



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.101151 OF 2023 (482(Cr.PC)/528(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. PRAVEEN BASAPPA PUJAR
S/O. BASAPPA PUJAR,
AGED 33 YEARS, OCC. ENGINEER,
RESIDENT OF HALAPETE, WARD NO.2,
NEAR HANUMAN TEMPLE, KERUR,
TQ. BADAMI, DIST. BAGALKOT-587206.
2. RENUKA PUJAR W/O. BASAPPA PUJAR,
AGED 57 YEARS, OCC. ANGANAWADI TEACHER,
RESIDENT OF HALAPETE, WARD NO.2,
NEAR HANUMAN TEMPLE, KERUR,
TQ. BADAMI, DIST. BAGALKOT-587206.
3. RAVI BASAPPA PUJAR S/O. BASAPPA PUJAR,
AGED 38 YEARS, OCC. DRIVER
RESIDENT OF HALAPETE, WARD NO.2,
NEAR HANUMAN TEMPLE, KERUR,
TQ. BADAMI, DIST. BAGALKOT-587206.
4. LAKSHMI PUJAR W/O. RAVI PUJAR,
AGED 26 YEARS, OCC. HOUSE WIFE,
RESIDENT OF HALAPETE, WARD NO.2,
NEAR HANUMAN TEMPLE, KERUR,
TQ. BADAMI, DIST. BAGALKOT-587206.
5. SHREEDEVI PATIL W/O. SHIVANAGOUDA PATIL,
AGED 36 YEARS, OCC. GOVT. PRIMARY
SCHOOL TEACHER,
SHANKARWADI, C/O. MAHADEVAPPA KATTIMANI,





HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC-D:6708
CRL.P No. 101151 of 2023

NEAR WATER TANK, BASAVESHWARA NAGAR,
POST. SHAHABAD, TQ. SHAHABAD, DIST.
KALABURGI-585228.

6. SHIVANAGOUDA PATIL S/O. SIDDANAGOUDA PATIL,
AGED 43 YEARS, OCC. CONDUCTOR,
C/O. MAHADEVAPPA KATTIMANI,
NEAR WATER TANK, BASAVESHWARA NAGAR,
POST SHAHABAD, TQ. SHAHABAD,
DIST. KALABURGI-585228.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. AVINASH M.ANGADI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
THROUGH HUBBALLI DHARWAD
CITY WOMAN POLICE STATION,
REP. BY ITS STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, DHARWAD.
2. SMT. SAPNA PUJAR W/O. PRAVEEN PUJAR,
AGE. 32 YEARS, OCC. ENGINEER,
R/O. NO.304, RENUKA KRUPA ASHIRVAD
APARTMENT, RAJATGIRI-VIDYAGIRI, DHARWAD.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. GIRIJA S.HIREMATH, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. S.B. ANCHATAGERI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 482 OF CR.P.C. PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS PETITION AND QUASH THE CHARGE SHEETS AND ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN C.C.NO.537/2023 BY THE II ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC-II, DHARWAD FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/SEC. 498A, 323, 504, 506 R/W 149 OF IPC AND SEC. 3 AND 4 OF DP ACT AND ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO THEREIN IN RESPECT OF THE PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NO.1 TO 6 HEREIN, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.



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

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

ORAL ORDER

1. This petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 to quash the proceedings and the charge sheet filed against the petitioners.

2. The crime is registered in Crime No.92 of 2022 before Hubballi Dharwad City Town Women Police Station, Hubballi-Dharwad.

3. The complaint is registered on 07.12.2022 alleging commission of offence on 27.11.2022. The complaint is filed alleging the offences under Sections 498A, 323, 504, 506 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

4. The complaint is filed by the victim against her husband, mother-in-law, husband's brother, sister, husband of the sister and brother's wife.



5. The admitted fact is that the marriage had taken place on 06.05.2022. The complainant has alleged that on the date of her marriage, her husband's brother was married and husband was residing along with his brother, brother's wife, his mother. Elder sister was married and she used to visit her maternal home often.

6. It is stated that she was looked after well for few days after the marriage and later it is alleged that the husband used to come drunk and used to quarrel and when questioned, used to abuse her in filthy language. Husband used to beat her and also insisted on bringing money and gold.

7. It is also alleged that the complainant informed her parents about the ill-treatment and her parents came to her matrimonial home and when they made enquiry about the ill-treatment to her daughter, the husband, mother-in-law and the brother-in-law insisted the complainant's brother to take the complainant back to her maternal home.

8. The complainant states that she came to her sister's house and took treatment in a private hospital. It is further stated that she stayed in her sister's house for sometime and also secured an employment and informed about her new



employment to her husband. The husband came to complainant's sister's house and took the complainant back to his house and again started abusing and beating her.

9. It is also stated that the husband repeatedly insisted to bring dowry. When the complainant informed about all these developments to her elder sister, elder sister spoke to the complainant's husband, the husband told that he would drop the complainant to complainant's elder sister's house and accordingly she was dropped in her elder sister's house.

10. It is also stated that the accused have snatched the laptop belonging to the complainant and that the complainant has been abandoned. Based on these allegations, the complaint is filed and the FIR is registered.

11. After the investigation, the police have also filed the charge sheet. It is an admitted factual position that all the petitioners are on bail.

12. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that allegations against the petitioners are bald and vague and they do not constitute the offence alleged and no case is made out to register an FIR. Even the charge sheet is filed without any basis and the very fact that the complaint is filed against the married



sister and the husband of the married sister, would indicate that the complaint is false and the same is nothing but abuse of the process of the Law. Thus, he would urge that the petition has to be allowed.

13. Learned High Court Government Pleader would oppose the petition on the premise that, after investigation the police have filed the charge sheet and evidence is collected and the matter requires trial. The contentions raised by the petitioners are disputed questions of facts and those disputed facts can be traced out only after the trial and would urge to dismiss the petition.

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

15. There is no dispute that the petitioner No.5, who is the sister of petitioner No.1, is married. Petitioner No.6 is the husband of petitioner No.5. Petitioner No.5 and petitioner No.6 are residents of Kalaburgi. The alleged incident has taken place in Badami, where the petitioner No.1 is residing.

16. Though there is an allegation in the complaint that all the family members have ill-treated the complainant, the Court is of the view that the allegations are vague and not specific as



against the petitioners No.5 and 6, who are admittedly married and residing in a different place.

17. On consideration of the materials in the charge sheet, the Court is of the view that no purpose would be served in case the petitioners No.5 and 6 are tried for the alleged offences. The very fact that they are residing separately after marriage is a fundamental distinguishing factor in the facts and circumstances of this case, and case against petitioners No.1, 2, 3 and 4

18. In the backdrop of aforementioned facts and circumstances, the Court is of the view that the prosecution against petitioners No.5 and 6 is unjustified.

19. Accordingly, the following

ORDER

- i. The petition is ***allowed-in-part.***
- ii. The proceeding and charge sheet against petitioners No.5 and 6 is quashed.
- iii. It is further made clear that the observations made in this order should not be construed as an observation



relating to the merits or demerits of the case of the prosecution and petitioners No. 1, 2 3 and 4.

- iv. The observations made in this order should not be relied on while deciding the case against petitioners No.1, 2, 3 and 4. The case has to be decided independently based on the evidence placed on the record.
- v. The disposal of this case shall not come in the way of the petitioners and the complainant entering into settlement, if advised in law.

**Sd/-
(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)
JUDGE**