



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO.101184 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

BABLU SINGH S/O. BHARAT SINGH,
AGE. 52 YEARS, OCC. BUSINESS,
R/O. TORANAGALLU VILLAGE,
TQ. SANDUR, DIST. BALLARI-583123.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K.S. PATIL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
BALLARI, TQ. AND DIST. BALLARI-583101.
2. THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
BALLARI-583101.
3. THE POLICE SUB INSPECTOR,
TORANAGALLU POLICE STATION,
TQ. TORANAGALLU, DIST. BALLARI-583123.
4. THE ASI,
TORANAGALLU POLICE STATION,
TQ. TORANAGALLU, DIST. BALLARI-583123.
5. SHRI. K. RANGANAICALU
S/O. GOVINDAIAH,
AGE. MAJOR,
R/O. VANKARNI CAMP,





SHREEDHAR GADDE POST,
TQ. AND DIST. BELLARI-583101.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. T. HANUMAREDDY, ADDL. GOVT. ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO A. ISSUE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER, OR DIRECTION COMMANDING THE RESPONDENT NO.3 AND 4 TO REGISTER FIRST INFORMATION REPORT (FIR) BASED ON THE PETITIONER'S WRITTEN COMPLAINT DATED 08.12.2025 (ANNEXURE-C) IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANDATORY PROVISIONS OF SECTION 173 OF THE BNSS AND INVESTIGATE THE CRIME (COMPLAINT) FOLLOWING THE GUIDELINES OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN LALITA KUMARI VS. GOVT. OF U.P, IN LETTER AND SPIRIT. B. ISSUE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY APPROPRIATE WRIT QUASHING THE CLOSURE REPORT/ ENDORSEMENT DATED 19.12.2025 (ANNEXURE-D), PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.4, WITHOUT FOLLOWING THE DUE PROCESS OF LAW. C. DIRECT A FAIR INVESTIGATION BY TRANSFERRING THE CASE/ COMPLAINT (ANNEXURE-C) TO A SENIOR OFFICER, IN LIGHT OF THE DEMONSTRATED BIAS AND PARTIALITY SHOWN BY THE RESPONDENT NO.4. D. PASS ANY OTHER SUCH ORDERS(S) AS THIS HON'BLE COURT MAY DEEM FIT AND PROPER IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.

THIS WRIT PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:



CORAM: THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

The present writ petition is filed seeking the following prayers:

"a. Issue Writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction commanding the Respondent No.3 and 4 to register First Information Report (FIR) based on the Petitioner's written complaint dated 08.12.2025 (ANNEXURE-C) in accordance with the mandatory provisions of Section 173 of the BNSS and investigate the Crime (Complaint) following the guidelines of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P, in letter and spirit.

b. Issue Writ in the nature of Certiorari or any appropriate Writ Quashing the closure report/ endorsement dated 19.12.2025 (ANNEXURE-D), passed by the Respondent No.4, without following the due process of law.

c. Direct a Fair Investigation by transferring the case/ complaint (ANNEXURE-C) to a senior officer, in light of the demonstrated bias and partiality shown by the Respondent no.4.

d. Pass any other such orders(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice."

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner is a partner in a firm and the firm undertakes contract to supply machinery, spare parts etc., to JSW Industries in Toranagallu. It is the case of the petitioner that on 28.11.2025 at about 06.45 p.m. the respondent No.5/accused along with 15 henchmen



entered into the Kannikaa Infotech Services Co. Ltd., and threatened the petitioner calling him 'bastard'. The respondent No.5 further threatened the complainant saying that you are follower of Nagendra and to cheat him, created another company. On such instance, the respondent No.5 has also taken away the key of Maruti ECO Van No.KA-34/P-8704. The petitioner searched the vehicle around the town and thereafter, on 08.12.2025, filed a written complaint before respondent No.3/the jurisdictional Police narrating the true story. It is the case that, without conducting the investigation, based on false statement given by respondent No.4, the police issued endorsement closing the crime. It is the case that the respondent No.3 and 4 police are not exercising their powers in the investigation and instead they are taking the side of the accused. Hence, the petitioner has come before this Court seeking the direction to the respondent No.3 and 4.

3. Having heard the learned counsel on either side, perused the material on record. The writ petition filed before this Court is not maintainable. When the complaint is closed by the respondent/police, the petitioner has an effective remedy of filing



a private complaint before the Magistrate and need not file a writ petition. Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, this Court cannot go into these kind of issues when there is an effective alternative remedy is available to the victim. Accordingly, this Court is passing the following:

ORDER

- (i) The writ petition is ***dismissed*** giving liberty to the petitioner to avail alternative remedy.
- (ii) All I.As., in this writ petition stand closed.

Sd/-
JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

YAN
CT: UMD
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 17