

(2025) 12 KAR CK 1524
In the Karnataka High Court, Principal Bench
Case No : Criminal Petition No. 17416 Of 2025

Mangala J

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Karnataka By Anekal Police Station Represented By
State Public Prosecutor, High Court Of Karnataka Bengaluru -
560001

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 30-12-2025

Acts Referred:

Bharatiya Nagarika Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 — Section 482
Bharatiya Nyaya Samhita, 2023 — Section 3(5), 316(4), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3),
340(2)
Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 — Section 192(A)

Citation : (2025) 12 KAR CK 1524

Hon'ble Judges : Anant Ramanath Hegde, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mahesh S, Waheeda. M.M

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Anant Ramanath Hegde, J

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned HCGP appearing for the respondent.
2. This petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The petitioner apprehends her arrest pursuant to the registration of the FIR in Crime No.379 of 2025 registered before Anekal Police Station for the offences under Sections 316(4), 336(3), 318(4), 336(2), 340(2) read with Section 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Samhita read with Section 192(A) of Karnataka Land Revenue Act.
3. It is the contention of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner was appointed as First Division Assistant on compassionate ground on the demise of her husband. It is urged that the office of Tahsildar in Anekal had undertaken the exercise of digitalizing the documents and the task of digitalizing

the documents was out-sourced and certain data entry operators were entrusted with the task of digitalizing the documents. When the petitioner received certain applications under the Right to Information Act, petitioner noticed that certain documents are missing and informed the same to the Tahsildar. Then, Tahsildar has asked the petitioner to lodge a complaint, in this regard. The petitioner claims to have lodged a complaint on 31.07.2025 stating that documents are missing.

4. The learned HCGP would oppose the application on the premise that the petitioner's presence is very much required to investigate the matter and custodial presence is necessary. It is also urged that CCTV footage is available, which would indicate the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of alleged offence.

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

6. The FIR was registered on 28.11.2025 alleging commission of offence between 14.10.2025 to 28.11.2025. Thus, it is apparent that even before the alleged offence took place, the petitioner has lodged a complaint alleging that certain documents are missing. Since, it is submitted that CCTV footage is available and who was the custodian of the documents at a relevant point of time is a matter of record, the Court is of the view that the petitioner has made out a case for the relief of anticipatory bail, as the custodial interrogation is not required. However, the petitioner is to be put on certain conditions. Hence, the following:

ORDER

i) The petition is allowed.

ii) The petitioner shall also execute an indemnity bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) with two sureties for the like-sum to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, in the event of her arrest in connection with Crime No.379/2025 registered before Anekal Police Station.

iii) The petitioner shall make herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.

iv) The petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her/him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

v) The petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.