



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

**DATED THIS THE 25<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2023**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO.3696 OF 2023 (439)**

**BETWEEN:**

SHRI. AMRIT PAUL IPS,  
S/ SHRI NETRAM BANSAL,  
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,  
RESIDING AT: NO.F-34,  
CHITRAKOOT, CENTURY APTS,  
NEAR NEW SHANTHI SAGAR HOTEL,  
SAHAKARNAGAR, BENGALURU – 560 092.

**... PETITIONER**

**(BY SRI M.S.SHYAM SUNDAR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR  
SMT. VANDANA P.L., ADVOCATE)**

**AND:**

STATE BY HIGH GROUND P.S.  
REPRESENTED BY HCGP,  
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,  
BANGALORE – 560 001.

**... RESPONDENT**

**(BY SRI P.PRASANNA KUMAR, SPL. COUNSEL FOR  
RESPONDENT)**

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 439 OF CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, PRAYING TO GRANT BAIL TO THE PETITIONER AND SET HIM AT LIBERTY IN RESPECT OF CRIME NO.60/2022 OF RESPONDENT HIGH GROUNDS P.S. FOR THE OFFENCES PUNISHABLE UNDER SEC.36, 37, 119, 409, 201, 420, 465, 468, 471, 120(B) R/W. 34 OF IPC ARRAIGNING THE PRESENT PETITIONER AS A35, PENDING ON THE FILE OF





SPECIAL COURT FOR LOKAYUKTHA AND PC ACT (CCH 24) IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS PETITION, PERTAINING TO BENGALURU BENCH, HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON 28.07.2023, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF ORDER THIS DAY (**AT KALABURAGI BENCH THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE**), THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

### **ORDER**

This petition is filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.60/2022 of High Grounds Police Station, Bengaluru City, registered against accused Nos.1 to 22, for the offence punishable under Sections 120B, 420, 465, 468, 471 read with Section 34 of IPC.

2. Charge sheet was filed initially against accused Nos.1 to 34 for the offence punishable under Sections 120B, 409, 420, 465, 468, 471, 201 read with Section 34 of IPC.

3. Additional/supplementary charge sheets were filed for the offence punishable under Sections 120B, 36, 37, 119, 409, 420, 465, 468, 471, 201 read with Section



34 of IPC and Section 7(a),(c), 8 and Section 13(1) (a) read with Section 13 (2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The petitioner is arraigned as accused No.35.

4. Brief facts of the case are that, the Government of Karnataka issued Notification No.98/ Recruitment-2/2020-21 dated 21.01.2021 inviting the applications for filling up 545 PSI vacancies in the Police Department from eligible candidates through online. Physical test of the candidates who submitted the application was conducted and date was fixed for conducting written test of the selected candidates at 91 centres, on 03.10.2021. It is alleged in the present case that, the accused persons conniving with each other with an intention to earn money illegally by selecting the candidates in a fraudulent way, instructed the candidates who were willing to pay money, to answer only few questions in the answer sheet and to leave the remaining questions blank and later, on receiving the answer sheets in the recruitment division,



filled the blank spaces in the OMR sheets and fraudulently selected ineligible candidates to the post of PSI.

5. The allegations against the petitioner/accused No.35 are that from 01.02.2020 till 27.04.2022 he worked as the ADGP, Recruitment Wing of the Police Department and he was the head of the entire recruitment process. He hatched a conspiracy with accused Nos.25, 28, 29 and 31 to get undeserving candidates selected to the post of PSI, by allowing them to tamper the original OMR answer sheets of accused Nos.1 to 22. It is the case of prosecution that, the answer sheets which were collected after the examination were sealed and stored in kit boxes in the strong room situated in the Recruitment Wing. The petitioner, being the head of the entire recruitment process, was entrusted with the duty to keep the safe custody of the keys of the kit boxes. However, as per the conspiracy, on 05.10.2021, the CCTV installed in the office where the OMR answer sheets of the candidates were kept, were turned off at the instruction of the petitioner



and the OMR sheets were removed from the strong room and tampered by filling correct answers in the blank spaces and thus, the accused helped ineligible candidates to be appointed as PSI, illegally collecting more than Rs.5 crores.

6. According to the prosecution, in the month of October, 2021 petitioner/accused No.35 received a sum of Rs.1.35 crores from accused No.31 and invested the said amount through one Mr. Shambulingayya (CW-218). The petitioner was arrested on 04.07.2022 and he is in judicial custody.

7. Heard the learned Senior Counsel Sri M. S. Shyam Sundar appearing for the petitioner and Sri P. Prasanna Kumar, learned Special Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/State.

8. It is contended by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner has been remanded to judicial custody exercising powers under



Section 309 (2) of Cr.P.C. unlawfully and without jurisdiction as no cognizance was taken, and therefore, his detention is illegal. He contends that the petitioner was not arraigned as an accused initially in the FIR and after arraigning 34 accused persons with various overt acts attributed against them, the Investigation Officers have laid their hands on the petitioner alleging he was the person responsible for keeping the strong room keys where the answer sheets were kept and he parted with the keys allowing and tampering of the answer sheets. He would contend that though the petitioner appeared and given complete explanation to each query of the I.O.s, he has been framed as an accused due to extreme pressure.

9. It is contended by the learned Senior Counsel that the petitioner was arrested on 04.07.2022 and after police custody, he was remanded to judicial custody on 15.07.2022. Charge sheet was filed against accused Nos.1 to 34 on 27.07.2022 and cognizance was taken on 04.08.2022 and first supplementary charge sheet naming



the petitioner as accused No.35 was filed on 28.09.2022, however, without taking cognizance, the petitioner was remanded to judicial custody on various dates which is illegal. He has contended that the cognizance for either of the offences punishable under IPC or Prevention of Corruption Act was not taken on submission of the charge sheet and therefore, the learned Magistrate erred in remanding the petitioner and his detention in judicial custody is therefore, without jurisdiction. He would also contend that as per the order sheet, on 24.02.2023 the order of remand was granted till 17.03.2023, which exceeds the prescribed period of 15 days, which violated the liberty guaranteed to the petitioner under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Even thereafter, the petitioner was remanded unlawfully. He contended that the remand order passed by the learned Magistrate without taking cognizance after filing the charge sheet is unlawful and amounts to illegal detention.



10. The learned Senior Counsel has further contended that on invoking the provisions of the Prevention of Corruption Act, the Special Court called for the transfer of file and pursuant to the same, the learned Magistrate transferred the case, which is also illegal since, the Magistrate Court has no authority to transfer cases and the power to transfer cases could be exercised only under Sections 406, 407 and 408 of Cr.P.C. respectively.

11. Nextly, it is contended by the learned Senior Counsel that the allegations that the petitioner demanded a sum of Rs.5 crores from the co-accused is entirely false and there is absolutely no evidence to sustain the said allegation. He contends that the petitioner was not the only custodian of the key of the antechamber almira and the keys of the kit boxes. He further contended that the allegations that the petitioner collected money from the co-accused is without any basis. He contends that except a mobile phone, nothing has been recovered from the petitioner and only on the voluntary statement of the co-





accused, the prosecution is alleging that the said accused No.31 has handed over the money to the petitioner.

12. The learned Senior Counsel has further contended that the allegations that the petitioner was on leave on the alleged date of conspiracy i.e., on 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> of October, 2021 and therefore, he motivated or helped the commission of the offence without any basis and that the allegations are made on surmises.

13. The learned Senior Counsel has contended that the entire case against the petitioner is based on circumstantial evidence and that too of conspiracy and even though the allegations levelled are serious, there is no sufficient material to continue his detention, since denying a person of his liberty is a serious matter. He submits that the petitioner has an unblemished service and now with some vested interest, he has been framed in this case which is nothing but a case of malicious



prosecution and due to his detention, his entire family members are suffering.

14. The learned Senior Counsel submits that the petitioner is ready to abide by any reasonable conditions which may be imposed by the Court and undertake to appear before the trial Court on every date of hearing, since the object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at trial and it is neither punitive nor preventive.

15. *Per contra*, the learned Special Prosecutor who has filed statement of objections, has strenuously contended that the petitioner/accused No.35, working as Additional Director General of Police, Recruitment Wing of Police Department has conspired with other accused persons and agreed to receive a sum of Rs.5 crores in order to assist the undeserving candidates in securing the post of PSI and as per the conspiracy, the OMR sheets of certain accused candidates were removed from the strong



room and they were tampered, to facilitate them to clear the examination. The FSL reports clearly indicate that there has been alteration on the OMR sheets. He has contended that the duty of the petitioner was to have the safe custody of the keys to the kit boxes where the answer sheets were stored, but without receiving the keys and leaving the office earlier than usual, petitioner has intentionally allowed the commission of the offence. He contends that at the instruction of the petitioner, the CCTV was turned off by accused No.31.

16. The learned Special Prosecutor has further contended that the present petitioner has received a sum of Rs.1.35 crores from accused No.29, collected from the candidates and middlemen and given to CW-218 – Shambulingayya Swamy and a sum of Rs.41 lakhs has been recovered from the said witness.

17. The learned Special Prosecutor has further contended that insofar as the contention raised by the



learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner has been detained illegally without an order of taking cognizance, even after filing of charge sheet for the offences alleged against him, the same has been considered by the learned Special Judge and the application filed by the petitioner under Section 309(2) of Cr.P.C. has been rightly rejected.

18. The learned Special Prosecutor contends that the competent authority have issued sanction to prosecute the accused, under Section 170 of the Police Act and Section 19 of the P.C. Act. This Court has rejected the bail petition in respect of accused Nos.30 and 34 and the bail petition in respect of accused Nos.4 ,16, 19, 20, 24 and 27 are also rejected. He contends that the offence committed is serious in nature affecting the public administration system and the petitioner being an influential person, there is likelihood of tampering the witnesses in the event of grant of bail. He has therefore sought to dismiss the petition.



19. In pursuance to the notification issued by the Government of Karnataka, inviting the application for filling up 545 posts of Civil PSI, written exams were conducted at different centres across Karnataka and final selection list was published on 19.01.2022. As certain miscreants had indulged in malpractices in the examination, a case was registered in Crime No.48/2022 of Chowk Police Station, Kalaburagi for various offences punishable under Sections 465, 468, 471, 420, 120B read with Section 34 of IPC and investigation was taken up. In the said case, the allegations are of writing the examination using bluetooth devices by the students, etc. In the course of investigation, according to the prosecution, it was found that the original OMR sheets did not tally with the carbon copy of the OMR sheets in respect of 22 candidates. It is alleged that the accused persons have tampered with the said OMR sheets of the candidates and awarded more marks than they had scored. In this connection, Crime No.60/2022 came to be



registered against accused Nos.1 to 22 for the offence punishable under Section 120B, 420, 465, 468, 471 read with Section 34 of IPC. The petitioner was not arraigned as an accused in the FIR. Charge sheet was filed initially against accused Nos.1 to 34. In the additional/supplementary charge sheet, the petitioner working as ADGP, Recruitment is shown as accused No.35. It is alleged that all the accused conspired with each other with an intention to earn money illegally by selecting the candidates in a fraudulent way and in furtherance of the said conspiracy, the OMR sheets which were sealed and stored in kit boxes in the strong room situated in the recruitment wing were removed and the answer sheets of certain candidates were tampered.

20. It is alleged by the prosecution that the petitioner, working as ADGP was the head of Recruitment Wing of the Police Department and he is instrumental in allowing the other accused persons to gain access to the strong room, remove and tamper the OMR sheets.



21. It is contended by the learned Senior Counsel for petitioner that even after filing of the charge sheet against the petitioner, no cognizance was taken, however, he was being remanded to judicial custody which is unlawful and without jurisdiction and therefore, his detention is illegal. As rightly contended by the learned Special Prosecutor appearing for the respondent, the petitioner had filed an application under Section 309(2) of Cr.P.C. before the learned Special Judge to release him on bail on the ground of illegal detention, which was dismissed by an order dated 28.03.2023. The learned Special Judge has passed an elaborate order on the said application. Though the learned counsel has raised a contention alleging illegal detention of the petitioner, the above referred order has not been separately challenged.

22. Another ground urged by the learned Senior Counsel is that, after the charge sheet was filed invoking the provisions of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988,



the learned Magistrate without any authority or jurisdiction, transferred the case to the Special Court. The validity of the said order passed by the learned Magistrate cannot be gone into in this petition filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C.

23. It is not in dispute that the petitioner, arraigned as accused No.35 was working as the ADGP, Recruitment Wing. The main allegations are that being the head of recruitment process, he conspired with accused Nos.25, 28, 29 and 31 to get undeserving candidates selected to the post of PSI, by allowing them to tamper the original OMR answer sheets of accused Nos.1 to 22. It is alleged that the petitioner parted with the keys of the kit boxes and at his instructions the CCTV installed in the office were turned off and the OMR sheets were removed from the strong room and tampered by filling correct answers. The material on record reveal that the petitioner was not the only custodian of the key and CW-81 was admittedly having another set of keys of the almirah where the keys





of the kit boxes carrying the OMR sheets were kept. It was contended by the learned Senior Counsel that the possibility of CW-81 misusing the said keys is not ruled out. Further, it is alleged that petitioner handed over the key to accused No.31 and on 05.10.2021 accused No.31 using the said key took out the keys of the kit boxes of the examination centres. There is no material at this stage to show that the petitioner handed over the key to accused No.31. The allegations of turning off the CCTV camera is against accused No.31. The prosecution has to establish during trial that it was done at the instance of the petitioner. There is no allegation that the present petitioner had opened the kit boxes and removed the OMR sheets and handed it over to the other accused persons. On the other hand, it is alleged that accused No.31 after turning off the CCTV, delivered the already collected carbon OMR sheets, etc. to accused Nos.25 and 28 in order to facilitate the tampering of OMR sheets. The further allegations are that on 07.10.2021, 08.10.2021 and 16.10.2021 accused Nos.25 and 28 with the aid of



accused Nos.29 and 31, entered the strong room and gained access to the answer sheets and tampered with the original OMR sheets from the candidates. The allegations against the petitioner –accused No.35 is that as per his directions, the said accused have committed the offence. However, there is no material, except the fact that the petitioner was working as ADGP of the Recruitment Wing, to show that at his instructions the other accused persons gained access to the strong room, removed and tampered the OMR sheets of the accused – candidates who appeared for the examination.

24. It is alleged that accused No.29 handed over a huge sum of Rs.1.35 crores collected by the co-accused to accused No.31 and in turn the said accused paid the said sum to the petitioner/accused No.35. Admittedly, except a mobile phone, no cash has been recovered from the petitioner. The prosecution is relying on the statement of CW-218, from whom a sum of Rs.41 lakhs was recovered. The learned Senior Counsel has contended pointing out



that both CW-218 and CW-219 have stated in their 164 Cr.P.C. statement that they handed over the said amount to the CID and further contended that the denominations mentioned in the charge sheet are also different. The prosecution has to prove that the said amount was received by CW-218 from the petitioner and it related to the crime in question.

25. It is alleged by the prosecution that at the instruction of the petitioner, CW-82 switched off the CCTV camera. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner has pointed out that CW-82 in his statement has clearly stated that CCTV footage of the petitioner's chamber was not in a working condition.

26. It is contended by the learned Special Prosecutor that the offence alleged is very serious in nature and the bail petition of accused No.4, 16, 19, 20, 24, 27, 30 and 34 are rejected. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that in



the present case bail is already granted to accused Nos.1 to 24 , 27, 36 to 38 and 41. He submits that all the accused in Crime No.48/2022 are enlarged on bail.

27. It is no doubt true that the offence alleged are serious in nature which has serious adverse impact on the society. The learned Special Prosecutor has relied on para-10 and 11 of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Chandrakeshwar Prasad alias Chandu Babu vs. State of Bihar and another*** reported in **(2016) 9 SCC 443** which are extracted hereunder:

*"10. This Court in Rajesh Ranjan Yadav v. CBI reported in (2007) 1 SCC 70 balanced the fundamental right to individual liberty with the interest of the society in the following terms in para 16 thereof:*

*16. We are of the opinion that while it is true that Article 21 is of great importance because it enshrines the fundamental right to individual liberty, but at the same time a balance has to be struck between the right to individual liberty and the interest of society. No right can be absolute, and reasonable restrictions can be placed on them. While it is true that one of the considerations in deciding*



*whether to grant bail to an accused or not is whether he has been in jail for a long time, the court has also to take into consideration other facts and circumstances, such as the interest of the society.*

11. *In Ash Mohammad v. Shiv Raj Singh reported in (2012) 9 SCC 446, this Court in the same vein had observed that though the period of custody is a relevant factor, the same has to be weighed simultaneously with the totality of the circumstances and the criminal antecedents. That these are to be weighed in the scale of collective cry and desire and that societal concern has to be kept in view in juxtaposition to individual liberty, was underlined."*

28. Further, the learned Special Prosecutor has relied on para-17 of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Vinod Bhandari vs. State of Madhya Pradesh*** reported in ***(2015) 11 SCC 502*** which is extracted hereunder:

*"17. In the light of above-settled principles of law dealing with the prayer for bail pending trial, we proceed to consider the present case. Undoubtedly, the offence alleged against the appellant has serious adverse impact on the fabric of the society.*



*The offence is of high magnitude indicating illegal admission to large number of undeserving candidates to the medical courses by corrupt means. Apart from showing depravity of character and generation of black money, the offence has the potential of undermining the trust of the people in the integrity of medical profession itself. If undeserving candidates are admitted to medical courses by corrupt means, not only the society will be deprived of the best brains treating the patients, the patients will be faced with undeserving and corrupt persons treating them in whom they will find it difficult to repose faith. In these circumstances, when the allegations are supported by material on record and there is a potential of trial being adversely influenced by grant of bail, seriously jeopardising the interest of justice, we do not find any ground to interfere with the view taken by the trial Court and the High Court in declining bail."*

29. Para-23 of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Brijmani Devi vs. Pappu Kumar and another*** reported in **(2022) 4 SCC 497**, relied on by the learned Special prosecutor is extracted hereunder:



"23. This Court in *Ram Govind Upadhyay vs. Sudarshan Singh* – (2002) 3 SCC 598, speaking through Banerjee, J., observed as under:

"3. Grant of bail though being a discretionary order – but, however, calls for exercise of such a discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. Order for bail bereft of any cogent reason cannot be sustained. Needless to record, however, that the grant of bail is dependent upon the contextual facts of the matter being dealt with by the court and facts, however, do always vary from case to case. While placement of the accused in the society, though may be considered but that by itself cannot be a guiding factor in the matter of grant of bail and the same should and ought always to be coupled with other circumstances warranting the grant of bail. The nature of the offence is one of the basic considerations for the grant of bail – more heinous is the crime, the greater is the chance of rejection of the bail, though, however, dependent on the factual matrix of the matter."

30. In ***Sanjay Chandra vs. Central Bureau of Investigation*** reported in **2011 AIR SCW 6838** relied on by the learned Senior counsel for petitioner, it is held that the object of bail is neither punitive nor preventive. It



is to secure appearance of accused persons at his trial. Para-14 and 15 of the said judgment are extracted hereunder:

*"14. In bail applications, generally, it has been laid down from the earliest times that the object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of bail. The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment, unless it can be required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The courts owe more than verbal respect to the principle that punishment begins after conviction, and that every man is deemed to be innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty. From the earliest times, it was appreciated that detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. From time to time, necessity demands that some un-convicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial but in such cases, 'necessity' is the operative test. In this country, it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the Constitution that any person should be punished in respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted*





*or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances. Apart from the question of prevention being the object of a refusal of bail, one must not lose sight of the fact that any imprisonment before conviction has a substantial punitive content and it would be improper for any Court to refuse bail as a mark of disapproval of former conduct whether the accused has been convicted for it or not or to refuse bail to an un-convicted person for the purpose of giving him a taste of imprisonment as a lesson.*

*15. In the instant case, as we have already noticed that the "pointing finger of accusation" against the appellants is 'the seriousness of the charge'. The offences alleged are economic offences which has resulted in loss to the State exchequer. Though, they contend that there is possibility of the appellants tampering witnesses, they have not placed any material in support of the allegation. In our view, seriousness of the charge is, no doubt, one of the relevant considerations while considering bail applications but that is not the only test or the factor : The other factor that also requires to be taken note of is the punishment that could be imposed after trial and conviction, both under the*



*Indian Penal Code and Prevention of Corruption Act. Otherwise, if the former is the only test, we would not be balancing the Constitutional Rights but rather "recalibration of the scales of justice." The provisions of Cr.P.C. confer discretionary jurisdiction on Criminal Courts to grant bail to accused pending trial or in appeal against convictions, since the jurisdiction is discretionary, it has to be exercised with great care and caution by balancing valuable right of liberty of an individual and the interest of the society in general. In our view, the reasoning adopted by the learned District Judge, which is affirmed by the High Court, in our opinion, a denial of the whole basis of our system of law and normal rule of bail system. It transcends respect for the requirement that a man shall be considered innocent until he is found guilty. If such power is recognized, then it may lead to chaotic situation and would jeopardize the personal liberty of an individual. This Court, in Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan- (2005) 2 SCC 42, observed that "under the criminal laws of this country, a person accused of offences which are non-bailable, is liable to be detained in custody during the pendency of trial unless he is enlarged on bail in accordance with law. Such detention cannot be questioned as being violative of Article 21 of the Constitution, since the same is authorized*



*by law. But even persons accused of non-bailable offences are entitled to bail if the Court concerned comes to the conclusion that the prosecution has failed to establish a prima facie case against him and/or if the Court is satisfied by reasons to be recorded that in spite of the existence of prima facie case, there is need to release such accused on bail, where fact situations require it to do so."*

31. The allegations against the petitioner is one of conspiracy. The allegations of opening the strong room and removing the OMR sheets from the kit boxes and tampering those OMR sheets are alleged against other accused persons. Hence, rejection of bail petitions of those accused is not a ground to detain the petitioner. The prosecution has to prove in a full-fledged trial that at the instruction or direction of the petitioner, other accused persons committed the said act. It is alleged that the petitioner being the head of the Recruitment Wing, failed in conducting the examination in a fair manner. Merely because the petitioner was working as ADGP, Recruitment Wing, it cannot be concluded at this stage that the alleged



offence is committed at his instruction or in other words, he has conspired to commit the offence. Hence, he cannot be detained in custody till conclusion of the trial, considering the number witnesses cited in charge sheet. Petitioner was arrested on 04.07.2022 and since then he is in judicial custody. There are no allegations that during his career the petitioner was involved in misconduct, etc. He has undertaken to furnish sufficient surety to ensure his regular presence before the trial Court and undertaken to abide by other conditions.

32. Accordingly, the following:

**ORDER**

The petition is allowed. Petitioner/accused No.35 shall be enlarged on bail in Crime No.60/2022 of High Grounds Police Station, Bengaluru City, pending on the file of the XXIII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge and Special Judge (P.C. Act), Bengaluru (CCH No.24), subject to following conditions:



- i. Petitioner shall execute a personal bond in a sum of ₹5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs Only) with two sureties for likesum to the satisfaction of the jurisdictional Court;
- ii. Petitioner shall furnish proof of his residential address and shall inform the Court, if there is any change in the address;
- iii. 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 him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.
- iv. Petitioner shall not tamper with the prosecution witnesses and shall not influence or intimidate any of the Investigating Officers of this case.
- v. Petitioner shall not travel outside India without prior permission of the jurisdictional Court.



- vi. Petitioner shall cooperate with the further investigation of the case, if any.
- vii. Petitioner shall appear before the trial Court on all dates of hearing, unless exempted for any genuine reason.

The observations made in this order are confined to the disposal of this petition and shall not influence trial of the case in anyway.

**Sd/-  
JUDGE**

swk  
Sl No.: 1