



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 24008 OF 2025 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

MANJUNATH N
C/O NARASIMHA
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
R/A NO.27, 3RD MAIN ROAD
JCW NAGAR, SHESHADRI PURAM,
BENGALURU NORTH, BENGALURU - 560020

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAKSHITH R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SHESHADRI PURAM PS
REP BY AGA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BANGALORE - 560 001
2. CCB
REP BY AGA
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BANGALORE - 560001

...RESPONDENTS

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

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS TO NOT HARASS THE PETITIONER BY SUMMONING HIM TO THE POLICE STATION WITHOUT ANY VALID REASON AND TO NOT TAKE ANY COERCIVE ACTION AGAINST THE PETITIONER WITHOUT FOLLOWING DUE PROCESS OF LAW.



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

In the captioned petition, petitioner is primarily aggrieved by the action of the respondent/police officers in unnecessarily summoning petitioner to the police station without any valid reason. Therefore, the captioned petition is filed seeking appropriate directions not to harass petitioner by summoning him to the police station.

2. On the previous date of hearing, this Court, having adverted to the specific allegations and grounds urged in the writ petition, more particularly the serious grievance voiced by the learned counsel for the petitioner that on every date of appearance before the jurisdictional Criminal Court, the petitioner, after marking his presence in the criminal proceedings, was being forcibly taken by the jurisdictional police to the police station and was made to remain seated therein for the entire day without any



justifiable cause or legal sanction, had directed the learned Additional Government Advocate to secure instructions and ensure the presence of the concerned Police Officer before this Court.

3. Pursuant to the said direction, the jurisdictional Inspector of Police appeared before this Court and, on instructions, fairly admitted that the petitioner was indeed taken to the police station on certain occasions. However, an attempt was made to justify such action on the ground that there was an alleged threat to the life of the petitioner based on information said to have been received from respondent No.2, and therefore, as a measure purportedly taken in the interest of the petitioner's safety, he was brought to the police station. This explanation, on the face of it, appears wholly untenable and raises serious concerns, as any perceived threat to an individual's life ought to have been addressed strictly in accordance with law by providing appropriate protection, and not by subjecting the individual to unwarranted restraint and



confinement within the precincts of a police station, which prima facie bears the trappings of misuse of authority.

4. The second justification offered by the officer that the petitioner is a "rowdy sheetee" and was summoned to the police station on one occasion for the purpose of reviewing his rowdy sheet status, also does not inspire confidence. Even assuming such status, the exercise of power by the police must conform to established legal procedure and cannot be permitted to degenerate into arbitrary or routine summoning, much less into a practice of detaining the petitioner for prolonged hours without any proceedings known to law. The explanations offered, therefore, appear to be more in the nature of an afterthought, lacking in legal justification, and indicative of a casual and highhanded exercise of police powers, which this Court cannot countenance.



5. This Court is constrained to observe that the power vested in the police is coupled with a corresponding duty to act fairly, reasonably, and strictly within the bounds of law. Any deviation therefrom, particularly actions that impinge upon the personal liberty of a citizen without authority of law, would amount to an abuse of power. The conduct admitted by the officer, even if confined to a few instances, reflects a pattern that borders on harassment and unwarranted interference with the petitioner's liberty.

6. However, in view of the statement now made by the officer before this Court that the petitioner will not hereafter be summoned to the police station in the absence of any lawful requirement or pending criminal proceedings, and that no coercive or intrusive measures will be adopted except in accordance with due process of law, this Court deems it appropriate to close the proceedings, while placing on record the said undertaking.



7. Accordingly, recording the statement and undertaking of the jurisdictional officer, the writ petition stands disposed of, reserving liberty to the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy in the event of any further infraction.

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

CA
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 49