Court on ***30.11.2026***.

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.: 24