



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

WRIT PETITION NO.200765 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

BASAVARAJ
S/O BOMMANIGAPPA CHOUR,
AGE: 22 YEARS, OCC: STUDENT,
R/O JAIBHEEM NAGAR, SINDAGI,
TQ. SINDAGI, DIST. VIJAYAPURA-586101.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI SANTOSHKUMAR B. BIRADAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
HOME DEPARTMENT,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
VIDHAN SOUDHA, DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560001.
2. DISTRICT POLICE OFFICE, VIJAYAPURA,
REP. BY THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
VIJAYAPURA, KARNATAKA-586101.
3. THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
INDI SUB DIVISION, INDI
VIJAYAPURA, KARNATAKA-586209.
4. THE POLICE CIRCLE INSPECTOR,
SINDAGI CIRCLE, INDI,
VIJAYAPURA KARNATAKA-586209.





5. THE POLICE SUB INSPECTOR,
SINDAGI POLICE STATION, VIJAYAPURA,
KARNATAKA-586209.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI MALLIKARJUN SAHUKAR, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT(S)/ORDER(S), THEREBY QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER NO.DSP INDI/R.S/59/2025 DATED 20.04.2025 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 (ANNEXURE-D). B) ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT (S)/ORDER(S), THEREBY DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT NO.5 TO REMOVE THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER FROM THE LIST OF ROWDY SHEETER REGISTER. C) ISSUE ANY SUCH OTHER WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION THAT THIS HONOURABLE COURT DEEMS FIT AND PROPER UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

ORAL ORDER

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondents.

2. This petition is filed by the petitioner seeking to quash the impugned order No.DSP INDI/R.S/59/2025 dated 20.04.2025, passed by respondent No.3 registering the name of petitioner in the rowdy sheet register.

3. It is contended that the petitioner is a 23-year-old, law-abiding citizen and a meritorious final year (6th semester) student pursuing a Bachelor of Arts degree at C M Managuli Arts, Science and Commerce College, Sindagi. Currently, preparing for competitive examination. He has no criminal history and antecedents. The petitioner was falsely implicated in Crime No.187/2024, registered by Sindagi Police Station/respondent No.5 along with 8 others and later on, a charge sheet came to be filed.



4. This being the state of affairs, respondent No.5 issued a show-cause notice to open a rowdy sheet against the petitioner and pursuant to the said show cause notice, a reply was given by the petitioner, denying the contents therein. However, acting on the recommendation of respondent Nos.4 and 5, respondent No.3 has passed an order registering the name of the petitioner in Category A of the Rowdy Sheet in Order No.DSP INDI/R.S/59/2025 dated 20.04.2025, which is the subject matter of this petition.

5. It is the vehement contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that the respondents have not followed the procedure contemplated under Order 1059 of the Karnataka Police Manual, so also the guidelines issued by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Sri B.S.Prakash Vs. State of Karnataka and others*** reported in ***2022 (4) KCCR 3648*** and several other judgments relied by the counsel in the petition. Therefore, for having violated the procedures to be followed as per



the Standing Order No.1059 of the Karnataka Police Manual and the guidelines issued by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Sri B. S. Prakash** (supra), this petition would have to be allowed and the petitioner's name requires to be deleted from the Rowdy Sheet.

6. *Per contra*, learned Additional Government Advocate sustains the impugned order, contending that in view of the criminal case registered against the petitioner and there being a constant threat of the petitioner creating a law and order situation, his name is included in the rowdy sheet, which does not call for interference, as the procedure is followed.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents.

8. It is seen that whenever the respondent authorities want to include the name of the petitioner in



the rowdy sheet, the following guidelines are to be followed:

"GUIDELINES FOR ROWDY/HISTORY SHEETING:

i. Before entering the name of an individual to the Register of Rowdies, the jurisdictional police shall collect and collate the material information concerning him and frame the proposal for registration on that basis.

ii. A brief proposal notice shall be sent to the individual concerned in a sealed cover with an option to submit his representation within two weeks as to why his name should not be registered as a rowdy. However, there is no need to afford a personal hearing. In exceptional cases notice may be dispensed with for reasons to be recorded in the Register of Rowdies.

iii. In terms of Clause (5), Order 1059 of the Manual, the Superintendent of Police or the Sub Divisional Police Officer shall not accord approval for entering the name of individual concerned to the Register of Rowdies without calling for records and objectively considering the same. He shall briefly record his reasons for according the approval and mark a copy thereof to the individual forthwith, with a mention that



he may petition the Police Complaints Authority, against the same.

iv. The jurisdictional Police shall compulsorily once in two years, undertake a periodic review of entries in the Register of Rowdies suo motu, as provided under Clause (2), Order 1057 of the Manual. However, it is open to the aggrieved, to make a representation at any time after one year of registration, seeking deletion of name from the Rowdy Register on the basis of changed circumstances such as rectitude, good conduct, social/community service, etc.

v. The representation for review shall be considered by the jurisdictional Police at the initial level within a period of 30 days, during which necessary inputs may be obtained through the available sources as to merits of the claim. The recommendation shall be sent to the jurisdictional Superintendent of Police or the Sub Divisional Police Officer, within 15 days along with the representation & the material collected thereon. Such recommendation along with the result of consideration of the representation shall be communicated to the individual concerned within next 15 days.

vi. Any individual aggrieved by the rejection of his representation or continuation of



his name in the Register may petition to the Police Complaints Authority ordinarily within 30 days. However, no personal hearing shall avail. The petition shall be disposed off by recording reasons within an outer limit of 60 days, after considering the material on record or the fresh inputs that may be requisitioned, by the authority.

vii. The entire process of Rowdy/History Sheetting from the stage of issuance of proposal notice as specified above, up to the issuance of the orders on the petition if any to the Police Complaints Authority, shall be done only in a sealed cover procedure and that nothing therein shall be disclosed nor made available to anyone, except to the aggrieved, nor any Right To Information (RTI) application shall be entertained in this regard.

viii. The violation of these guidelines shall constitute a major misconduct and an adverse entry on proof thereof shall be made by the Disciplinary Authority in the Service Register of the erring official after hearing him and a copy thereof shall be marked to the victim of Rowdy Register/History Sheet, without brooking any delay.

ix. Whatever guidelines herein above laid down shall be applicable to the case of History



Sheeters as well, mutatis mutandis and subject to the provisions of Karnataka Police Manual, 1965."

9. In view of the judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Sri B. S. Prakash** (supra), it is mandatory to follow the guidelines and the Standing Order No.1059 of the Karnataka Police Manual, which has not been done in the present case.

10. Accordingly, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i. The writ petition is **allowed**.
- ii. The impugned order dated 20.04.2025 bearing No.DSP INDI/R.S/59/2025, registering the name of the petitioner in the Rowdy Sheet Register, maintained by respondent No.3 at Annexure – D, is hereby quashed.
- iii. A writ of mandamus is issued directing respondent No.5 to remove the name of the petitioner from the Rowdy Sheet Register,



within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

- iv. Liberty, however, is reserved to the respondent/State to proceed in accordance with law against the petitioner, if at all any case is made out and while doing so, they shall strictly follow the guidelines laid down by this Court in the case of ***Sri B. S. Prakash v. State of Karnataka and others*** reported in **2022 (4) KCCR 3648**.

Sd/-
(PRADEEP SINGH YERUR)
JUDGE

RSP
LIST NO.: 2 SL NO.: 25
CT:SI