HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:21434
WP No. 11285 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 21ST DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 11285 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

SRI. VENKATA REDDY
S/O SRI. NARAYANAPALLI VENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
R/O GOWDAHALLI VILLAGE
KASABA HOBLI, SRINIVASAPURA TALUK

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. DESHPANDE AMIT ANAND, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
HOME SECRETARY
VINDHAN SOUDHA,
BENGALURU

2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
KOLAR DISTRICT,
KOLAR - 563 103 .

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K.P.YOGANNA, AGA)

Digitally signed by CHAITHRA A
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS TO REMOVE THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER FROM THE LOST OF ROWDY SHEETERS IN THE KOLAR DISTRICT AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

The captioned writ petition is filed seeking a direction against the respondents to remove petitioner's name from the list of rowdy sheets in Kolar District.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned AGA.

3. The material on record would indicate that the petitioner’s name came to be entered in the rowdy register solely on account of his involvement in a criminal case which ultimately culminated in the filing of charge sheet in S.C. No.58/2022 on the file of the I Additional District and Sessions Judge at Kolar. The said case pertained to offences punishable under Sections 143, 147, 148, 323, 324, 302, 504 and 506 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code. It is not in dispute that the very foundation for

opening of the rowdy sheet against the petitioner was the pendency of the aforesaid sessions case.

4. The primary grievance projected before this Court is that the petitioner, having secured an order of acquittal in S.C.No.58/2022, has submitted a detailed representation dated 23.06.2025 to respondent No.2 seeking deletion of his name from the rowdy register by enclosing the certified copy of the judgment of acquittal. Notwithstanding the same, respondent No.2 has remained completely inert and has failed to consider the said representation within a reasonable time. It is this inaction and apathy on the part of the Authority that has compelled the petitioner to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India.

5. This Court is of the considered view that if the genesis for inclusion of the petitioner's name in the rowdy register was the registration of a criminal case, which has now culminated in an honourable acquittal, the competent

Authority is under a statutory and constitutional obligation to re-examine the necessity of continuing the petitioner's name in the rowdy sheet. The issue is no longer *res integra* in view of the authoritative pronouncement of this Court in ***Sri.B.S.Prakash vs State of Karnataka and others***[1]**,** wherein detailed guidelines have been laid down mandating periodic review and objective assessment before continuing or deleting a person's name from the rowdy register. The said judgment underscores that inclusion in a rowdy sheet cannot be mechanical or perpetual and must be founded on subsisting material indicating threat to public order. Therefore, when the petitioner seeks deletion on the strength of an acquittal, respondent No.2 is duty-bound to consider the representation strictly in the light of the principles enunciated therein.

6. A perusal of the records would further disclose that the representation submitted by the petitioner, as

[1] 2022(4) KCCR 3648

evidenced at Annexure-B, has not been considered till date. Such inaction on the part of respondent No.2 reflects administrative indifference and is contrary to the mandate of law. When a citizen's civil liberties are impacted by continuation of his name in a rowdy register, the Authority cannot afford to remain supine. This Court is therefore satisfied that the present case warrants issuance of a writ of mandamus directing consideration of the petitioner's representation within a time-bound framework.

7. With these above observations, this Court proceeds to pass the following;

ORDER

(i) The writ petition is hereby allowed.

(ii) A writ in the nature of mandamus is issued directing respondent No.2 to consider the petitioner's representation dated 23.06.2025 seeking deletion of his name from the rowdy register, by taking into account the judgment of acquittal rendered in S.C.No.58/2022.

(iii) While undertaking such consideration, respondent No.2 shall strictly adhere to the principles and guidelines laid down by this Court in ***B.S.Prakash vs State of Karnataka*** (cited supra) and pass a reasoned order.

(iv) The aforesaid exercise shall be completed within a period of six (6) weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(v) Needless to observe that if the Authority fails to comply within the stipulated time, it would be open to the petitioner to seek appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE

NBM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 13