Reserved on : 23.06.2026
Pronounced on : 13.07.2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 13TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. NAGAPRASANNA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.743 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

CHETAN M.N.,
S/O NAGARAJU M.,
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.3002,
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT
1ST STAGE, NEAR WATER TANK,
BENGALURU SOUTH,
J.P.NAGARA,
BENGALURU – 560 078.

... PETITIONER

Digitally signed by PADMAVATHI B K
Location: High Court of Karnataka

(BY SMT.KEERTHI KRISHNA REDDY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SUDDAGUNTEPALYA POLICE,
REPRESENTED BY
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT
BENGALURU – 560 001.

2 . XXXXXX

XXXXXX
XXXXXX

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT.WAHEEDA M.M., HCGP FOR R-1;
SRI SHRAVAN MADHAV K.P., ADVOCATE FOR R-2)

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 528 OF B.N.SS., PRAYING TO QUASH THE F.I.R AND COMPLAINT IN CR.NO.09/2026, FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 69 AND 351(2) OF BNS, 2023, REGISTERED BY THE SUDDAGUNTEPALYA POLICE, WHICH IS PENDING BEFORE THE CJM, BANGALORE.

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON 23.06.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: **THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA**

CAV ORDER

The petitioner, sole accused in Crime No.9 of 2026 registered for offences punishable under Sections 69 and 351(2) of the BNS, is before the Court, calling in question the said registration of crime.

2. Heard Smt. Keerthi Krishna Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Smt. Waheeda M. M., learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for respondent No.1 and

Sri Sharavan Madhav K.P., learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2.

3. Facts, in brief, germane are as follows: -

3.1. The 2nd respondent is the complainant. The complainant was earlier working as an Area Service Manager at Reliance Rescue Limited Company and had resigned from the said job in March, 2025. During the period when she was working at the operations of Reliance Rescue Limited which is said to have been managed by one Felicia Enterprises under a tie-up arrangement, on 01-04-2025, the complainant becomes acquaintance with the present petitioner who was working with Felicia Enterprises. It is, therefore, the complainant is said to have joined that Company on the assurance of the petitioner on a monthly salary of ₹35,000/-. Both the petitioner and the complainant then became friends. The friendship developed into acquittance and acquaintance blossomed into relationship, both physical as well.

3.2. Sometime in the month of October, 2025 the petitioner is said to have taken the complainant to his house and introduced her to the family members. Both of them did not belong to the same

caste. Then began brooding due to the caste status of the petitioner and the complainant. The petitioner is said to have got engaged to another woman on 14-12-2025, after which the complainant's request for marriage with the petitioner comes to be declined. On 02-01-2026, it is alleged that the petitioner got complainant's termination from Felicia Enterprises and stopped all communication by blocking her phone number and all social media contacts. The complainant left with no choice of alleged deception and exploitation registers a complaint before the jurisdictional Police on 10-01-2026 for offences punishable under Sections 69 and 351(2) of the BNS. The moment the crime is registered on 10-01-2026, the petitioner comes before this Court, calling in question the said crime. This Court protects the interest of the petitioner by grant of stay of investigation, on the score that the acts between the two were consensual. The interim order is subsisting even today. The 2nd respondent/complainant is served, represented and has filed affidavit. Therefore, with the consent of parties, the matter is heard.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would vehemently contend that the petitioner and the 2nd respondent were co-employees in a Company. They became acquainted to each other and had physical relationship as well; but never on the promise of marriage. The petitioner is wanting to get married to another woman with whom he is already engaged. Therefore, the story of the complainant that they had sexual relationship on the promise of marriage is contrary to facts. The learned counsel would submit that such consensual acts between the two cannot become a matter of crime for offence punishable under Section 69 of the BNS.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent/complainant would submit that the facts in the complaint are clear. The complainant was working elsewhere. She was lured into the Company where the petitioner was working for a higher salary. They became friends; friendship developed into relationship, which was physical as well. She would submit that even after registration of crime, the petitioner has appeared before an organization named 'Sakhi' where he expressed his willingness to marry the complainant. The parents of the petitioner are not

permitting marriage solely on the score that the petitioner and the complainant belong to different castes. He would seek to take this Court through the affidavit filed by the complainant and documents to demonstrate that petitioner's engagement has not at all happened.

6. A counter affidavit is also filed by the petitioner, which the learned counsel for the petitioner takes this Court through. The learned counsel for the petitioner would seek the crime to be obliterated and the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent would seek investigation to be permitted to continue, as according to the learned Counsel this forms a classic illustration of offence under Section 69 of the BNS.

7. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective learned counsel and have perused the material on record.

8. The afore-narrated facts, dates and link in the chain of events are all a matter of record. They would not require any

iteration. The petitioner being an employee of Felicia Enterprises is a matter of record. The complainant joining the said Company on the instructions of the petitioner is what is alleged. The two becoming acquaintances, having relationship and the relationship being physical are admitted facts. Since the entire issue has triggered from registration of complaint, I deem it appropriate to notice the complaint. It reads as follows:

"ದಿನಾಂಕ: 10-01-2026

ರವರಿಗೆ,
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್,
ಸುದ್ದಗುಂಟೆಪಾಳ್ಯ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ,
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ.

ಇಂದ,
XXXXXXX
XXXXXXX
XXXXXXX

ಮಾನ್ಯರೆ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡ, ವಯಸ್ಸು ಸುಮಾರು 32 ವರ್ಷ ಎಂಬಾತನು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾಗಿ ನಂಬಿಸಿ, ವಂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಲೈಂಗಿಕ ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯವೆಸಗಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದೂರು.

*****

ನಾನು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಳಾಸದ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 2025ನೇ ಜೂನ್ ಮಾಹೆಯಿಂದ ವಾಸವಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ವಿಲ್ಸನ್‌ಗಾರ್ಡನ್ ಫೆನಿಶಿಯಾ ಎಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೈಸಸ್ ಕಂಪನಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋ ಆರ್ಡಿನೇಟರ್ ಆಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆನು. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ವಿಳಾಸ: XXXXXXX ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ನಾನು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಡೈರಿ ಸರ್ಕಲ್ ಬಳಿ ಇರುವ ಐ.ವಿ.ಸಿ ಟೆಕ್ ಪಾರ್ಕ್ ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ರಿಲಾಯನ್ಸ್ ರೆಸ್ಟೋ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏರಿಯಾ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರ್ ಆಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, 2025ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ಮಾಹೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸದರಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಲಾಯನ್ಸ್

ಕಂಪನಿಗೆ ಫೆನಿಶಿಯಾ ಎಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೈಸಸ್ ಕಂಪನಿಯು ಟೈಅಪ್ ಆಗಿ, ರಿಲಾಯನ್ಸ್ ಕಂಪನಿಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಫೆನಿಶಿಯಾ ಎಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೈಸಸ್ ರವರು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಫೆನಿಶಿಯಾ ಎಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೈಸಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ, ಕುಮಾರಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಲೇಔಟ್, ದಯಾನಂದ ಸಾಗರ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಹತ್ತಿರ ವಾಟರ್ ಟ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಎದುರು ವಾಸವಿರುವ ಚೇತನ್ ಗೌಡ ಎಂಬುವರು ದಿನಾಂಕ: 01-04-2025 ರಂದು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯವಾಗಿ ನೀನು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ನೀಡಿ, ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಂಪನಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ನಮ್ಮ ಫೆನಿಶಿಯಾ ಎಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೈಸಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ, ನಿಮಗೆ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ 35,000/- ರೂ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಆಫರ್ ನೀಡಿದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಂದಿನಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಪೆನಿ ಶಿಯಾ ಎಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೈಸಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಂತರ ನನ್ನ ಮೊಬೈಲ್ ನಂ.xxxxxxxxx ಅನ್ನು ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡ ರವರು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರ ಮೊಬೈಲ್ ನಂ. 9902088866 ರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾಲ್, ಮೆಸೇಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆಗ ನಾನು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರೊಂದಿಗೆ ವಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಕಾರಣಾಂತರಗಳಿಂದ ಅವರ ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಂತರ ಚೇತನ್ ಗೌಡ ರವರು ದಿನಾಂಕ: 05-06-2025 ರಂದು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಳಾಸದ ಜಿ.ಆರ್ ರೆಸಿಡೆನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಂತರ ಚೇತನ್ ಗೌಡ ರವರು ನನ್ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಸಲುಗೆಯಿಂದ ಇದ್ದು, ನನಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ವಸ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸುವುದು, ನನ್ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರತಿದಿನ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆ ಬಳಿ ಬಂದು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಆಫೀಸ್‌ಗೆ ಪಿಕ್ ಅಪ್ ಡ್ರಾಪ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಪ್ರೀತಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ತುಂಬಾ ಕಾಳಜಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರ ಕಾಳಜಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಅವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ನಾನು ಮನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸುಮಾರು 15 ದಿನಗಳ ನಂತರ ಚೇತನ್ ಗೌಡ ರವರು ನನಗೆ, ನಿನ್ನನ್ನು ನಾನು ತುಂಬಾ ಪ್ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದು, ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ, ನನಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ನನ್ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಲೈಂಗಿಕ ಕ್ರಿಯೆ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ದಿನ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಉಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದು, ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ನನ್ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹಲವು ಬಾರಿ ಲೈಂಗಿಕ ಕ್ರಿಯೆ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಂತರ 2025ನೇ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ಮಾಹೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡ ರವರು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಅವರ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಅಕ್ಕ ಭಾವನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಿಸುವುದಾಗಿ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಅವರ ಮನೆಗೆ ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದು, ಆಗ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿ ಯವರು ನೀವು ಬೇರೆ ಜಾತಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ನಮಗೂ, ನಿಮಗೂ ಆಗಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ನೀನು ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡನನ್ನು ಮರೆತು, ಅವನನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಬೆದರಿಕೆ ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಂತರ ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡ ರವರು ನಾನು ನಿನ್ನನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡುವುದಲ್ಲ, ನಾನು ಹೇಗಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ನಿನ್ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಪುನಃ ನನ್ನ ಮನೆ ಬಳಿ ಬಂದು ನನ್ನ ಜೊತೆ ಲೈಂಗಿಕ ಕ್ರಿಯೆ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದಿನಾಂಕ: 14-12-2025 ರಂದು ಚೇತನ್ ಗೌಡ ರವರು ಅನು ಎಂಬುವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಎಂಗೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮದುವೆ ನಿಶ್ಚಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡ ರವರನ್ನು ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ ನಾಗರಾಜು, ತಾಯಿ ಪುಷ್ಪ ಹಾಗೂ ಅಕ್ಕಳಾದ ಸೌಮ್ಯ ರವರನ್ನು ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡರವರನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇರಲು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಅವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಂತರ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 02-01-2026 ರಂದು ಪೆನಿಶಿಯಾ ಎಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೈಸಸ್ ಕಂಪನಿಯಿಂದ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಕೆಲಸದಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಹಾಗೂ

ದಿನಾಂಕ:05-01-2026 ರವರೆಗೆ ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡ ರವರು ನನ್ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು, ಅದೇ ದಿನ ರಾತ್ರಿ ನನ್ನ ಮೊಬೈಲ್ ನಂಬರ್, ಫೇಸ್‌ಬುಕ್, ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಾಗ್ರಾಮ್ ಎಲ್ಲದರಲ್ಲೂ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾಗಿ ನಂಬಿಸಿ, ವಂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನನ್ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಲೈಂಗಿಕ ದೌರ್ಜನ್ಯವೆಸಗಿರುವ ಚೇತನ್‌ಗೌಡ, ವಯಸ್ಸು ಸುಮಾರು 32 ವರ್ಷ ಎಂಬಾತನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಂದನೆಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ,

ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ
ಸಹಿ/-"

It appears that after registration of the complaint by the complainant, the petitioner also registers a complaint against the complainant alleging harassment and extortion and the said complaint reads as follows:

"10th January 2026

"To,
Kumaraswamy Layout
Police Station limit,
B'lore – 560 078.

Subject: Harrasment and Extortion by xxxxxx,
Ex office Employee/Colleague.

xxxxxxx

Respected Sir/Madam,

I Chetan MN S/o Nagaraj, an resident of Kumaraswamy layout have been facing constant harassment from xxxxxx. She has been taking money from me from long time, saying she will return it back. She has been working with me in Felicia Enterprise from 6 months. For some reason, she has left the company. Later we have had good friendship with her, but she has taken it easy and thought it as love and I have not accepted her love so she forcefully forced me to love and marry her and

rejected her proposal. She has been trying to blackmail me by various means and on January 1st 2026, around 2:30 AM, she came to my home and harassed me and my parents, also to marry me. She is telling me that if I don't marry she will commit suicide. She is demand ₹10,00,000 (Ten Lakh) amount or else threatened to file an complaint on me. She has mentally tortured and harassed even my family members by sending irrelevant messages.

I request the concerned authority to help me in this situation and do the needful.

9902088866[Chethan]

Thanking you
Sd/-"

The Police, on the complaint registered by the petitioner against the complainant, registers a non-cognizable report. The report reads as follows:

"ನಂ.ಸಂ.76ಎ ಮೂಲ ಪ್ರತಿ

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ/ Reference No.: NCR NO19/2026

ಜಿ.ಎಸ್.ಸಿ (GSC No) ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: PO1378260600022 ದಿನಾಂಕ: 10/01/2026

ಅರ್ಜಿ ನಮೂನೆ : Non Cognizable ಅರ್ಜಿ(Petition No.) ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 58/1378/2026

1. ಸಂದರ್ಶಕರ/ಪಿರ್ಯಾದುದಾರರ/ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾದ ಸೂಚಕರ ಹೆಸರ : CHETHAN M.N
2. Father / Husband Name
3. Address : Nill
   K.S.LAYOUT
   Bengaluru City
   Karnataka.
4. Mobile :
5. ಸಂದರ್ಶನದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ

ದಿನಾಂಕ:10.01.2026 ರಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಚೇತನ್ ಎಮ್.ಎನ್. ರವರು ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನೀಡಿದ ದೂರಿನ ಸಾರಾಂಶವೇನೆಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯವಿರುವ ಥಥಥಥಥಥ ರವರು ದಿನಾಂಕ:01.01.2026 ರಂದು ರಾತ್ರಿ 02:30 ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಮದುವೆಯಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ 10 ಲಕ್ಷ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಮೇಲ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದು, ನನಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿ ರವರಿಗೆ ಬೆದರಿಕೆ ಮಾನಸಿಕವಾಗಿ ಹಿಂಸೆ ನೀಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿರವರನ್ನು ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ಕರೆಯಿಸಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ದೂರು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ.

6. Counter party Details Name : XXXXXXX

Address: Nil

XXXXXX

XXXXXX

7. Application/Doc : Yes

8. ಸ್ವಾಗತಕಾರರ ಸಹಿ"

....

"ದಿನಾಂಕ 10.01.2026ರಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಚೇತನ್ ಎಂ ಎನ್ ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನೀಡಿದ ದೂರಿನ ಸಾರಾಂಶವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಇರುವ xxxxxx ಅವರು ದಿನಾಂಕ 10.01.2026 ರಂದು ರಾತ್ರಿ 02:30 ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಮದುವೆಯಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ 10 ಲಕ್ಷ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ಮೇಲ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ನನಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಬೆದರಿಕೆ ಮಾನಸಿಕವಾಗಿ ಹಿಂಸೆ ನೀಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ರವರನ್ನು ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ಕರೆಯಿಸಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ದೂರು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ."

9. The crux of the complaint registered by the complainant is that the complainant became acquainted with the petitioner while working in the Company where the petitioner was working. The allegation of the complainant is that the petitioner induced the complainant to join the Company where he was working by

promising higher salary; developed a close relationship; professes love and promises marriage; repeatedly had sexual intercourse allegedly on the assurance that he would marry her; introduces her to his parents; thereafter his family opposes the marriage on caste consideration; petitioner gets the complainant terminated from the Company and blocked all communications. This is the narration in the complaint.

10. The gist of the complaint of the petitioner against the complainant is that the relationship was consensual; after he rejected the proposal of marriage, she has begun to harass him; she demanded ₹10/- lakhs threatening to implicate him if he refuses to marry her. She has visited the house and harassed his parents.

11. The petitioner and the complainant appear before the Kumaraswamy Layout Police station and a non-cognizable report, as quoted hereinabove, is rendered by the Police.

12. The central legal issue is, **whether the allegations disclose an offence under Section 69 of the BNS or whether the entire relationship was a consensual relationship that subsequently turned sore after the petitioner refused marriage?**

13. Section 69 of the BNS reads as follows:

> "**69. Sexual intercourse by employing deceitful means, etc**.—Whoever, by deceitful means or by making promise to marry to a woman without any intention of fulfilling the same, has sexual intercourse with her, such sexual intercourse not amounting to the offence of rape, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years and shall also be liable to fine.
>
> *Explanation*.—"deceitful means" shall include inducement for, or false promise of employment or promotion, or marrying by suppressing identity.
>
> **NOTES** ► In the Penal Code 1860, prior to repeal, having sexual intercourse on false promise of marriage, employment, promotion or by supressing identity was not recognised as an offence."

Section 69 of the BNS which is now newly introduced, punishes the person who indulges in sexual intercourse with a woman by employing deceitful means of false promise of marriage. Deceitful means is explained which would include inducement for, or false promise of employment or promotion, or marrying by suppressing

identity. The complaint and its purport is quoted hereinabove. If the complaint is noticed this would become a 'classic promise to marry' prosecution under Section 69 of the BNS. If the issue had stopped at that juncture it would have been a circumstance altogether different. Unlike many that confine to original complaint, the case at hand includes multiple affidavits, transcripts, audio recording and allegation of events occurring during the pendency of quashing proceedings.

14. The event that has occurred is participation of the petitioner before a women organization called 'Sakhi' which has undertaken the work of counselling between the two for the purpose of marriage. This material transform the case into one involving sharply disputed questions concerning consent, deception, the genuineness of promise to marry and parties conduct after institution of criminal proceedings.

15. The central legal issue however remains, whether the allegations disclose false promise of marriage from the inception to obtain consensual consent, thereby attracting Section 69 of the

BNS. The resolution of that issue turns on seriously contested facts and credibility of competing narratives which are ordinarily matters of investigation. The affidavit and the counter affidavit filed by the two read as follows:

"AFFIDAVIT ON BEHALF OF THE COMPLAINANT/RESPONDENT NO.2

I, xxxxxxx, do hereby solemnly affirm on oath and state as follows:

1. I state that, on 10/01/2026 I had approached the jurisdictional police station to file a complaint about forceful sexual intercourse done on me by the accused several times. I had gone to the police station with a written complaint. However, the Police officials refused to take that complaint. Instead, they have written the present complaint and asked me to sign on it, which I have did.

2. I state that, the Accused on multiple occasions have forced himself on me and since, he had promised that he would marry me I had to keep quiet.

3. I state that, I had given the present complaint on 10.01.2026, this Hon'ble Court has given stay on further investigation on 21.01.2026 and pursuant to which the SAKHI Division of the State Government which conducts conciliation process between the victim of the sexual act and the accused had called me and the accused for conciliation.

4. I state that, pursuant to such conciliation the Accused started to talk to me on a day-to-day basis and still promised that, he would marry me and has asked me only to call the parents of the girl whom the accused is set to marry. The recording of this conversation is available with me.

5. I state that, I had called the girl and her parents whom the accused is set to marry. However, they have not responded in any favorable manner.

6. I state that, pursuant to the conciliation process the accused used to call me and take me out and while dropping me back to my home he used to come inside to check on me and on multiple occasions have forced himself on me.

7. I state that, the continued after the stay was granted by this court and recently on 17th of may which is on my birthday he took me out and got me intoxicated and again forcefully had sex. I have sufficient material to show that, this incident has happened and I can show the same to any women to which this Hon'ble Court directs.

8. I state that, regarding the financial transactions which the Accused is relying upon in the Petition. I would like to say till the date of the Petition I have paid in excess of 20 thousand and recently on 9th may 28000 and 25000 on 9th June has been paid by me to him.

9. I state that, the accused had also promised me to withdraw the present petition and had also convinced me to withdraw the complaint. However, he has moved the matter behind my back and still cheating on me.

10. I state that, on 8th on June he forced me to call the father of the girl whom he is set marry and this has happened after him sharing the number with me.

11. I state that, the accused has forced on me after this Hon'ble Court has given Interim Order in his favour.

12. I state that, I am in search of justice and I beg that, this Hon'ble Court dismisses the present petition and punish the Accused for his wrongfull act.

Place:Bengaluru Sd/-
Date:17.06.2026”

…. …. ….

"**AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE PETITIONER**

I, Chetan M N, S/o Nagaraju M, aged about 34 years, R/a #3002, Kumaraswamy Layout 1st Stage, near Water tank, Bangalore South, J P Nagara, Bengaluru-560078 do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows:

1. I state that, I am the Petitioner in the above petition and as such I am well acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case. I am competent to swear to this affidavit.

2. I state that, I have carefully gone through the affidavit filed by Respondent No.2. Save, and except what is specifically admitted herein, all other averments, allegations, inferences and contentions made therein are denied as false, incorrect, misleading and contrary to the records.

3. I state that, at the outset, I submit that the affidavit filed by Respondent No.2 is an attempt to create a false narrative and to prejudice the proceedings before this Hon'ble Court by introducing facts which are extraneous to the issues involved in the present petition.

4. I state that, with regard to the averments relating to the conciliation proceedings, I state that it is true that I appeared before the SAKHI Organisation on 30.01.2026 pursuant to repeated telephonic calls received from its officials. The officials informed me that a complaint had been received from Respondent No.2 and called upon me to appear, failing which I was given to understand that a notice would be issued against me. However, no notice, summons, or written communication was ever issued or served upon me by the said organisation. I state that I appeared before the said organisation only on account of the said telephonic calls and the apprehension of a notice being issued against me, and not with any intention of conciliating or reconciling with Respondent No.2, nor did I at any point agree, consent to, or participate in any conciliation with Respondent No.2.

5. I further state that, upon appearing before the said organisation, I specifically informed the authorities that the subject matter was already pending adjudication before this Hon'ble Court and that my marriage engagement had already taken place. I categorically stated that there was no possibility of any reconciliation between myself and Respondent No.2, and that I was not willing to participate in any conciliation whatsoever. Upon being apprised of these facts and the pendency of the proceedings before this Hon'ble Court, the officials of the SAKHI Organisation did not contact me thereafter, nor did they issue any further notice, summons, or communication.

6. I state that I have preserved the telephonic conversations exchanged with the officials of the SAKHI Organisation and have obtained transcripts of the said conversations. The said transcripts are produced along with this for the kind perusal of this Court as **DOCUMENT No.1.**

7. I state that a true and faithful reading of the said transcripts itself demonstrates that I never visited the SAKHI Organisation of my own volition or with any intention to conciliate with Respondent No.2. The transcripts record that it was the official of the SAKHI Organisation who repeatedly called me, and on my failing to appear on the first occasion fixed, I was specifically told that a notice would be issued against me if I did not attend on the next date, and I was directed to come on the following Monday at 12 noon failing which a notice would be served on me. I state that I had, on my own, called back the said official only to ascertain whether any notice had in fact been issued against me, and I categorically informed her that I had already approached the jurisdictional police station, that no FIR or complaint had been registered against me on my own complaint, and that the matter had already been carried to this Hon'ble High Court. In response, I was informed that since a complaint had been lodged by Respondent No.2, I was still required to appear, and was once again directed to be present at 11:30/12 noon the next day. I state that the entirety of the conversation reflects compulsion arising from the apprehension of a notice being issued

against me, and at no point did I attend, or agree to attend, the said office for the purpose of conciliating or reconciling with Respondent No.2.

8. I state that the averments made in paragraph No.7 of the affidavit filed by Respondent No.2 are false and misleading. I met Respondent No.2 only upon her repeated requests and telephonic calls, despite my reluctance. Respondent No.2 had threatened that, if I failed to meet her, she would circulate my photographs and videos to the family members of my fiancée, thereby creating unnecessary complications in my personal life and proposed marriage. As I was already under considerable stress due to the pending proceedings and my impending marriage, and in order to avoid any unnecessary controversy, embarrassment, or disturbance to my personal and professional life, I reluctantly agreed to meet her. My presence at the said meeting cannot be construed as willingness for reconciliation or continuation of any relationship with Respondent No.2.

9. I state that my engagement with Anu D, which had taken place on 14.12.2025 as already placed on record in the present petition, has since fructified into a fixed wedding. I state that the marriage has since been scheduled to be solemnised on 08.07.2026 and 09.07.2026 respectively, and the printed wedding invitation card issued in my name and that of Anu D is produced herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT No.2**. I state that the said invitation card further demonstrates that my proposed marriage, which had already been placed on record before this Hon'ble Court at the time of filing of the present petition, has been proceeding in the ordinary course and is wholly unconnected with, and unaffected by, the false and frivolous allegations levelled by Respondent No.2.

10. I further state that Respondent No.2 would frequently visit or appear near my workplace and create unnecessary scenes, causing embarrassment and discomfort to me in the presence of my colleagues and superiors. In order to avoid any untoward incident, disturbance at my workplace, or damage to my professional reputation, I was constrained to maintain

regular communication with Respondent No.2. Such communication was only to avoid unnecessary embarrassment and complications in my personal and professional life and should not be construed as willingness to continue any relationship with Respondent No.2.

11. I state that, the allegations made by Respondent No.2 are selective, incomplete, and do not disclose the true sequence of events. The affidavit seeks to draw adverse inferences against me while suppressing material facts and circumstances.

12. I therefore pray that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to reject the contentions raised in the affidavit filed by Respondent No.2 and proceed to consider the present petition on its own merits and in accordance with law.

VERIFICATION

I, Chetan M.N., the deponent above named, do hereby verify that the contents of paragraphs 1 to 12 are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Place: Bengaluru Sd/-
Date:23/06/2026 DEPONENT

…. …. ….

"**AFFIDAVIT**

I, xxxxxxxxxx, do hereby solemnly affirm on oath and state as follows:

1. I state that on, 10-06-2026 I had approached the jurisdictional police station to file a complaint about forceful sexual intercourse done on me by the accused several times. I had gone to the Police Station with a written complaint. However, the Police officials refused to take that complaint. Instead, they have written the

present complaint and asked me to sign on it, which I have done.

2. I state that, on multiple occasions the accused has forced himself on me since, he had promised that he would marry me I had to keep quite.

3. I state that, on 21-01-2026 this Hon'ble Court was pleased to grant an interim order of stay on further investigation in CR.No.09/2026.

4. I state that, on 17-06-2026 by way of affidavit, I have narrated the incidents post the grant of the interim order by this Hon'ble Court.

5. I state that, after I have filed the affidavit on 17-06-2026, the accused has met me and requested me not to submit any material before this Hon'ble Court and again promised me that he will get married to me and not get married to anyone else.

6. I state that on 18-06-2026, I have filed a memo before this Court. Based on the court proceedings held on 18-06-2026, the accused has met me in my house and again convinced me about his intention of resolving things and he will only get married to me.

7. I state that, from 19-06-2026 to 21-06-2026, the accused continuously met me and forced himself on me and had sexual intercourse and continued his false promise to marry me. Further, on 22-06-2026, the accused met me during the nighttime and stayed with me till around 12:30 mid night. When I confronted him about the invitation card attached in the affidavit filed by the accused, he responded by saying that the invitation card is not genuine and he has assured that he will not be signing on the affidavit and reassured me that he will not get married to the person mentioned in the invitation card.

8. I state that, after the court proceedings on 23-06-2026, the accused met me and when I confronted him about the affidavit filed, then he absconded and I was had no

information regarding his whereabouts. In order to speak to the accused. I have gone near his house and tried calling him but there was no response. The Parents of the accused came to know that I was near his house and the situation worsened and there were quarrel between me the accused parents. I had to call 112 helpline number for my safety and protection, and Hoysala Police came and I informed them about the entire situation tried to resolve the situation. During the same, the Parents of the accused admitted that the wedding invitation card is not genuine and there is no wedding of the accused taking place on 09-07-2026. Further, they also admitted that the wedding invitation card was printed and submitted to this Court based on the instructions of the advocate who represents the Accused.

9. I state that, the transcript (relevant portion is highlighted in Pg No. No.6, 10, 11 & 12 of the conversation between me and the parents of the accused with the presence of Hoysala Police Officials are submitted before this Court as Document No.1 and the audio recording is submitted as Document No.2.

10. I state that, this Court may consider this Affidavit along with the enclosed documents, and dismiss the petition filed by the accused. Further, this Court may take necessary action against the Accused petitioner, to provide justice, by punishing the accused for this wrongful acts.

Place: Bengaluru Sd/-
Date: 25.06.2026"

The audio script of the conversation between the complainant, sister of the complainant, parents of the petitioner and the Investigating Officer read as follows:

"Date of Recording: 23-06-2026

Time of Recording: Approximately 21:49 hrs

Audio File: "23-06-2026 21.49.m4a"

Language: Kannada

ಇತರರು: ಇಲ್ಲ ಪಕ್ಕ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾವನನ್ನ ಕೇಳಿ ಸರ್... ಹಾ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ಇದು ಮನೆಗೆ ಬರಲ್ವಾ? ಯಾವುದು ಸರ್?
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಇವತ್ತು ಬರ್ತಾರೋ ಇಲ್ಲೋ ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಬಂದ್ಯಲ್ಲ ಸರ್, ನಾನು ಎರಡು ಹೊತ್ತು ಊಟ ಮಾಡಿಟ್ಟು ಮಲಗಿದ್ದೀನಿ. ನಾನು ಮೇಲೆ ಮಲಗಿದ್ದ.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ನೀವು ಯಾಕೆ ಸರ್ ಯಾವತ್ತಿಂದ ಹಿಂಗೆ ಮಾಡ್ತೀರಾ?
XXXXX: ಸರ್ ನೆನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಸರ್. ನಾನೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಜೊತೇಲಿ ಇದ್ದೀನಿ. ಸಾವಿರ ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡ್ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಉಗುಸ್ಕೊಂಡವರೆ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಹೌದು, ನನ್ನ ಮಗ ಲೇಟ್ ಬಂದ್ರೆ ನಾವು ಬಿಡ್ತೀವಾ ಸರ್?
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ಈಗ ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ (ಮಹಿಳೆಗೆ): ಅಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ, ನೀವಲ್ಲಾರ... ಬಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಉಗುಸ್ಕೋತೀರಾ ಅಂದ್ರೆ ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಕಳೆಯೋಕೆ...
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ :ಏನ್ ಅಮ್ಮ, ನೀನು ಹಿಂಗೆ ಮಾತಾಡ್ತೀಯಾ? ಇವಾಗ ಬಂದು ಮಲಗಿದ್ದ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ರೆ ಅರ್ಥ ಏನು ಅದು?
XXXXX: ತೋರ್ಸಲಾ?
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಏನು ಬೇಡ, ನೀನು ಏನು ತೋರ್ಸೋಕ್ ಹೋಗ್ಬೇಡ. ಈ ತರ ತೋರ್ಸಿ, ಈ ತರ ಮಾಡಿ ಇನ್ನೇನು ಯಾರಾದ್ರೂ ಇದು ಮಾಡ್ತಾರಾ?
XXXXX: ಏನು ಮಾಡೋದು ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಮಾಡ್ತೀನಿ ಏನ್ ಮಾಡೋದು ಅಂತ.

ಭಾಗ ೨: ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ವರ್ಸಸ್ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಳಪ್ಪ... ಕೋರ್ಟಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೀತಾ ಇದ್ಯಲ್ಲ ಯಾಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಮಾಡ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಾ?
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ಅವನು ಬರ್ಬೇಕು ಮಾತಾಡ್ತೀನಿ. ಕೋರ್ಟಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೀತಿರುವಾಗ ನಾನು
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ:* ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾಕೆ ಇರ್ತೀರಾ ನೀವು? ಕೋರ್ಟಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸ್ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೋಂಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ.
XXXXX: ನನಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಆಗಿರೋದು ಈ ಮನೇಲಿ
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಈ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲ.

XXXXX: ಈ ಮನೇಲೇ!

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ನಮಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧನೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ನೀನು...

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಇದು ಹೆಂಗೆ ಈ ತರ ನೀವು... ನೀವಲ್ಲ ಸುಮ್ನಿರಿ... ನಾವು ಮಾಡಲ್ಲ ಕೇಳ್ರಮ್ಮ... ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಯಾರು... ನಮ್ಮಿಬ್ಬರು ಏಜ್ ಆಗಿರೋರ ಹತ್ರ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಆಟ ಆಡಬೇಡಿ. ಇಲ್ಬಾ ನಾನೇ ಇಲ್ಲೇನಾದ್ರು ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಂಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತೆ.

XXXXX: ನಾನು ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಂತೀನಿ. ಇಲ್ಲೇ ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಂತೀನಿ. ನನಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಆಗಿರೋದು ಇದೇ ಮನೇಲಿ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಬೇಡ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೇಲಿ ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಂಬೇಡ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೇಲಿ ಆಗಿರೋಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯನೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಿಂದು ಏನಿದ್ಯೋ ಅದು ಎಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡ್ಕೊ್ಳೀತೀಯೋ ನೋಡ್ಕೊ್ಳೀ ಹೋಗು. ಸರ್ ಜೊತೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀಯಾ, ಸರ್ ಜೊತೇಲಿ ಹೋಗ್ಬೇಕು ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನೀನು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಏನಿದ್ಯೋ ಮಾತಾಡ್ಕೋ

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಸರ್ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರೋದು ಮನೆಗೆ ಅವರೇ. ನಮಗೆ ಅವರ ಹತ್ರ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನಾವು ಮಾತಾಡ್ತಾ ಇರೋದು.

ಇತರರು :ನಾನೇ ಅದೇ ತರ ಬೆಳಗಿನ ಜಾವದ ತನಕ ನಂಬಿಸಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟೆ ಬಿ, ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ಹಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು, ನಿಮಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೋಪ ಬಂದಿರಲ್ಲ?

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಪಾಪ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ನೀವೆಲ್ಲ ಏನ್ ಮಾತಾಡ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಾ... ಇವತ್ತಿಂದ ಏನಾದ್ರು ಬಂದು ನಮಗೇನಾದ್ರು ಇದು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀವಿ, ನಮಗೆ ಇದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀವಿ ಅಂತ ನಾವು ಇನ್ನುವರೆಗೂ ಒಂದು ದಿನ ನೋಡಿರ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದಿನ ಬಂದಾಗ ನೋಡಿರೋದು ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನಾನು.

ಭಾಗ ೩: ರಾಜೀ ಸಂಧಾನದ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ಸುತ್ತಿ ಬಳಸಿ ಯಾಕೆ ಮಾತಾಡ್ತಾರೆ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಎಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಕರ್ಸಿ ಮಾತಾಡಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಏನ್ ಹೇಳ್ತಾನೆ ಕೇಳಿ, ಅವನು ಏನು ಹೇಳ್ತಾನೆ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಡಿಪೆಂಡ್.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಸರಿ ಸರ್... ಕೋರ್ಟಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸ್ ನಡೀತಾ ಇದೆ ನಡೀಲಿ. ಅದೇನ್ ಡಿಸೈಡ್ ಆಗ್ತದೆ ಆಗ್ಲಿ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹುಡುಗ ಎಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾನೆ?

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಸರ್ ಅದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಹೋಗಿರೋದು ಆಫೀಸ್ ಗೆ ಇನ್ನು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರೇ ಹೋಗಿ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಂಪ್ಲೇಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡಿರೋದು.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿ. ಯಾವ ಫೋನ್ ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡ್ತಾನೆ ನೋಡಿ, ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿರ್ತಾನೆ, ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕರ್ಸಿರಿ. ಈಗ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಆಗಿರೋದು ಅವರಿಬ್ಬರ ನಡುವೆ ಅಲ್ವಾ, ಕರ್ಸಿ ಮಾತಾಡಿ. ಏನಿದೆ ಅವರು ಬೇಕಾದ್ರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಲ್ಲಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಸರ್ ಅವ್ರು ಏನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಳ್ತಾರೋ, ಅದನ್ನೇ ಬೇಕಾದ್ರೆ ಅನುಭವಿಸ್ಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ನಮಗೆ ಏನು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಸರ್ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

XXXXX ಳ ಅಕ್ಕ: ಇವತ್ತು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಅಂದ್ರೆ, ಮಗನ್ ಕರ್ಸಿರಿ ನಾವು ಕೇಳ್ಕೊಂತೀವಿ.

ಭಾಗ ೪: ವಿಡಿಯೋ ರೆಕಾರ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ಜಗಳ

XXXXX ಳ ಅಕ್ಕ: ಬಿಡಮ್ಮ ಅಲ್ಲಿ.... ಯಾಕ್ರೀ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಎಂಟ್ರಿ ಮಾಡ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಾ? ನೀವು ಒಂದು ವಿಡಿಯೋ ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ನೋಡಿ... ನಮ್ ಇದಿಲ್ದೆ ತೆಗಿಬೇಡ್ರಿ, ನಾವು ತೆಗಿತೀವಿ ನಿಮ್ದು ವಿಡಿಯೋ. ಕೂತ್ಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಮನೇಲಿ...

XXXXX ಳ ಅಕ್ಕ: Who are you to take my video? Delete ಮಾಡಿ ಇವಾಗ! ಸರ್ ವಿಡಿಯೋ ಡಿಲೀಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಸರ್... ನನ್ನ ಫೇಸ್ ಬರ್ಕೂಡದು ವಿಡಿಯೋದಲ್ಲಿ, ವಿಥೌಟ್ ಮೈ ಪರ್ಮಿಷನ್ ವಿಡಿಯೋ ಯಾರು ತೆಗಿಬಾರದು ಸರ್.

XXXXX ಳ ಅಕ್ಕ: ಡಿಲೀಟ್ ಮಾಡ್ಸಿ ಸರ್ ವಿಡಿಯೋನ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ವಿಡಿಯೋ ಡಿಲೀಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ:ಈ ತರ ಮನೆಗೆ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬಹುದಾ?

ಭಾಗ ೫: ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಎಂಗೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ವಿಚಾರ

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ನಿಮ್ ಮಗನಿಗೆ ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರೇ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಬರ್ತಾನೋ ಇಲ್ವೋ ಅಂತ ಕೇಳಿ. ಬರ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ ಅಂದ್ರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಬೇಕಾದ್ರೆ ಎಚ್ .ಎ.ಎಲ್ ಪೋಲಿಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಗೆ...

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ನಾನು ಕಳಿಸ್ತೀನಿ ಇರಿ ಸರ್. ನಿಮ್ದು ಏನು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಇದೆ ಕುಮಾರಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಲೇಔಟ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಗೆ ಬನ್ನಿ...

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಸರ್ ನಾವಂತೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಎಚ್.ಜೆ ಪಾಳ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿಲ್ಲ ಸರ್. ನಾವು ಕುಮಾರಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಲೇಔಟ್ ಅಲ್ಲೇ ನಮ್ದು ಕಂಪ್ಲೇಂಟ್ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದು. ಈಗ ಬಂದು ಮನೆ ಹತ್ರ ಬಂದು ಗಲಾಟೆ, ಕೇಸ್ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಹೆಂಗೆ ಮನೆ ಹತ್ರ ಬಂದು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡ್ತಾರೆ ಸರ್?

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಮನೆಗೆ ಬರೋದು ಬೇಡ. ಆಯ್ತು ನೀವು ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಹತ್ರ ಬನ್ನಿ ಅವರೂ ಬರ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಬಂದು ಮಾತಾಡೋಣ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಖಂಡಿತ ಬರ್ತೀವಿ ಸರ್. ಯಾರ್ ಮಗ ಬಂದರೂ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗನೂ ಕರ್ಸಿ. ನಮ್ಮಮ್ಮ ಈಗ ಅವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಇಲ್ಲ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳ್ತಾವನೆ. ಬರೋವರೆಗೂ ಕಾಯ್ತಿನಿ ಸರ್.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ: ನಂಬರ್ ಕೊಡಿ... ನಂಬರ್ ಹೇಳಮ್ಮ.

XXXXX: 9902088866.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಕೇಳಿ ಸರ್ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಅಂದ್ಬಿಟ್ಟು.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಬೇಡಪ್ಪ, ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು ಬಿಡಮ್ಮ, ಸರ್, ನಮ್ಮದು ನಾವು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಬರಬೇಕು ಬರ್ತೀವಿ ಮಾತಾಡ್ತೀವಿ ಸರ್.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಅಲ್ಲ ಅಲ್ಲ, ನೀವು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸರಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹುಡುಗ ಅವನು ಕೆಲಸದ ಟೈಮಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಏನ್ರೀ?
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಸರ್, ಅವರು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಟೈಮಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಅವನು ಬರೋದು ರಾತ್ರಿ 10:00 ಗಂಟೆ 11:00 ಗಂಟೆ 12:00 ಗಂಟೆ ಆದ್ರೂ ಒನ್ ಒಂದ್ ಸಲ ಬರ್ತಾನೆ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಇವಾಗ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದೇ ಜಾಬ್ ನಡೀತಾ ಇರೋದು ಅಷ್ಟೇ. ಎಸಿ ಗೆ ಜಾಬ್ ನಡೀತಾ ಇದೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಲೇಟ್ ಆಗ್ತಿವಿ ಅಷ್ಟೇ.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಹೋಗಿ ಅವನ ಫ್ರೆಂಡ್ಸ್ ಗಾದ್ರು ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿ, ಕೆಲಸ ಮುಗಿತಾ ಅಪ್ಪ? ಎಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾನೆ? ಇನ್ನು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಯಾರೋ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾರೋ ರಿಲೇಷನ್ ಅವನ ಫ್ರೆಂಡ್ಸ್ ಕಾಯ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಸರ್, ನಾವು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಕಳಿಸ್ತೀವಿ ಇವರನ್ನ ಸರ್. ಇವರನ್ನ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಸರ್.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಕೇಳಮ್ಮ, ನಿಮ್ಮಂತ ಕಂಪ್ಲೆಂಟ್ 1000 ಕಂಪ್ಲೈಂಟ್ ಅಟೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀವಿ ನಾವು. ಇವಾಗ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಮಾತಾಡ್ತಾವನೆ ಅಲ್ವಾ? ಅವನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಬಂದ್ರೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯುತ್ತೆ. ಈಗ ನಿಮ್ಮದೇನು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗಂದು ಅವರದು.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಹೌದು ಸರ್.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ಬಂದ್ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮಾತಾಡಿದ್ರೆ, ಅದು ಏನಿದೆ ಬೇಕಾದ್ರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಹತ್ರ ಮಾತಾಡ್ತೀರೋ ಇಲ್ಲ ಏನ್ ಮಾತಾಡ್ತೀರೋ ನಿಮಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು. ಫೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮುಗಿತಾ? ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಇದ್ದಾನಾ? ಏನ್ ಹೇಳ್ತಾನೆ?
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ:: ಲಾಯರ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬರ್ತೀನಿ ನಾಳೆ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಗೆ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಗೆ ಇವಾಗ್ಲೇ ಕಳಿಸ್ತೀವಿ ಹೋಗಿ ಸರ್.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಬೇಕಾದ್ರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೋಹನ್ ನ ಕೇಳಿ ಸರ್, ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಬೇಕಾದ್ರೆ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಬೇಡ ಬೇಡ ಅಮ್ಮ, ಇವರೆಲ್ಲ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಅಲ್ಲ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಕೇಳಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೋಹನ್ ನ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮೋಹನ್ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ. ನಾನು ಎಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಈ ಲೇಔಟ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದೀನಿ ಅನ್ನೋದು.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಯಾಕಪ್ಪ ನಮಗೆ ಇವರದೆಲ್ಲ ಇನ್ಸ್ಟ್ರುಯೆನ್ಸ್ ಬೇಡ. ನಮ್ಮದು ಏನಿದೆ ಅದು ಮಾತಾಡೋಣ.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಅಲ್ಲ ಇದು ನಿಮ್ಮದು ಅಲ್ಲ ನಮ್ಮದು ಅಲ್ಲ ಅರ್ಥ ಆಯ್ತಾ? ಅವರಿಬ್ಬರು ಏನೋ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬುದ್ದಿ ಇಲ್ಲ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಹೌದು ಸರ್. ಸರ್ ಅದನ್ನ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನಮ್ಮ ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ತಲೆ ಮೇಲೆ ತಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನಾವು ಸಾಯೋದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಸರ್?
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಹೌದು ಆಗುತ್ತೆ ಅದು.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಮತ್ತೆ ನಮಗೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧನೇ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಯಾರೇ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರಲಿ ಸರ್, ಪೇರೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಇದ್ದೀವಿ ಅಲ್ವಾ? ನಮಗೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ಇವಳಿಗೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೆ ಏನು ಗೊತ್ತಿರುತ್ತೆ? ಇವತ್ತಿಗೂ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ ತಾಯಿನ ನಾವು ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಏನು ಇಲ್ಲ, ಇವಳು ಒಂದು ಹೆಣ್ಣುಮಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸಲ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೀವಿ ಅಷ್ಟೇ. ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಳಲ್ಲ...
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಹೌದು ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೀವಿ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಇವತ್ತು ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಾ.
XXXXX: ಎರಡು ಸರಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀನಿ.
XXXXX: ಇವತ್ತು ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಾ, ಹೌದು ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಾ. ಊಟ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೀನಿ ಆ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಹೌದು
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಹೌದಪ್ಪ,
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ:ಇವಾಗ ನೀವು ಏನೇ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದು ನಿಜ.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಫೋನ್ ಪಿಕ್ ಮಾಡ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಹ್ಮ್...

(ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಗುವಿನ ಧ್ವನಿ ಮತ್ತು ಫೋನ್ ಡಯಲ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಶಬ್ದ ಕೇಳಿಸುತ್ತದೆ: ಅಪ್ಪ 9686 ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಅಂತ)

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ನೋಡಿ ಈಗ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಬಂದ್ರೆ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಹತ್ರ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ. ಇಲ್ಲ ಅಂದ್ರೆ ಇವಾಗ ಈಗ ನೋಡಿ ಇವಾಗ ಅವರು ಬರ್ತಾರೆ, ಬಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಮೊದಲೇ ಮನೆ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಬೇಡ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿರೋದು ಈಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲೂ ಕೆಳಗಡೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಇರೋರು ಇರ್ತಾರೆ, ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಆಗೋದು ಬೇಡ ಇವಾಗ. ಅವರು ಬಂದ್ರೆ ಅವರ ಮಗ ಬಂದ್ರೆ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬರ್ತಾರೆ ಅಷ್ಟೇ, ನೀವು ಬಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತಾಡಿ. ನೀವು ಆಲ್ರೆಡಿ ಈಗ ನೀವು ಎಚ್ ಜೆ ಪಾಳ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಲ್ರೆಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಎಫ್ಐಆರ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಸರ್, ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೀತಾ ಇದೆ. ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೀತಾ ಇದೆ. ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೀತಾ ಇದೆ.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2:* ಅವರು ಬಂದಿದ್ದು ಒಂದೇ ತಾನೇ ಕೇಳಿದೆ, ಮದುವೆ ಒಂಬತ್ತನೇ ತಾರೀಕು ಏನು ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡ್ಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದೊಂದೇ ತಾನೇ ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು. ಅದು ಇವತ್ತೆ ಅಂತ ಅಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ, ಮುಂಚೆನೆ ಆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿನ. ನನಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೋದರೆ ತಾನೇ. ಕರ್ಸಿ ದಿನ, ಏನಿದೆ ನನಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅವರ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಸಮಾಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗಂದು...

ಇತರರು:* ಸರ್, ಹಾ... ಇದು ನೀವು ಲವ್ ಮಾಡೋಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆನೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತಾ?
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಇಲ್ಲ.
ಇತರರು: ಇಲ್ವಾ, ನೋಡಿ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಇಲ್ಲ, ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಯಾವುದು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಲೇಯ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಹುಡುಗನ ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತಲ್ಲ, ಅವರದ್ದಾಗಿರೋದು, ನಮ್ಮದ್ದಾ?
ಇತರರು: ಯಾವ ತಾರೀಕು?
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಹ್ಮ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಸರ್, ನಾನು ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನ ಯಾವಾಗ ಭೇಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಅಮ್ಮ?
XXXXX: ಅಮ್ಮ, ನಿಮಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಭೇಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ನಾನು? ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ವಾ?
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಇರಬಹುದು.
*ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ನೀವೇನಿದೆ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಗೊತ್ತಿತ್ತಂತೆ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳ್ತಾರೆ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಹೌದು ಗೊತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಹೌದು ಕರೆದವರಲ್ಲ.
XXXXX: * ಗೊತ್ತಿತ್ತು, ನಾನೇ ಇವರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದು. ಯಾರು ಕರೆದಿರೋದು ನನಗೆ? ನನ್ನ ಒಂದನೇ ತಾರೀಕು ಬಂದುಬಿಟ್ಟು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವಾ? ಅವಾಗ ನಾನು ಕರೆದೆ, ನೋಡಪ್ಪ ಒಂದನೇ ತಾರೀಕು... ಒಂದ್ಸಲ ಫೋರ್ತ್ ಅನ್ಸುತ್ತೆ.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ಹಂಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾತಾಡಬೇಡ್ರಿ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಗೆ ಕರೆದೆ ನಾನು.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಕೇಳ್ರಿ, ಇವನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ, ನೀವು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗನನ್ನು ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ. ಆಯ್ತಾ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಗೆ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ. ಅವರಿಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಬಿಡಿ ಮಾತಾಡೋಕೆ, ಅವರು ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾತಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಅರ್ಥ ಆಯ್ತಾ? ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಲೈಫ್ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಯಾರು ಬಂದವರ ಲೈಫ್ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಇದು ನಿಮ್ಮದು ಅಲ್ಲ. ಪಾಪ ನಿನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ನಿಮ್ಮ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಯಾಕೆ ಅವನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಆಗಿರೋದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಟೆನ್ಷನ್.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: * ಹೌದು ಸರ್, ಟೆನ್ಷನ್. ಆಯ್ತಾ?
*ಹುಡುಗನ ತಂದೆ: * ಸರ್ ಆ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿರೋದು. ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಇವಾಗ ಇವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಂಪ್ಲೆಂಟ್ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಆಗಿರೋದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಟೆನ್ಷನ್ ಅಷ್ಟೇ.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಕಂಪ್ಲೈಂಟ್ ಆಗಿ ಆಲ್ರೆಡಿ ಒಂದು ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳು, ಒಂಬತ್ತು ತಿಂಗಳು ಆಗಿದೆ.
ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಹ್ಮ್ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದು.

ಇತರರ : ಬಿಫೋರ್ ಒಂದ್ಸಲ ಇವರೇನು ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡ್ಕೊಬೇಕಾದ್ರೆನೆ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಆಗಿತ್ತು, ಎಫ್ಐಆರ್ ಆಗಿ ಫೈಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಗೆ...

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಇಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆದಾಗ ಏನು ಇಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ, ಇಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ.

ಇತರರು: ಗೊತ್ತಿರೋ ವಿಷಯ. ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ ನಮಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ನೀವು ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ನೋಡಪ್ಪ ಇಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ಇಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದು ನಮಗೆ ಏನು ಗೊತ್ತಾ ಕೇಳಿ?

ಇತರರು:ಇಲ್ಲ ವಾದ ಮಾಡೋಕೆ ಬರಬೇಡಿ, ವಿಷಯ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಸಮಯ ವೇಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಇದು ಮಾಡ್ಬೇಡಿ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ನಾವು ಎಂಗೇಜ್ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿರೋದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀವಿ ಅಷ್ಟೇ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಒಂಬತ್ತನೇ ತಾರೀಕು ಮದುವೆ ಆಗ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ ತಾನೇ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗಂದು?

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಒಂಬತ್ತನೇ ತಾರೀಕು ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡ್ತಾ

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಇಲ್ಲ... ಇಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಲ್ಲ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಅಂದ್ರೆ ಅವರು ಈ ಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಇದು ಮಾqÉÆiÃರು ಕಳಿಸಿದರೆ?

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ಇಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲ್ಲ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದು ಕ್ಲಿಯರ್ ಆUÉâÃಕು. ಆಯ್ತು.

XXXXX: ಸರ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆಯಾ ಕೇಳಿ ಸರ್.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಅಯ್ಯೋ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಗಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ ರೀ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಅಂದ್ರೆ, ಆಯ್ತು ಒಂದು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಿ ಅಂದಿದ್ದು.

XXXXX: ಏನಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇಡಂ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದು? ಏನಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದು ಕೇಳಿ ಸರ್, ನನಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಬೇಕು.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾಕೆ ಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮಾriದ್ದಾರೆ, ಏನ್ ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಾ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗಂದು?

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಸರ್, ಲಾಯರ್ ಕೇಳಿದ್ರು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀವಿ. ಲಾಯರ್ ಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು, ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾ? ಆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಾಯಿ: ಮದುವೆ ಆಗ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ ಸರ್. ಒಂದು ಅದು ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಹೋಗಿದೆಯಾ?

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ನಾನು ಕೇ½Üರೋದು ಅವರಿಗೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕ£Àಮರ್ಮ ಆದ್ರೆ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 2: ನೋಡಿ ಬರ್ಲಿ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗ ಬಂದ್ರೆ ಕರ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಾಂದ್ರೆ ನೀವು ಲೇಡೀಸ್ ಬರೋದು ಬೇಡ, ಅವರವರ ತಂದೆ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಕಳಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಳಿ, ಅದೇ ಅದೇ ಹೇಳ್ತಿನಿ. ಈ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಗಳದ್ದು ಯಾವುದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಆಗೋವರೆಗೂ...

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಹೌದು.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ 1: ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಗಂದು ಯಾವುದೇ ಮದುವೆ ಅದು ಇದು ಮಾqÉâÃಡಿ.

ಚೇತನ್ ಅವರ ತಂದೆ: ಆಯ್ತು. ಖಂಡಿತ, ಹೌದು ಸರ್."

Therefore, on these seriously contested facts and credibility of narrative and counter narrative, as also the audio script, this becomes a fit case for investigation in the least, rather than summary adjudication in the proceedings seeking quashing of FIR.

16. It becomes apposite, in this regard, to refer to the judgment of the Apex Court in **PRADEEP KUMAR KESARWANI v. STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH**[1]**,** wherein it is held as follows:

> "…. …. ….
>
> **18.** There is a clear distinction between rape and consensual sex and in a case where there is a promise of marriage, the Court must very carefully examine whether the accused had actually wanted to marry the victim, or had mala fide motives and had made a false promise to this effect only to satisfy his lust, as the latter falls in the ambit of cheating or deception."

The Apex Court holds that in cases of rape on false promise of marriage, the Courts must examine if accused made promise only to satisfy his lust, as there is a clear distinction between rape and consensual sex.

---

[1] **2025 SCC OnLine SC 1947**

17. It is further apposite to refer to the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **KAPTAN SINGH v. STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH[2],** wherein it has been held as follows:

"…. …. ….

> **9.1. At the outset, it is required to be noted that in the present case the High Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,, has quashed the criminal proceedings for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 406, 329 and 386 IPC. It is required to be noted that when the High Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,, quashed the criminal proceedings, by the time the investigating officer after recording the statement of the witnesses, statement of the complainant and collecting the evidence from the incident place and after taking statement of the independent witnesses and even statement of the accused persons, has filed the charge-sheet before the learned Magistrate for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 406, 329 and 386 IPC and even the learned Magistrate also took the cognizance.** From the impugned judgment and order [Radhey Shyam Gupta v. State of U.P., 2020 SCC OnLine All 914] passed by the High Court, it does not appear that the High Court took into consideration the material collected during the investigation/inquiry and even the statements recorded. **If the petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,, was at the stage of FIR in that case the allegations in the FIR/complaint only are required to be considered and whether a cognizable offence is disclosed or not is required to be considered. However, thereafter when the statements are recorded, evidence is collected and the charge-sheet is filed after conclusion of the investigation/inquiry the matter stands on different footing and the Court is required to consider the material/evidence collected during the investigation.** Even at this stage

[2] **(2021) 9 SCC 35**

also, as observed and held by this Court in a catena of decisions, the High Court is not required to go into the merits of the allegations and/or enter into the merits of the case as if the High Court is exercising the appellate jurisdiction and/or conducting the trial. As held by this Court in Dineshbhai Chandubhai Patel [Dineshbhai Chandubhai Patel v. State of Gujarat, (2018) 3 SCC 104 : (2018) 1 SCC (Cri) 683] in order to examine as to whether factual contents of FIR disclose any cognizable offence or not, the High Court cannot act like the investigating agency nor can exercise the powers like an appellate court. It is further observed and held that that question is required to be examined keeping in view, the contents of FIR and prima facie material, if any, requiring no proof. **At such stage, the High Court cannot appreciate evidence nor can it draw its own inferences from contents of FIR and material relied on. It is further observed it is more so, when the material relied on is disputed. It is further observed that in such a situation, it becomes the job of the investigating authority at such stage to probe and then of the court to examine questions once the charge-sheet is filed along with such material as to how far and to what extent reliance can be placed on such material.**

9.2. In Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar [Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar v. State of Maharashtra, (2019) 18 SCC 191 : (2020) 3 SCC (Cri) 672] after considering the decisions of this Court in Bhajan Lal [State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 : 1992 SCC (Cri) 426] , it is held by this Court that exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,, to quash the proceedings is an exception and not a rule. It is further observed that inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,, though wide is to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution, only when such exercise is justified by tests specifically laid down in the section itself. It is further observed that appreciation of evidence is not permissible at the stage of quashing of proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., Similar view has been expressed by this Court in Arvind Khanna [CBI v. Arvind Khanna, (2019) 10 SCC 686 : (2020) 1 SCC (Cri) 94]

, Managipet [State of Telangana v. Managipet, (2019) 19 SCC 87 : (2020) 3 SCC (Cri) 702] and in XYZ [XYZ v. State of Gujarat, (2019) 10 SCC 337 : (2020) 1 SCC (Cri) 173] , referred to hereinabove.

9.3. Applying the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid decisions to the facts of the case on hand, we are of the opinion that the High Court has exceeded its jurisdiction in quashing the criminal proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,

10. The High Court has failed to appreciate and consider the fact that there are very serious triable issues/allegations which are required to be gone into and considered at the time of trial. The High Court has lost sight of crucial aspects which have emerged during the course of the investigation. The High Court has failed to appreciate and consider the fact that the document i.e. a joint notarised affidavit of Mamta Gupta Accused 2 and Munni Devi under which according to Accused 2 Ms Mamta Gupta, Rs 25 lakhs was paid and the possession was transferred to her itself is seriously disputed. It is required to be noted that in the registered agreement to sell dated 27-10-2010, the sale consideration is stated to be Rs 25 lakhs and with no reference to payment of Rs 25 lakhs to Ms Munni Devi and no reference to handing over the possession. However, in the joint notarised affidavit of the same date i.e. 27-10-2010 sale consideration is stated to be Rs 35 lakhs out of which Rs 25 lakhs is alleged to have been paid and there is a reference to transfer of possession to Accused 2. Whether Rs 25 lakhs has been paid or not the accused have to establish during the trial, because the accused are relying upon the said document and payment of Rs 25 lakhs as mentioned in the joint notarised affidavit dated 27-10-2010. It is also required to be considered that the first agreement to sell in which Rs 25 lakhs is stated to be sale consideration and there is reference to the payment of Rs 10 lakhs by cheques. It is a registered document. The aforesaid are all triable issues/allegations which are required to be considered at the time of trial. The High Court has failed to notice and/or consider the material collected during the investigation.

11. Now so far as the finding recorded by the High Court that no case is made out for the offence under Section 406 IPC is concerned, it is to be noted that the High Court itself has noted that the joint notarised affidavit dated 27-10-2010 is seriously disputed, however as per the High Court the same is required to be considered in the civil proceedings. There the High Court has committed an error. Even the High Court has failed to notice that another FIR has been lodged against the accused for the offences under Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC with respect to the said alleged joint notarised affidavit. Even according to the accused the possession was handed over to them. However, when the payment of Rs 25 lakhs as mentioned in the joint notarised affidavit is seriously disputed and even one of the cheques out of 5 cheques each of Rs 2 lakhs was dishonoured and according to the accused they were handed over the possession (which is seriously disputed) it can be said to be entrustment of property. Therefore, at this stage to opine that no case is made out for the offence under Section 406 IPC is premature and the aforesaid aspect is to be considered during trial. It is also required to be noted that the first suit was filed by Munni Devi and thereafter subsequent suit came to be filed by the accused and that too for permanent injunction only. Nothing is on record that any suit for specific performance has been filed. Be that as it may, all the aforesaid aspects are required to be considered at the time of trial only.

12. Therefore, the High Court has grossly erred in quashing the criminal proceedings by entering into the merits of the allegations as if the High Court was exercising the appellate jurisdiction and/or conducting the trial. The High Court has exceeded its jurisdiction in quashing the criminal proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,

13. Even the High Court has erred in observing that original complaint has no locus. The aforesaid observation is made on the premise that the complainant has not placed on record the power of attorney along with the counter filed before the High Court. However, when it is

> specifically stated in the FIR that Munni Devi has executed the power of attorney and thereafter the investigating officer has conducted the investigation and has recorded the statement of the complainant, accused and the independent witnesses, thereafter whether the complainant is having the power of attorney or not is to be considered during trial.
>
> 14. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above, the impugned judgment and order [Radhey Shyam Gupta v. State of U.P., 2020 SCC OnLine All 914] passed by the High Court quashing the criminal proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., is unsustainable and the same deserves to be quashed and set aside and is accordingly quashed and set aside. Now, the trial is to be conducted and proceeded further in accordance with law and on its own merits. It is made clear that the observations made by this Court in the present proceedings are to be treated to be confined to the proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C., only and the trial court to decide the case in accordance with law and on its own merits and on the basis of the evidence to be laid and without being influenced by any of the observations made by us hereinabove. The present appeal is accordingly allowed."
>
> (Emphasis supplied)

The Apex Court holds that this Court should not interfere at the stage of crime, if the case projected is shrouded with seriously disputed questions of fact, which the case on hand is. The crime is registered on 10-01-2026. This petition is preferred on 17-01-2026 and there is an interim order of stay. Therefore, no investigation worth the name has happened in the case at hand, while the

fulcrum of the complaint cried for investigation. In the light of the aforesaid facts and the judgments of the Apex Court, I decline to extend the protective hand of this Court under Section 528 of the BNS to nip the crime in the bud.

18. Finding no merit in the petition, the petition stands **dismissed**. Interim order, if any operating, shall stand dissolved. Consequently, I.A.No.2 of 2026 stand disposed.

It is made clear that the observations made during the course of this order are only for the purpose of consideration of the case of the petitoner under Section 528 of the BNSS and the same would not bind or influence the FIR and further proceedings pending before the concerned Court.

Sd/-
(M.NAGAPRASANNA)
JUDGE

Bkp
CT:MJ