



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.SRISHANANDA
CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 100036 OF 2026
(438(CR.PC)/482(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. SHRI CHANDRAKANTH ANANDA KUMBAR @ BHARGAV
AGE. 48 YEARS, OCC. PANDIT,
2. SMT. SHWETA
W/O CHANDRAKANTH ANANDA KUMBAR @ BHARGAV
AGE. 43 YEARS, OCC. HOUSEWIFE,
3. SRI SURESH @ SURYAKANT ANANDA KUMBAR @
BHARGAV
AGE. 45 YEARS, OCC. AGRICULTURE,

R/O MAHARANA PRATAP CHOWK, TALDAGE ROAD,
HATTAKNAGALE, HUPARI, RENDAL
TQ. HATKANAGALE, DIST. KOLHAPUR,
STATE MAHARASHTRA 416203.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. BHARATHI G BHAT, ADVOCATE)

AND:

STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS P.S.I., VIDYAGIRI POLICE STATION, DHARWD
R/BY GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE,
HIGH COURT BUILDING, DHARWAD.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. P.N. HATTI, HCGP)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 482 OF BNS, 2023, PRAYING TO GRANT THEM ANTICIPATORY BAIL IN CR.NO. 0203/2025 OF VIDYAGIRI PS DHARWAD, REGISTERED FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/SEC. 108, 3(5), 351(2) OF BNS 2023, PENDING BEFORE 3RD ADDL. CJ AND CJM COURT DHARWAD, HUBLI-DHARWAD, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.



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

ORAL ORDER

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.SRISHANANDA)

1. Heard Smt. Bharathi G. Bhat, learned counsel for the petitioners Sri. P. N. Hatti, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State.
2. This petition is filed by the petitioners/accused persons in Crime No.203/2025 of Vidyagiri Police Station, Dharwad registered for the offences punishable under Section 108, 3(5) and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, with the following prayer:

"Wherefore, the petitioners/accused No.1, 2, 4 most humbly pray that the Hon'ble Court may be pleased to grant them anticipatory bail in Cr. No.0203/2025 of Vidyagiri PS Dharwad, registered for the offences punishable U/s. 108, 3(5), 351(2) of BNS 2023, pending before III Addl. CJ and CJM Court, Dharwad, Hubli-Dharwad, in the interest of justice and equity."

3. Facts in nutshell which are utmost necessary for disposal of the case are as under:



3.1. Smt. Sudha W/o. Chennayya Nilajageri, lodged a complaint with Vidyagiri Police Station in Dharwad stating that herself, her husband Chennayya (deceased) and children were residing together at Borgaon, Tq. Nippani. Smt. Shobha is the first wife of her husband and two children were born to her.

3.2. When her husband Chennaya was residing at Borgaon in a rented house, the petitioners herein contracted him to work as a driver on the promise of paying Rs.25,000/- per month as salary. But, they retained that amount with them on the ground that they would get two guntas plot and a constructed house therein with the salary earned by him.

3.3. It is further alleged that her husband was worked as a driver with the petitioners who were indulged in black magic and but they did not pay the salary to him. Whenever there was a demand for the salary by her husband, petitioners used to procure grocery to the complainant's family but, did not pay the salary.



3.4. When the matter stood thus, her husband has worked with the petitioners between 2016 and 2019 and thereafter, left the job. All the four petitioners visited the house of the complainant and demanded Rs.10,00,000/- which was saved by the husband of the complainant. Having been frightened with the black magic, her husband left the job and then opened a gift shop.

3.5. Again all the four petitioners visited the shop of the husband of the complainant and demanded the money. Same was intimated by her husband to the complainant.

3.6. When the matter stood thus, on 03.12.2025 the husband of the complainant left the house by informing the complainant that he would visit the first wife and children who are residing in Sattur at Dharwad.

3.7. On 04.12.2025 at about 11.00 p.m., owner of the house of the complainant informed over telephone that her husband has fallen down in Sattur at Dharwad and he has been shifted to KIMS Hospital. On 05.12.2025 at about



04.30 a.m., when complainant visited KIMS Hospital, she noticed that her husband was no more.

3.8. It is her apprehension that on 04.12.2025 petitioners herein gave a life threat to her husband and therefore, her husband consumed poison. There is also a death note and a video clipping before his death and sought for action against the petitioners herein.

4. After registering the case, police investigated the matter. From the date of offence, petitioners are absconding and the attempt made by the petitioners to obtain an order of grant of anticipatory bail is turned down by the learned District Judge. Thereafter, petitioners are before this Court.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners reiterating the grounds urged in the petition would contend that the complaint averments are contradictory in nature, *inasmuch as*, in one breath the complainant has stated that there was no salary paid and at another breath, she would say that a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- is parted away from the husband of



the complainant by the accused persons. When there was no salary paid at all by the petitioners herein how could they demand Rs.10,00,000/- from the husband of the complainant, is a question which exposes the hollowness of the prosecution case.

6. She would further contend that petitioners are law abiding citizens and they would cooperate with the Investigation Agency and thus, sought for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent-State reiterating the contents of the objection statement would contend that from the date of offence petitioners are not available for the investigation.

8. He would invite the attention of this Court about the video clipping recorded by the deceased himself before his death and also the death note which would *prima facie* establish the threat given by the petitioners herein to the deceased which ultimately resulted in deceased consuming the poison.



9. Therefore, custodial interrogation is utmost necessary in the case on hand and thus, sought for dismissal of petition.

10. Having heard the arguments of both sides, this Court perused the material on record meticulously.

11. On such perusal of the material on record, it is crystal clear that acquaintance of the husband of the complainant with the accused persons is not in dispute.

12. Admittedly, husband of the complainant has worked with the petitioners herein for the year 2016 to 2019 as a driver. Further, specific averments are made that the petitioners were indulged in black magic. What transpired between the deceased and the petitioners during the said work is to be investigated by the Investigation Agency.

13. Admittedly, there is an allegation that a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- was already parted away by the husband of the complainant to the petitioners herein and there was a further demand.



14. Contents of death Note and the video clipping are to be taken note of and thereafter, the matter is to be investigated by taking the petitioners into custody.

15. Therefore, *prima facie* materials available on record as on today would indicate that there is a direct nexus between the suicidal death of the husband of the complainant and the petitioners herein.

16. Hence, this Court is of the considered opinion that petitioners have not made out any good grounds to allow the anticipatory bail request.

17. Accordingly, the following:

ORDER

The petition is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(V.SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE