



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 38360 OF 2025 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

SRI. SHIVAKUMARA
@ HANDI KUMARA @ KUMARA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
R/AT KADABAGERE,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU-562 130.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SATISH R GIRJI.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOME,
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001.
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
NO.5, MILLARS ROAD,
VASANTHNAGAR, BENGALURU-560 052.
3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
MADANAYAKANAHALLI,
BENGALURU-562 123.

...RESPONDENTS

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

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING THAT THIS HON'BLE
COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO ISSUE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF

Digitally
signed by
CHAITHRA A
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE R-3 MADANAYAKANAHALLI POLICE STATION TO REMOVE THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER IN THE LIST OF ROWDY SHEETER.

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 petitioner in the present writ petition seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to delete the petitioner's name from the rowdy register maintained by the respondent-police authorities.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, reiterating the grounds urged in the writ petition, has invited the attention of this Court to the judgment rendered by the learned Sessions Court in S.C. No.150/2015 c/w S.C. No.68/2016. Placing strong reliance on the said judgment, he would submit that the petitioner has been honourably acquitted of all the charges levelled



against him. He would further contend that despite the said acquittal, the petitioner's name continues to be retained in the rowdy register maintained by respondent No.3, which action is arbitrary and violative of the petitioner's fundamental rights. Learned counsel would also submit that the petitioner has submitted several representations requesting deletion of his name from the rowdy list by specifically referring to the order of acquittal; however, the respondent-authorities have failed to consider the same. It is further pointed out that similarly placed accused No.1, who has also been acquitted in the very same sessions case, has already been granted the benefit of deletion from the rowdy register, and therefore, the inaction on the part of respondent No.3 in the case of the present petitioner is discriminatory and unsustainable in law.



3. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate, on instructions, would submit that respondent No.3 shall take into consideration the judgment of acquittal rendered in S.C. No.150/2015 c/w S.C. No.68/2016 and examine the petitioner's request in accordance with law, and thereafter take an appropriate decision in the matter.

4. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and having perused the material on record, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner, having been acquitted by a competent Sessions Court, is entitled to seek reconsideration of his inclusion in the rowdy register. It is not in dispute that the petitioner's name was entered in the rowdy register as far back as in the year 2016. In the light of the subsequent acquittal and the settled legal position governing maintenance and review of rowdy sheets, the petitioner acquires a legal right to seek deletion of his name. This Court also takes note of the principles and guidelines laid down by the Coordinate



Bench of this Court in B.S. Prakash vs. The State of Karnataka & Ors., wherein it is held that continuation of a person's name in the rowdy register, despite acquittal and absence of subsequent criminal antecedents, would be unjustified unless supported by fresh material in accordance with law. Therefore, the continued retention of the petitioner's name, without proper review, cannot be sustained.

5. For the foregoing reasons, this Court proceeds to pass the following;

ORDER

(i) Writ petition is ***allowed***;

(ii) A writ in the nature of mandamus is issued directing respondent No.3 to forthwith delete the name of the petitioner from the rowdy register maintained against him;

(iii) It is, however, made clear that liberty is reserved to the respondent-police authorities to initiate appropriate proceedings, if warranted,



in accordance with law, and strictly in compliance with the guidelines governing the opening and continuation of rowdy sheets, as laid down by this Court;

(iv) All pending interlocutory applications, if any, stand disposed of.

Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE

CA
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 51