News

Vachanananda Swamiji's anticipatory bail in the POCSO case is revoked by the Karnataka High Court.

lawread



The High Court observed that the victim was not heard and that bail was given prior to the complaint being registered.

Veerashaiva Lingayitha Panchamasali Peetha and Vachanananda Swamiji

In a case involving accusations under the Protection of **Children from Sexual Offenses (POCSO) Act, the Karnataka High Court on Thursday revoked the anticipatory bail granted to Vachanananda Swamiji, Jagadguru of the Panchamasali Peetha in Harihar.**
Judge M Nagaprasanna granted the victim's petition contesting the issuance of anticipatory bail, ruling that interference was needed due to the way pre-arrest bail was given.
This Court is troubled by the way pre-arrest bail is issued because it is provided for offenses covered by Sections 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 of the POCSO Act one week before the complaint is actually registered. Therefore, it is not just the filing of the charge sheet that results in the obliteration of the subject order, but rather the offense and the way in which it is issued."

M. Nagaprasanna, Justice

Lawread

The Court made it clear that an order granting anticipatory bail is not terminated by the mere submission of a charge sheet.
The judge declared, "In that light, I deem it appropriate to obliterate this order and reserve liberty to the petitioner to knock at the doors of the appropriate court to seek regular bail."

To allow him to visit the appropriate court and request ordinary bail, the Court did, however, grant him three weeks of protection from arrest.
The Bench further noted that anticipatory bail was granted without the victim being heard, which was another reason to overturn the ruling.

The Court stated that "the very fact that the victim has not been heard in a case concerning POCSO would also be a ground for obliteration of the order granting bail."
The victim's attorney contended at the hearing that a "pre-FIR anticipatory blanket order" had been issued before to the case's registration.
In order to file an **application for ordinary bail, the Swamiji's attorney requested a four-week extension of protection.**

"Until you take bail, you don't utter any vachana," the Bench said orally.Please keep silent; my name is Vachananda alone. You threaten the witness, but why? On its face, this

(anticipatory bail) order could not have been approved.

On May 2, a special court in Davanagere granted Vachanananda Swamiji anticipatory bail, citing social media statements by a mutt trustee that implied attempts were being made to unjustly incriminate him during an administrative conflict within the Peetha.

The Veerashaiva Lingayatha Panchamasali Peetha was founded in 2008, according to **the Swamiji's plea before the special court. Internal disagreements about its management emerged when Dr. Mahanta Shivacharya Swamiji passed away in 2012.** According to Swamiji, he started accusing trustees of financial violations after assuming leadership as Jagadguru. This led to animosity and attempts to remove him from the Peetha.

He further claimed that trustees had encouraged parents of children staying at the camp to file complaints by threatening to file a POCSO case against him through interactions with the media. Additionally, he asserted that political animosity resulted from his participation in the **Panchamasali** reserve movement.

Lawread