



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 9659 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

MOHAMMED YASIN,
S/O MOHAMMED HANIF,
AGED ABOUT 24 YEARS,
R/AT 2-182(1),
HAIKADI MELPETE,
HAIKADI, HILYANA POST,
UDUPI - 576 101.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SHRIRAMA ADIGA, ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS,
AMBEDKAR VIDHI,
VIDHANASOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.



2. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
OFFICE AT, 8PVQ+C76,
OLD DC OFFICE ROAD,
BANNANJE CIRCLE, BANNANJE,
UDUPI, KARNATAKA - 576 101.
3. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
BRAHMAVARA POLICE STATION,
UDUPI - 576 101.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA,AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECTION TO THE RESPONDENT NO.3 POLICE TO COMPLETE THE INVESTIGATION AND FILE THE CHARGE SHEET IN FIR NO.155/2025 PENDING ON THE FILE OF ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC UDUPI WITHIN A REASONABLE AND TIME BOUND PERIOD.

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 petition is filed by the petitioner/accused seeking directions to conclude the investigation in Crime No.155/2025.

2. Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned AGA appearing for the respondents. Perused the records.

3. The petitioner is before this Court being aggrieved by the prolonged pendency of investigation in Crime No.155/2025, which came to be registered on 20.07.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 5, 7 and 12 of the Karnataka Prevention of Slaughter and Preservation of Cattle Act, 2020 and Sections 11(1)(a) and 11(1)(d) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960. It is the specific grievance of the petitioner that, though considerable time has elapsed since the registration of the crime,



the Investigating Officer has not taken steps to conclude the investigation.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would vehemently contend that the continued pendency of investigation, in the absence of any incriminating material against the petitioner, amounts to an abuse of the process of law. The inordinate delay in completing the investigation not only causes undue harassment but also seriously impinges upon the valuable rights of the petitioner, including the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which encompasses the right to a fair and expeditious investigation.

5. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate, on instructions, would submit that the investigation is in progress and assures this Court that



the same would be concluded within a reasonable time.

6. This Court has given its anxious consideration to the submissions made on both sides. While it is trite that investigation is the domain of the police authorities and ordinarily this Court would be slow in interfering with the same, it is equally well settled that such investigation cannot be prolonged indefinitely. An open-ended investigation, without any justifiable cause, would result in prejudice to the accused and would amount to infringement of his fundamental rights. The criminal law machinery cannot be permitted to be used in a manner that keeps the sword of uncertainty hanging over a citizen for an indefinite period. If the registration of the FIR is permitted to hang like a Damocles' sword over the head of the petitioner indefinitely, it would result in



subjecting the petitioner to continuous uncertainty and undue mental agony. Such prolonged pendency of investigation, without any tangible progress, would seriously prejudice the petitioner's rights, adversely affecting his liberty, reputation, and day-to-day life. The law does not contemplate a situation where a citizen is kept under perpetual apprehension of criminal proceedings without the investigation being brought to its logical conclusion within a reasonable time.

7. In the facts of the present case, having regard to the submission made by the learned Additional Government Advocate that the investigation would be concluded within a reasonable time, this Court deems it appropriate to fix an outer limit for completion of the investigation.



ORDER

The writ petition stands ***disposed of***.

The Investigating Officer is directed to conclude the investigation in Crime No.155/2025 strictly in accordance with law and file the appropriate final report, as contemplated under law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

HDK
List No.: 1 SI No.: 15