IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S VISHWAJITH SHETTY

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 6282 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SRI MAHENDRA REDDY G.S
S/O SRINIVASA REDDY G.R
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.47, DASARA BEEDI
GUNJUR, VARTHUR HOBLI
BENGALURU HOBLI, BENGALURU URBAN.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI SATYANARAYAN CHALKE, ADV.)

AND:

STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE SHO
MARATHAHALLI POLICE STATION
MARATHAHALLI SUB-DIVISION
BENGALURU CITY - 560 037
REPRESENTED BY SPECIAL PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT BLDG.
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
AT BANGALORE - 560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI PRASANNA KUMAR P, SPL.PP)

Digitally signed by NANDINI M S
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

THIS CRL.P. IS FILED U/S.439 CR.P.C PRAYING TO THE PETITIONER IN CC NO.52459/2026 (IN CRIME NO.0586/2025) REGISTERED FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENCES P/U/S 103 AND 238 OF THE BNS REGISTERED FOR AN ALLEGED OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER ON THE PENDING FILE BEFORE THE HONBLE 29TH ADDL.CMM COURT, MAYO HALL BENGALURU CITY AT BENGALURU.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON 03.07.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S VISHWAJITH SHETTY

CAV ORDER

1. Accused in Crime No.586/2025 registered by Marathahalli Police Station, Bengaluru City, for the offences punishable under Sections 103 & 238 of BNS, 2023, is before this Court in this petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail.

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.

3. FIR in Crime No.586/2025 registered by Marathahalli Police Station, Bengaluru City, for the offence punishable under Section 103 of BNS, 2023, against the petitioner herein based on the first information dated 14.10.2025 received from K.Munireddy, S/o Krishna Reddy - father of deceased Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy who was the wife of the petitioner herein. In the said case, petitioner was arrested on 15.10.2025 and subsequently remanded to judicial custody. After completing investigation, charge sheet was filed against him for the aforesaid offences. His bail application filed before the jurisdictional Sessions Court in Crl. Misc. No.1764/2026 was rejected on 07.03.2026. Therefore, he is before this Court.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire case of the prosecution is based on circumstantial evidence. There is inordinate delay in registering FIR against the petitioner. He submits that medical records do not conclusively prove that death was homicidal. The prosecution has not collected sufficient material to prove the alleged motive of the petitioner to commit the crime. He submits that the petitioner is a qualified doctor having no criminal antecedents. Investigation of the case is now completed and charge sheet has been filed. His custody is no more required by the prosecution. Accordingly, he prays to allow the petition.

5. Per contra, learned Spl. Public Prosecutor who has filed his statement of objections opposing the bail petition, submits that petitioner's conduct immediately after the death of his wife in insisting not to perform postmortem of the dead body raises a serious doubt against him. CW-48 - Dr. Surendar.S. speaks about this conduct of the petitioner. The statement of CW-48 is corroborated by the statement of CWs-1 to 6 & 9. Because of the petitioner's conduct, CW-3 - Dr. Nikitha.M., who is the sister of the deceased had given a request in writing immediately thereafter to conduct the postmortem of the dead

body of the deceased. He refers to the various forensic science laboratory reports and submits that the said report clearly shows traces of anesthetic drug known as Propofol in the dead body of the deceased and also in the IV cannula and extension tube. The prosecution has collected sufficient material to show that petitioner had purchased the aforesaid anesthetic drug two days prior to the date of death and had injected the same to the deceased along with IV fluid. He submits that the statement of CW-12 & CW-37 would prima facie show the extra-marital relationship of the petitioner, and therefore, there is sufficient material to prima facie prove the motive to commit the murder. He submits that the material collected by the prosecution during the course of investigation clearly makes out a strong case against the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner had hatched a plan and had systematically committed the murder, and therefore, in the event petitioner who is a doctor, is enlarged on bail, chances of he tampering with the evidence cannot be ruled out. Accordingly, he prays to dismiss the petition.

6. Petitioner is the husband of deceased Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy, who was the daughter of the first informant in the

present case. Their marriage was solemnized on 26.05.2024. In the first information, it is mentioned that after the marriage, the relationship between the couple was not very cordial because the petitioner was not properly taking care of his wife and was frequently making demand for money. It appears that deceased Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy had some gastric problem and on the night of 21.04.2025, in his house, the petitioner had inserted IV cannula to the right leg of his wife. On 22.04.2025, at about 8.30 a.m., he had dropped his wife in the house of first informant. On the said date, during night hours, he gave some medicine to her. On 23.04.2025 at about 12.00 p.m., Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy had complained about severe pain in her leg to which IV cannula was inserted by the petitioner and when she requested him to remove the same, he allegedly informed her not to remove the same. At about 9.00 p.m. on the same day, he had gone to Dr. Kruthika's room for the purpose of giving her some medicine and on the night of 23.04.2025 he had given medicine to Dr. Kruthika through IV cannula and on 24.04.2025 at about 7.30 a.m., he had brought to the notice of his in-laws that Dr. Kruthika was not responding and immediately thereafter, she was taken to Kaveri Hospital at

Marathahalli and in the said hospital, the doctors had declared her dead.

7. After the death of Dr. Kruthika, petitioner had insisted not to perform postmortem on the dead body of the deceased, but at the request of CW-3 - Dr. Nikitha, postmortem of the dead body of deceased Dr.Kruthika was performed and portion of the contents of small intestine, portion of the kidney, blood, portion of right foot skin from the alleged injected site of right leg, portion of left foot skin and the sealed paper envelope said to contain IV cannula and extension tube were forwarded to the FSL for chemical examination. After receipt of the report from the FSL which showed traces of anesthetic drug known as Propofol in the articles that were forwarded to the FSL for examination, based on which the opinion regarding cause of death was given by the medical officer, the first informant had approached the police on 14.10.2025 and based on his first information, FIR was registered against the petitioner in Crime No.586/2025. Subsequently, petitioner was arrested on 15.10.2025 at Mangaluru, and thereafter produced before the court and remanded to judicial custody.

8. During the course of investigation, statement of CW-48 - Dr. Surendar.S., who was the doctor incharge of emergency department on 24.04.2025 when Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy was taken to Kaveri Hospital was recorded. This witness has stated that when the patient arrived, there was no heart beat, bi lateral pupils dialated and not reactive, ECG showed flat line, and hence, patient was declared brought dead. He has also stated that immediately thereafter though he had advised the family members of deceased Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy to register a medico-legal case and inform the police, the petitioner allegedly opposed the same stating that in the event medico-legal case is registered, postmortem of the dead body will be done, for which he refused to give consent. It is only thereafter, CW-3 - Dr. Nikitha submitted a written requisition for conducting postmortem of the dead body. The statement of CW-48 is corroborated with the statement of CW-1 to 6 & 9.

9. After the postmortem was conducted, the contents of stomach, portion of small intestine, portion of live and kidney, portion of right leg skin from the alleged injected site, IV cannula and extension tube were forwarded to the FSL for chemical examination and the test reports reflect that

anesthetic drug Propofol was traced in the articles which were forwarded to the FSL. Even in the IV cannula and tube that was inserted to the right thigh of the deceased by the petitioner herein, the traces of propofol was traced. The test report would go to show that propoful is a anesthetic drug used for the purpose of surgery of the patients and it is a Schedule-H drug in India, which is required to be sold in retail on the prescription of registered Medical Practioners only. The deceased only had gastric complaints and the question that haunts the mind is, why Propoful was injected to her. In the final opinion regarding cause of death it is mentioned, "*possibility of death due to complications as a result of intravenous injection of substance containing propoful cannot be ruled out*".

10. CW-26 - H.Sathish Kumar, Pharmacist at Krish Pharma, has stated that two days prior to the death of the deceased, petitioner had come to Krish Pharma and had introduced himself as a qualified doctor and had purchased two vials of Neorof - 10 ML which contains Propofol and had paid a sum of Rs.405/- through Phonepe. The Investigation Officer has collected bank statements of the petitioner as well as the

pharmacy, which would go to show that the said amount of Rs.405/- was paid from the account of the petitioner to the account of the pharmacy. The Investigation Officer also has collected material which shows that after Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy had died, petitioner had searched online regarding the "case of residual detection long after administration of Propofol".

11. The statement of CW-12 & 37 would go to show that petitioner had extra marital affairs and he also had proposed to CW-12 to marry her after he becomes a divorcee or a widower. Several messages which were sent to CW-12 after the death of Dr. Kruthika M.Reddy would go to show that the petitioner was apprehending trouble after the postmortem of the deceased was conducted. The prosecution has collected sufficient material which make out a strong prima facie case of circumstantial evidence as against the accused.

12. Evidence can make or break a case. Circumstantial evidence is used when there are no direct evidence. When circumstances link to each other and a chain is formed, then such evidence forms a strong case. An eye-witness may lie, but circumstantial evidence normally don’t. Sometimes an eye-witness may be unreliable but circumstantial evidence such as

DNA, fingerprint evidence, chemical examination report, FSL report, etc., can be very hard to dispute, especially when it is gathered in a scientifically reliable manner. Circumstances speak for themselves and normally they do not lie, whereas direct evidence under certain circumstances may not be reliable.

13. At the stage of considering a bail application, the Courts are not required to hold a mini trial. In the background of the basic parameters that are required to be considered while dealing with the bail application of an accused, if the material available on record is scrutinized, prima facie it appears that there is a link in the circumstantial evidence collected, which connect to each other and makes out a prima facie case for the alleged offence. Petitioner is a qualified doctor and the chances of he tampering with the material witnesses/evidence cannot be ruled out in the event he is enlarged on bail.

14. Under the circumstances, I am of the opinion that the prayer made by the petitioner for grant of regular bail cannot be entertained at this stage. Accordingly, petition is dismissed, with liberty to the petitioner to renew his bail application before the Trial Court after the examination of material witnesses, or

in the event the trial is not commenced within a reasonable period.

Sd/-
(S VISHWAJITH SHETTY)
JUDGE

KK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 131