



CNR: KAHC010470912026

NC: 2026:KHC:36379-DB
WA No. 1726 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

WRIT APPEAL NO. 1726 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

1. MUTHOOT FINCORP LIMITED
A COMPANY REGISTERED UNDER
THE COMPANIES ACT, 1956
WITH ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT
MUTHOOT CENTRE
TC NO. 27/3022, PUNNEN ROAD
TRIVANDRUM
KERALA - 695 001
WITH ITS BRANCH OFFICE AT:
NO. 11 AND 11A, FIRST FLOOR
ABBIGERE MAIN ROAD
NEAR VISHNU SUPER MARKET
KAMMAGONDANAHALLI
BENGALURU - 560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS
AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE
MS. BINDU V.S.

...APPELLANT

(BY MS. SPOORTHY COTHA, ADVOCATE,
SRI HAROM TIWARI, ADVOCATE AND
SRI A.S. VISHWAJITH, ADVOCATE)



CNR: KAHC010470912026

NC: 2026:KHC:36379-DB
WA No. 1726 of 2026

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS HOME SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
DEPARTMENT OF HOME
BENGALURU - 560 001

2. SHIVAJINAGAR POLICE STATION
H.K.P ROAD, SHIVAJINAGAR
BENGALURU CITY - 560 051
REPRESENTED BY ITS
STATION HOUSE OFFICER
REPRESENTED BY
THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU - 560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI K.S. HARISH, GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 17/06/2026 IN W.P. NO.13166/2026 & ETC.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:



CNR: KAHC010470912026

**NC: 2026:KHC:36379-DB
WA No. 1726 of 2026**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal impugning an order dated 17.06.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.13166/2026 (GM-POLICE).
2. The appellant had filed the said writ petition, *inter alia*, impugning two notices, both dated 21.04.2026, issued by respondent No.2 (Shivajinagar Police Station) informing the appellant regarding registration of an FIR under Section 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) on the allegations of theft of gold jewellery/articles.
3. In the said case, accused No.1 (Sri Ameer Ahmed) had been arrested. He admitted the theft of the jewellery from the complainant's house and disclosed that he had pledged the same with the appellant in the name of accused No.2 (Sri Syed Ameen Ahmed). The appellant was called upon to produce the gold jewellery in the said case for investigation. The appellant had not



CNR: KAHC010470912026

produced the jewellery at the appointed time and therefore, respondent No.2 had once again called upon the appellant to produce the jewellery at 11.00 am on 22.04.2026.

4. The appellant did not comply with the notices and did not produce the gold jewellery pledged with it before the concerned officials. The appellant contended before the learned Single Judge that the gold jewellery pledged with it could not possibly be the allegedly stolen articles, as those articles had been pledged prior to the date of the alleged offence as mentioned in the FIR.

5. The learned Single Judge noted that the accused is relative of the complainant and that it is alleged that the articles had been stolen from time to time without the knowledge of the complainant. Although the FIR indicates that the theft took place during the period from August 2025 to April 2026, the complainant's case is that the complainant was unaware of the exact dates on which the theft took place. In the aforesaid facts, the learned Single Judge held that the question as to whether the gold jewellery pledged with the appellant were stolen articles is a matter that would have to be ascertained in due course of the investigation. In the said view, the



CNR: KAHC010470912026

learned Single Judge held that there was no ground to quash the notices impugned in the writ petition.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant contends that the impugned order has in effect altered the FIR. He reiterated that the gold jewellery pledged with it could not be suspected to have been stolen.

7. We find no merit in the aforesaid contention.

8. The appellant was asked to produce gold jewellery that were pledged with it. Notices served to the appellant indicate that there is sufficient reason to call upon the appellant to produce the same. As noted above, accused No.1, who was arrested, had made a statement that he had pledged the same with the appellant. The questions whether the gold jewellery pledged with the appellant belong to the complainant and were stolen are the subject matter of the investigation. We do not consider it apposite to express any opinion with regard to the same. We find no reason for the appellant not to cooperate with the police authorities in their investigation and comply with the notices.



**NC: 2026:KHC:36379-DB
WA No. 1726 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010470912026

9. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(K.S. HEMALEKHA)
JUDGE**

KPS,AT
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 16