



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA**

**KALABURAGI BENCH**

**DATED THIS THE 3<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 203264 OF 2025 (GM-POLICE)**

**BETWEEN:**

JAMEER @ MUNNA S/O MASUMALI DANGE,  
AGE:48 YEARS, OCC:BUSINESS,  
R/O WARD NO.17 TO 18, KALE PLOT,  
BIJAPUR ROAD, INDI ,  
DIST: VIJAYAPURA – 586209.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI R.S LAGALI, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,  
REP BY ITS SECRETARY  
TO HOME DEPARTMENT,  
VIDHANA SOUDHA,  
BENGALURU – 560001.
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE  
VIJAYAPURA,  
DIST:VIJAYAPURA-586102.
3. THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE  
INDI DIVISION, INDI – 586209

Digitally signed  
by VARSHA N  
RASALKAR  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA



4. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE  
INDI PS, INDI -586209.
5. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE  
/ STATION HOUSE OFFICER (L AND O)  
INDI - 586209.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI MALLIKARJUN SAHUKAR, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO I) ISSUE A WRIT OR ORDER OR DIRECTION TO QUASH THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER IN THE ROWDY SHEET DT. 31.05.2005 IN THE ROWDY SHEET REGISTER MAINTAINED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.5 PRODUCED AS ANNEXURE-E. II) ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS OR ORDER OR DIRECTION TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION DT. 23.09.2022 ISSUED BY THE PETITIONER AS PER ANNEXURE-F AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

### **ORAL ORDER**

This petition is filed by the petitioner seeking a writ of mandamus by way of a direction to quash his name in the Rowdy Sheet Register maintained by the respondent No.5.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that he is a resident of Indi town and he is a businessman, also



involved in political activities and community services. The petitioner also actively participates in the local body elections and parliamentary elections. He also espouses the economically weaker sections of the society. It is contended that due to his participation in politics and espousing public cause there is political rivalry. The rival politicians have targeted him, due to which petitioner has been implicated in 11 criminal cases. However, it is contended that out of the 11 criminal cases, petitioner has been acquitted in one of the cases and the remaining 10 cases have been withdrawn by the State Government.

3. This being the state of affairs, petitioner's name has been registered in the Rowdy Sheet Register maintained by the respondent No.5. It is further contended that the petitioner has been continuously put on surveillance by the police authorities. His family members are also continuously monitored and hounded by the police authorities during festivals and elections. In view of all this, petitioner made a representation to the



police authorities on 23.09.2022 to remove his name from the Rowdy Sheet Register. Despite the petitioner submitting such a representation, no action has been taken by the respondents and the police authorities have continued the name of petitioner in the Rowdy Sheet Register, without following proper guidelines laid down by this Court.

4. It is further contended that on 26.12.2024 when the petitioner applied for his passport to go to holy pilgrimage. But, the passport authorities kept the same on hold citing that the petitioner's name is found in the Rowdy Sheet Register maintained against him. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that despite all this considering the community serviced by the petitioner, the Government of Karnataka has appointed him as the member of District Waqf Advisory Committee, Vijayapura. It is also contended that petitioner is a law-abiding citizen and unnecessarily his name has been included at the instance of rival political parties in the



Rowdy Sheet Register, which is illegal and contrary to Standing Order No.1059 of the Karnataka Police Manual, 1998 and other provisions contained therein. It is also contended by learned counsel that the respondents have not followed the principles in the Standing Order No.1059 of Karnataka Police Manual and mechanically they have passed an order registering the name of the petitioner in the rowdy sheet, which is violative of Articles 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, he seeks to allow the petition and consequently, remove his name from the Rowdy Sheet Register. The counsel also contends that the respondent police have not followed 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**.

5. *Per contra*, learned Additional Government Advocate representing the State sustains the impugned order and contends that since several cases were registered against the petitioner and he was detrimental to



the interest of the peace and tranquility of the society, his name was registered in the Rowdy Sheet Register and in accordance to the police manual, the petitioner was being monitored lawfully. There is no illegality committed and there is no violation of any rule, law, act or procedure, so also the breach of any constitutional provisions. He also contends that the judgment relied by the petitioner in the case of **Sri B. S. Prakash** (supra), is much later than the registration of the name of petitioner in the rowdy sheet and it would not come to his benefit. Therefore, he seeks dismissal of this petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate for the State.

7. It is a fundamental rule of law that when a person is implicated as a rowdy sheeter by including his name in the list of rowdy sheet, the onus is upon the State to follow the due procedure contemplated under the relevant rules and regulations. In the present case, the



Karnataka Police Manual, more specifically, the Register of Rowdies maintained in order No.1059, which deals with history sheets and rowdy sheets and enrollment or registration of persons in the said sheet for register for continuous monitoring by the police authorities, is not followed. Standing Order No.1059 deals with registration of rowdies. The definition provided is that a rowdy may be defined as a gunda and includes a hooligan, tough, vagabond or any person who is dangerous to public peace and tranquility. There are many forms of rowdism, which are described therein and the process and procedure contemplated to be maintained in different parts, namely Part A, Part B and Part C, which govern the maintenance of a register and the names of the rowdies in their respective parts. It is the duty and obligation cast upon the respondents, which is not optional to follow the due procedure contemplated under the standing orders of the Karnataka Police Manual, while entering the name of a person in the rowdy sheet and there are certain



procedures to be mandatorily followed before entering the names. As contended by learned counsel for the petitioner, the process and procedure as contemplated under the standing Order No.1059 of the Karnataka Police Manual has not been followed and merely because he was involved in 11 criminal cases, he has been framed, out of which, in one of the cases petitioner is acquitted and others are withdrawn by the State. It is also contended that though the petitioner has made a representation to the respondent authorities after the acquittal on 23.09.2022, the representation has not been considered and even after the acquittal, he has been summoned to the jurisdictional police station for unnecessary interrogation, when there is no case pending against him.

8. It would be relevant to extract paragraph No.17 of the judgment of Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***K. M. Muniswamy Reddy v. State of Karnataka*** reported in ***ILR 1992 KAR 2543***, wherein the Division



Bench dealt with similar subject matter, which reads as under:

*"17. There can be no doubt that if any of the Fundamental Right is to be affected by the State action, it has to be authorised by law, in the sense of a law enacted by the Legislature or to be authorised by a subordinate/delegated legislation, like Rules and Regulations. However, if no Fundamental Right is adversely affected by the enforcement of Order No.1059, State is entitled to act upon it, even in case, the said order has no statutory source. On facts, we found that, a reading of Order No.1059 nowhere suggests vesting of an intruding power in the Police Department. enabling the latter to invade any of the Fundamental Rights of the rowdy-sheeted person. The maintenance of rowdy sheet in respect of a suspected person having tendency to commit criminal offence or disturb public peace, is to enable the police to speedy action in cases of breach of public peace; it provides the information of the persons to be watched by the law enforcing agency of the State and nothing more."*

9. Standing order No.1059 of Karnataka Police

Manual, 1998 is extracted below:

*"1059. (1) A rowdy may be defined as a goonda and includes a hooligan, rough, vagabond or any person who is dangerous to the Public peace and tranquility.*

*(2) The main forms of rowdyism are:-*

*a) Passing indecent remarks at women and School and College Girls;*



*b) Intimidation of Law abiding people by acts of violence or by show of force or by abusive language;*

*c) Forcible collection of subscription;*

*d) Taking sides in petty quarrels between landlords and tenants or between co-tenants and threatening people of the opposite party;*

*e) Disorderly conduct;*

*f) Rioting; and*

*g) Snatching and committing robbery*

*(3) In every Police Station, a 'Register of Rowdies' should be maintained in Form No.100 in three parts viz., Part A, Part B and Part C which should be in separate Volumes. All the volumes are to be treated as confidential records.*

*(4) (a) Names and particulars of 'Confirmed Rowdies' who are residents in the Police Station concerned should be entered in the Register Part A, a few pages being allotted for each person.*

*(b) Names and particulars of 'Confirmed Rowdies' who are not residents in the Police Station limits but operate within its jurisdiction and names of 'Homeless Confirmed Rowdies' should be entered in Part B, a few pages being allotted for every person.*

*(c) Names and particulars of "Novices" who are budding goondas should be entered in Part C. They may be either residents or non-residents of the Police Station concerned.*

*(5) Prior Orders of the Superintendent of Police or the Sub-Divisional Police Officer should be obtained for entering the name of every rowdy in the Register of Rowdies*

*(6) Names of persons against whom there are ample instances of rowdyism should be entered in the*



*Register Part A or Part B after the records are checked by the Inspector.*

*(7) When there are one or more instances of rowdyism against any person or if he has a very bad reputation in the locality as a bully, his name entered in Part 'C' on the ground of very bad reputation, a through enquiry should be made by the Officer in charge of the Police Station before the entry is made.*

*(8) in the running history, all the Criminal activities of the rowdy including reasonable suspicion of his complicity in cases and/or complaints against him with case numbers, if any, and results of cases, etc., should be mentioned in separate paragraphs which should be numbered chronologically. Against each entry in the running history, there should be reference to Station House Diary entries, case diaries, source reports, mass petitions, petty cases, etc., as the case may be.*

*(9) Officers incharge of Police Stations should, in the course of their daily scrutiny of the entries in the Station House Diary and the petty cases Register, satisfy themselves that relevant notes therefrom have been made and embodied in the 'Rowdy Register' against the rowdies concerned. Before despatching the copy of the Station House Diary to the Circle Inspector/SDPO, a note of having embodied the information in the rowdy register against the relevant entries, should be made.*

*(10) Supervisory officers, during their inspections of Police Stations, should satisfy themselves that the entries have been properly made.*

*(11) When the activities of a non-resident rowdy comes to notice, the Officer in charge of the Police Station concerned should not only make necessary entries in Part 'B' of the Rowdy Register but also promptly transmit information to the Officer in charge of the Police Station in the limits of which the*



*rowdy resides, to enable the latter to make necessary entries in Part 'A' of the Rowdy Register of his Police Station.*

*(12) When the Part 'C' rowdies indulge frequently in rowdy and anti-social acts, their names should be transferred from Part 'C' or 'B', as the case may be, of the Rowdy Register. When there is no entry against a Part 'C' rowdy during the period of one year from the date of entry of his name in the Register, his name may be struck off from the Register by the Officer in charge of the Police Station concerned in consultation with the Circle Inspector.*

*(13) No name should be struck off from Part 'A' or Part 'B' of the Rowdy Register without the order in writing of the Superintendent of Police. In such cases, the Inspectors should send their recommendations to Superintendent of Police through the Sub-Divisional Police Officers.*

*(14) The Inspectors should maintain in their offices, the entire lists of the names of rowdies with their addresses which are on record in the Rowdy Register of the Police Station under their charge. The lists should be maintained Police Station-wise and maintained separately for each type of rowdies. The Inspectors should once in a quarter, check up their own lists with the Rowdy Registers of the Police Stations under them.*

*(15) Under the existing laws, a rowdy can be dealt with in the following ways:*

- (i) Prosecution in specific cases, like robbery, rioting, grievous hurt, etc.,*
- (ii) Prosecution in appropriate cases for obscene acts and songs under Section 294 L.P.C. (This is a cognizable offence);*
- (iii) Prosecution for riotous and indecent behaviour, drunkenness, etc., under Sections*



*92 (o), (p), (q) and (r) of the Karnataka Police Act 1963, in the areas to which the provisions of that Section have been extended:*

*(iv) Action under Section 108 (b) of the code of Criminal Procedure;*

*(v) Action under Section 107 Cr. P.C.*

*(vi) Action under Section 110 Cr. P.C.*

*(vii) Action under the preventive detention laws;*

*viii) Externment proceedings under Section 55 and 56 of the Karnataka Police Act, 1963; and*

*(ix) Action under Section 509 I.P.C. for eve-teasing:*

*(16) Every information that any particular Tea Stall, Restaurant, Eating House or Bar is the resort of rowdies and other types of anti-social elements, when received should promptly be verified and if found correct, the office-in-charge of the Police Station should suitably warn the proprietor/keeper of the Tea-Stall, Restaurant, etc..*

*(17) With a view to facilitating identification of the rowdies by face, the Officer in charge of the Police Station should, during the roll call, show to the Station Staff recent photographs of the rowdies. He should instruct them to watch their movements and collect information about their activities.*

*(18) List of persons bound down under Section 106 or under Section 117 of the code of criminal procedure should be maintained in the Police Station with the names and address of the sureties in the following columns:-*

*1) Sl. No.*

*2) Name and address of the complainant*



3) *Gist of the complaint with date and place of occurrence.*

4) *Names and addresses of persons with aliases bound down.*

5) *Period for which bound down.*

6) *Order of the Magistrate with date.*

7) *Names and address of the sureties.*

8) *Remarks.*

*(19) If during the period a person is bound over, there are complaints against him, an immediate enquiry should be made and if the complaints are found to be true, the court should be moved for taking action against the person and the sureties."*

10. In view of the non-compliance of the procedure contemplated under Standing Order No.1059 of the Karnataka Police Manual and non-consideration of the representation given by the petitioner pursuant to his acquittal, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner has made out a valid case to consider favourably. Accordingly, I pass the following:

### **ORDER**

- i. The writ petition is ***allowed***.



- ii. The impugned order of opening Rowdy Sheet Register in the name of the petitioner dated 31.05.2005 maintained by the respondent No.5, is hereby quashed.
- iii. The respondents are hereby directed to remove the name of the petitioner from the Rowdy Sheet Register maintained by them, within a period of 4 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