Karnataka High Court

Sri.Mohan Kumar.V vs State By Mahadevapura on 29 July, 2009

Author: Subhash B.Adi

1:»: THE HIGH COURT or JGKRNATAKA, EANGA£:§3¥1\$ DATED '1"!-{IS THE 29TH DAY 03' JULY wrong 'A H THE I-fDR'BLE am. JUS'f'I\_f2E wwnrl \*iu~\IIuIlti lair' ¥lf'l□'\*&J§il"I.\\□''G WI?" WNW" K494:-V3JICW 'Jr □□□□□' H135??? ka□□□ EFT □□□□□"II\3UfI MKJWRW 'J7!' RIKKIVPIIHRR IF1§'L9l'¥ Ia': cmur No.252?:'or:"\_'2»'5'c9'=. BETWEEN V " V' 3RI.MOH3.N KUHAKV AGED ABOUT 3%' \* saw or a.vmn:o\$:\ 535.039 "

nesxnms Xi' r~Io.4\_\_'7, "1?EI§!GKT□"3k'P.MY couonv, Nam rm mvuum, -35\*, iwxymmsum, amsammgss□age, ~ ~ ' 5;

\_ .... \_ Q, swam BY MA}{A %9m§G'§A...

ecxnzm S'3'A't'IQN," V -\_ ' "

n£Pn.mge;i1~m:n BY-» 3'I\*ATE V. géuahgrik. PEF\_§I>5\$\_CU'£'O'I%;« ..... .. « \_ V assmxnmw ıv§.'ms5mmm, RC6?)

-I\*i::\$'1.\_;:1i£.'. § --.\_'□mn ws.43e CR.P.C 2? mm '=,A 'bv:.\*:\*.ATs "F.'OR,\_\_"'1"HE wrzrxcnsn PRAYING 1\*:-my ms

---- « H § ' § \* 3 ' . . 3 h E cwa'r\_": . MAY as 9233.359 '90 ENLARGE T'!-E A ii~'E?2'§!Iorx«l\\_...\\$3«NV'BAIL IN THE svszw or 3:5 Maw?: 14 '~7." .:,\$<1a\\$5\_'reg\absolute{aszlzooe} or THE RESPOHDENT POLICE on was eiimgaxgw cm was: saw 3991\* 341mm 9 szzmu, ma. 'SEE THIS FETITION '\$0!-1IRG OR FOR GRDSRB 11613 BA', THECOURT PASSED THE FQLLOWIHG: PETITIONER wumwwwes

-wvwjllmwvmmm wwra uwmamnwmummww mumwam wwwmm wI"' nmnamm ☐mmw &""NsW'W"5 wwmasam WV" W☐☐☐☐☐☐amtwm MKJUKE WW" WWWNMEMKM ?"'£Nwr"! LE. OREER wife is the <:uwJ.ai.nant. Sh\_§""\* A4 \*3 comlaint; before Hahadevapum \_ V A.\$'tL a\_t:i;crT:., aangalam City, can 31.1€:§;20 ☐8" «,£'s:\_T>r'i" T punishable under Sectigr; -i9 8\*.A '::\_ead '3t:§e: f:is§'txagL 3 and 4 at the Dawry P2::::}: ☐£:;bitV;.i.cs--::\_V' casén' is re§ist:ered izg:~'.,,\_Qri£ ☐#7"' She has alleged that aftéf ☐h ☐the petitiener has haras5{iI3§ haw': -~ as dwry.

**Iudge M51:**