



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 5874 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

SRI JAGADISH P.S.,
S/O. SRI. SAMPANGI,
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 453
PANATHUR VILLAGE,
GHPS LAYOUT,
VARTHUR HOBLI, PANATHUR
BENGALURU -560 103.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. N.SRIRAM REDDY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSE AND
LEGAL AFFAIRS,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
HOME SECRETARY
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
BENGALURU CITY,
INFANTRY ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.



3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF
POLICE, MARTHAHALLI,
BENGALURU-560 048.
4. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
SOUTH END CIRCLE,
JAYANAGAR, BENGALURU - 560 004.
5. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
VARTHURU POLICE STATION,
VARTHURU ROAD, NEAR MARKET,
VARTHURU, BENGALURU-560 087.
6. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
PUTTENHALLI POLICE STATION,
NO.126, K.R.LAYOUT,
J.P NAGAR, 6TH PHASE,
J.P NAGAR, BENGALURU- 560 056.

...RESPONDENTS

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

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO-
DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO REMOVE THE NAME OF
THE PETITIONER FROM THE ROWDY LIST IN INTEREST OF
JUSTICE AND EQUITY AND ETC.

THIS WRIT 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 present writ petition is filed seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent-authorities to remove the name of the petitioner from the rowdy register/rowdy list. The grievance of the petitioner is founded on the assertion that no criminal case is presently pending against him and, therefore, the continuation of his name in the rowdy register is arbitrary, unjust, and violative of his fundamental rights.

2. It is the specific case of the petitioner that he had submitted a detailed representation dated 20.12.2025 before respondent Nos.2 to 6, placing on record that all the criminal cases registered against him have either ended in closure or have culminated in his acquittal. Despite such representation and the material furnished in support thereof, the respondent-authorities have failed to take any action or pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. The inaction on the part of the respondents has compelled the petitioner to approach this Court.



3. This Court has had occasion to consider the issue relating to inclusion and retention of a person's name in the rowdy register and the requirement of periodic review in the decision rendered in ***B.S. Prakash vs. The State of Karnataka & Ors***¹. In the said judgment, it is clearly laid down that the authorities are under an obligation to periodically review the cases of persons whose names are entered in the rowdy register and to delete such names if the circumstances no longer justify their continuation.

4. In the present case, despite the petitioner specifically asserting that no criminal proceedings are pending against him and furnishing a representation in that regard, the respondent-authorities have not undertaken any exercise of review. Such inaction is contrary to the law laid down by this Court and amounts to failure to discharge statutory as well as constitutional obligations.

¹ 2022 (4) KCCR 3648



5. If indeed no criminal cases are pending against the petitioner and there is no material indicating that his activities pose any threat to public order or society at large, the continuation of his name in the rowdy register cannot be sustained. The petitioner, therefore, has a legal right to seek appropriate directions, and correspondingly, the respondent-authorities are duty-bound to consider and decide the petitioner's representation in accordance with law.

6. Having regard to the material placed on record and the admitted position that the petitioner's representation has not been considered till date, this Court is of the view that the present case warrants interference. The inaction on the part of the respondents justifies issuance of a writ of mandamus.

ORDER

(i) The writ petition is hereby ***allowed***;



(ii) A writ of mandamus is issued directing respondent Nos.2 to 6 to forthwith consider the representation dated 20.12.2025 submitted by the petitioner and, upon verification that no criminal cases are pending and that there is no subsisting material indicating threat to public order, delete the name of the petitioner from the rowdy register;

(iii) The aforesaid exercise shall be completed within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order;

(iv) It is made clear that liberty is reserved to the respondent-police to initiate appropriate proceedings afresh, if warranted, strictly in accordance with law and in compliance with the guidelines governing inclusion of names in the rowdy register.

(v) No order as to costs.

**SD/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE**