



2025:KER:83853

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K. BABU

TUESDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2025 / 13TH KARTHIKA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 12074 OF 2025

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

**PS KRISHNADAS
AGED 52 YEARS
PODIKULANGARA HOUSE, MATHUR AGRAHARAM PO,
PALAKKAD, PIN - 678571.**

**BY ADVS.
SMT.P.V.UTTARA
SMT.SHILPA SOMAN**

RESPONDENTS/COMPLAINANT:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF
KERALA, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, KERALA, PIN - 682031.**
- 2 THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER
PALAKKAD NORTH POLICE STATION, PALAKKAD
DISTRICT, PIN - 686575.**

**BY ADVS
ADV M C ASHI SR PP
ADV SWETHA R FOR ADDLTHIRD RESPONDENT**

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
04.11.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**



K.BABU, J.

B.A.No.12074 of 2025

Dated this the 04th day of November, 2025

ORDER

This is an application filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS').

2. The petitioner has directly approached this Court without moving an application before the Sessions Court concerned.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that, as the victim in the case is a lawyer practicing in the Palakkad Bar Association, no lawyers practicing there are willing to accept his vakalat. Thus, the petitioner has placed an exceptional circumstance for making an application under Section 482 of BNSS directly before this Court.

4. The petitioner is the accused in Crime No.1061 /2025 of Palakkad Town North Police Station. The offences alleged against the petitioner are punishable under Sections 78 and 79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 119(a) and 119(b) of the Kerala Police Act, 2011.

5. The prosecution case is as follows:

On 09.09.2025, at about 18:50 hours, the defacto complainant boarded a private bus, namely 'Kandath Motors,'



from the Stadium Bus Stand, Palakkad. The accused also boarded the same bus, sat on the rear seat, and tried to take the complainant's photograph. When she questioned him, the petitioner made sexually coloured remarks towards her. The petitioner also harassed the complainant by making unwelcome and sexually coloured comments and by requesting sexual favours.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned for the defacto complainant/victim and the learned Public Prosecutor.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the ingredients of the offences under Section 75 of the BNS are not attracted from the allegations.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor produced the Case Diary. I have gone through the Case Diary, which reveals that the petitioner demanded sexual favours from the defacto complainant and also made sexually coloured remarks. The offences alleged are grave in nature. The petitioner is not entitled to the extraordinary remedy under Section 482 of BNSS.

In the result, the bail application stands dismissed.

Sd/-
K. BABU, JUDGE



2025:KER:83853

APPENDIX OF BAIL APPL. 12074/2025

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

Annexure I

ANNEXURE I