



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

WRIT PETITION NO. 17212 OF 2022 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

MR. K. CHALAPATHI REDDY,
S/O THIRUPATHI REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
R/AT 672, 6TH B CROSS,
BEHIND BDA COMPELX,
3RD BLOCK, KORAMANGALA,
BANGALORE-560034.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SUNIL KUMAR H.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA BY
THE HOME SECRETARY,
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BANGALORE-560001.
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
INFANTRY ROAD,
BANGALORE-560001.
3. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
(SOUTH-EAST), KORAMANGALA,
BANGALORE-560095.
4. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
KORAMANGALA POLICE STATION,
KORAMANGALA, BANGALORE-560095.
5. MR KALINGAPPA,
SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KORAMANGALA POLICE STATION,

Digitally signed
by ARUNKUMAR
M S

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



KORAMANGALA, BANGALORE-560095.

6. THE REGISTRAR GENERAL,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
DR AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE-560001.
7. MR DHURUVARAMA REDDY,
S/O KODANDA RAMA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.A802, A BLOCK,
SALARPURIA SENORITA,
SARJAPURA MAIN ROAD,
HALANAYAKANAHALLI,
BANGALORE-560035.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI MAHANTESH SHETTAR, AGA FOR R1 TO R5
(MA NOT FILED)
SMT SUSHEELA S, SENIOR COUNSEL A/W
SRI SOMANATHA H, ADVOCATE FOR R6)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE R1, TO 3 TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PETITIONER DTD 8.7.2022 AND TAKE ACTION AGAINST THE R5 FOR ABUSE OF PROCESS OF LAW AND DERELICTION OF DUTY VIDE ANNEXURE-A, A1 AND A2. ISSUE DIRECTIONS TO R1 AND 2 TO TRANSFER THE INVESTIGATION IN FIR NO.171/2021 REGISTERED IN KORAMANGALA POLICE STATION DTD 14.08.2021 TO THE CCB OR CID OF POLICE FOR INVESTIGATION VIDE ANNEXURE-D AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH



ORAL ORDER

Heard learned counsels appearing for the respective parties.

2. In this writ petition, the petitioner has sought for writ of mandamus against respondent Nos.1 to 3 to consider the representations dated 08.07.2022, against the respondent No.5 for abuse of process of law and dereliction of duty vide Annexure-A series, *inter-alia* sought for a direction to the Registrar General, High Court of Karnataka to initiate perjury proceedings against the accused person- Mr. Dhruvaram Reddy for producing fake and fabricated documents before this Court in CrI.P.No.4225/2021 (Annexure-C).

3. It is submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that, the petitioner is not pressing prayer (b). It is contented by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner is a complainant in Crime No.68/2020, Koramangala Police Station. It is argued by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner by referring to the order dated 06.07.2021 in CrI.P.No.4225/2021 (Annexure-C), wherein, the petitioner herein was arraigned as respondent No.2. In the said proceedings, respondent No. 5 had produced fake documents



before this Court and in this regard, the petitioner has approached the Koramangala Police Station, with regard to the abuse of power made allegation against the accused/respondent No.7 in this writ petition.

4. It is further argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that, the respondent No.5 colluded with respondent No.7 in respect of production of fake documents before this Court and that apart, it is a clear case of dereliction of duty by the respondent No.5, and therefore sought for interference of this Court.

5. Lastly, it is the case of the petitioner that the respondent Nos.1 to 3 be directed to consider the representations produced at Annexure-A series to take action against the respondent No.5, for having threatened the petitioner herein and joining hands with the respondent No.7 herein by delaying the investigation process and accordingly sought for interference of this Court.

6. Per contra, Smt.Susheela.S., learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri.Somanatha H., learned counsel for respondent No.6, referred to the judgment of this



Court at Annexure-C and submitted that no finding has been recorded by this Court as to the documents being forged or fake as contented by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, and what is forthcoming from the order passed by this Court in Crl.No.4225/2021 are only contentions raised by the parties and therefore, the prayer made in the writ petition does not survive for consideration.

7. Sri. Mahantesh Shettar, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 5 submitted that, the charge sheet is filed before the competent Court in Crime No.171/2021 and therefore, the writ petition does not survive for consideration.

8. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsels appearing for the respective parties and upon careful consideration of the arguments advanced by the learned counsels appearing for the parties, wherein, it is the grievance of the petitioner that respondent Nos.5 and 7 have colluded with each other to produce fabricated documents before this Court in Crl.No.4225/2021.



9. On careful examination of the observations made by this Court, it would indicate that, ultimately the criminal petition came to be rejected by order dated 06.07.2021. It is also not disputed by the parties that the investigation is completed and charge-sheet has been filed before the Competent Court.

10. In that view of the matter, though the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, vehemently, contended as to the involvement of respondent No.5 is concerned, however, it is open for the petitioner to approach the competent authority to take action against respondent No.5 in a manner known to law. However, this Court while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, cannot embark upon the averments made in the representation at Annexure-A series and to direct respondent Nos.1 to 3 to take action against respondent No.5 unless an enquiry is to be made in a particular proceeding as such.

11. In that view of the matter, I am of the opinion that respondent Nos.1 to 3 cannot be ordered to consider the



representations produced at Annexure series. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner as stated.

With this observation, the writ petition is ***disposed*** of.

Sd/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

NM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16