HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:59469
WP No. 27537 of 2026
*C/W CRL.P No. 9923 of 2026*

CNR: KAHC010607352026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 27537 OF 2026 (GM-RES)**
**C/W**
**CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 9923 OF 2026**

**IN WP No. 27537/2026**

**BETWEEN:**

1. DEBANAJAN MUKHERJEE
   S/O. SRI. APARESH MUKHERJEE,
   AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT NO.129, LAKE SHORE HOMES,
   KASAVANAHALLI VILLAGE, VARTHUR HOBLI,
   CARMELARAM POST, BENGALURU – 560 035.

2. NIVEDITA BANERJEE
   W/O. SRI. DEBANJAN MUKHERJEE,
   AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT NO.129, LAKE SHORE HOMES,
   KASAVANAHALLI VILLAGE, VARTHUR HOBLI,
   CARMELARAM POST, BENGALURU – 560 035.

…PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. R.M.D.R. CHAVAN, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by BELUR RANGADHAMA NANDINI
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY BELLANDURU POLICE STATION,
   BENGALURU CITY,
   REPRESENTED BY THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU – 560 001.

2. MAHESH REDDY G.
S/O. G.K. GOPINATH,
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.257, LAKE SHORE HOMES,
KASAVANAHALLI, OFF SARJAPUR ROAD,
BENGALURU – 560 035.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. NAGHARISH G.S., HCGP FOR R1
SRI. PRADEEP G. BOTTUR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA READ WITH SECTION 528 OF BNSS, 2023 (S.482 OF CR.P.C., 1973) PRAYING TO-QUASHING THE COMPLAINT DATED 13.06.2026 VIDE ANNX-B AND FIR IN CRIME NO. 0255/2026 VIDE ANNX-A IN SO FAR AS THE PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED FILED BY THE R2.

**IN CRL.P NO. 9923/2026**

**BETWEEN:**

MAHESH REDDY G
S/O. G K GOPINATH
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS
R/AT. NO. 257, LAKE SHORE HOMES,
KASAVANAHALLI, OFF. SARJAPURA ROAD,
BENGALURU – 560 035

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PRADEEP G. BATTUR, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. GAJENDRA C., ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY BELLANDURU POLICE
   REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
   HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   BENGALURU – 560 001

2. DEBANJAN MUKHERJEE
   S/O. APARESH MUKHARJEE
   AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
   R/AT. NO. 129, LAKESHORE HOMES,
   KASAVANAHALLI,
   BENGALURU CITY – 560 035

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. NAGHARISH G.S., HCGP FOR R1

SRI. SHREYAS L. PATIL, ADVOCATE FOR

SRI. R.M.D.R. CHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 482 CR.P.C. (U/S 528 BNSS) PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR AND COMPLAINT IN CR.NO.251/2026 AGAINST THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.2 REGISTERED BY BELLANDURU P.S., FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 115(2),118,126,351(3),352,351(2) OF BNS, 2023, PENDING BEFORE THE 41st ACJM, BENGALURU CITY, VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

THESE PETITIONS, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

**ORAL ORDER**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners in Writ Petition No.27537/2026. Learned HCGP for the respondent no.1 and the learned counsel for respondent no.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned HCGP for respondent no.1 and learned counsel for respondent no.2 in Criminal Petition No.9923/2026.

2. These two petitions have been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.255/2026 and FIR in Crime No.251/2026 respectively registered by Bellanduru Police Station. FIR in Crime No.255/2026 is registered for the offences under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 352, 351(2) read with Section 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. Criminal Petition No.9923 of 2026 is filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.251/2026 registered for the offence under Section 115(2), 118, 126, 351(3), 352, 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Admittedly, both the cases relate to the same incident said to have taken place on 10.06.2026. Thus, in a

way, the presence of the petitioners in both cases at the place of incident is admitted.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in W.P.No.27537/2026 would submit that the only allegation against petition no.2 is that she has circulated a video and nothing beyond, as such, the FIR could not have been registered for the aforementioned offences.

5. Learned counsel for the second respondent in W.P.No.27537/2026 would submit that the allegation is that the video has been edited suitably to give an impression that the petitioner no.1 is the victim and the complainant/second respondent is the aggressor. Thus, would contend that the matter requires investigation.

6. The Court has considered the contentions raised at the bar and perused the records.

7. As already noticed, the case and counter cases have been filed and two FIRs have been registered relating to the same incident. Thus, the presence of the persons named in the

complaint appears to be admitted at this stage. The question is who is the aggressor and who is the victim.

8. However, whether the video is edited or not edited, whether it is morphed or not has to be investigated by the police. At the same time, the police should also investigate as to who is the aggressor and who is the victim. That being the position, the petitions cannot be allowed to quash the FIR / complaint at this stage. The matter requires investigation as the allegations attract the ingredients of cognizable offences.

9. Accordingly, the following:-

**ORDER**

i. The petitions are ***dismissed***.

ii. Observations made in this order should not be construed as a reflection on the merits of the complaint.

iii. The police shall investigate the matter and file appropriate report.

**Sd/-**
**(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)**
**JUDGE**

NMS; List No.: 2 Sl No.: 62