



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 24708 OF 2024 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

BETWEEN:

SRI. SNEHAMAYI KRISHNA
S/O LATE SRI. L. SIDDAPPA,
AGE 54 YEARS
R/AT DOOR NO.335,
BANDIPALYA, SACHIDANANDA
GANAPATHI ASHRAMA POST,
MYSORE - 570 025.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. LAKSHMIKANTH K, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL AND
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD, BESIDES RBI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL
OF POLICE LAW AND ORDER,
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BESIDES RBI, BENGALURU - 560 001.





3. THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
SOUTHERN RANGE, OFFICE AT JALAPURI,
KITTUR RANI CHENNAMMA CIRCLE,
MYSURU - 570 019.

4. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
MYSORE DISTRICT,
OFFICE AT JALAPURI,
KITTUR RANI CHENNAMMA CIRCLE,
MYSURU - 570 019.

5. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
SALIGRAMA POLICE STATION
SALIGRAMA TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 604.

...RESPONDENTS

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

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA R/W SEC. 482 OF CR.P.C PRAYING TO DIRECT R-1 TO 3 TO CONDUCT A THOROUGH AND IMPARTIAL FURTHER INVESTIGATION INTO THE DEATH OF MR. RAKSHITH, PERTAINING TO CRIME NO. 42/2019 OF SALIGRAMA POLICE STATION, THIS INVESTIGATION SHOULD RIGOROUSLY EXAMINE ALL RELEVANT EVIDENCE, INCLUDING ALIBI PROOFS, THE VIDEO RECORDING MADE BY THE DECEASED, AND THE REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER ON 07.02.2024 AND 02.05.2024 TO THE R-3 IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT THE INVESTIGATION BE CONDUCTED IN STRICT ADHERENCE TO LEGAL STANDARDS, ENSURING COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF FAIR INVESTIGATION AS STIPULATED IN JUDICIAL GUIDELINES AND THE KARNATAKA POLICE MANUAL FURTHERMORE, THE RESPONDENTS SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO CONSIDER THE EVIDENCE OBJECTIVELY AND TRANSPARENTLY ENSURING THAT JUSTICE IS SERVED AND THAT THE INVESTIGATION PROCESS UPHOLDS THE HIGHEST STANDARDS OF INTEGRITY AND FAIRNESS AND ETC.,



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 captioned writ petition is presented by the petitioner, who claims to be a journalist and social worker. The substance of the grievance projected in the petition is that the investigation conducted by the jurisdictional police in respect of a criminal case, now culminating in a charge sheet in S.C. No.436/2022 pending before the learned Sessions Judge, is defective and has resulted in the alleged false implication of several innocent persons. On these averments, the petitioner seeks a direction for further investigation, submission of a detailed report before this Court, and award of compensation to the accused persons on account of the alleged hardship suffered by them.

2. At the outset, this Court is required to examine the maintainability of the petition in exercise of its



extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. A careful reading of the pleadings would indicate that the petitioner has not demonstrated any infringement of a legally enforceable right personal to him. The grievance sought to be projected is not individual or personal, but is broadly couched in the nature of a public cause questioning the correctness of the investigation and the filing of the charge sheet.

3. It is trite that the writ jurisdiction of this Court cannot be invoked in the absence of a legal injury or violation of a fundamental or statutory right. The extraordinary jurisdiction is not intended to be converted into a forum for ventilating generalized grievances or to supervise criminal investigations at the instance of third parties, who have no direct nexus with the proceedings. If such petitions are entertained, it would open the floodgates for interference in criminal proceedings at the behest of busybodies and interlopers, thereby undermining the statutory framework governing criminal trials.



4. In the present case, the persons directly affected, namely the accused against whom the charge sheet is filed, have not chosen to question either the investigation or the final report before the competent court. The Code of Criminal Procedure provides adequate and efficacious remedies to such aggrieved persons, including seeking discharge, quashing of proceedings, or other remedies known to law. In the absence of any challenge by the affected parties, a third party cannot be permitted to maintain a writ petition seeking directions for further investigation or compensation.

5. The reliefs sought by the petitioner, though couched in the language of enforcement of justice, are in substance in the nature of a public interest litigation. However, even in matters of public interest, the jurisdiction under Article 226 is not meant to be invoked in criminal law matters relating to investigation and prosecution, except in rare and exceptional circumstances where gross miscarriage of justice or violation of



fundamental rights is demonstrated. No such exceptional circumstance is made out in the present case.

6. This Court has, on several occasions, deprecated the growing tendency of filing petitions under Article 226 seeking sweeping directions in matters where the petitioner has no locus standi. Entertaining such petitions would not only burden the constitutional courts but would also result in unwarranted interference with pending criminal proceedings, which are required to proceed in accordance with the procedure established by law.

7. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the present writ petition is a clear instance of misuse of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court. Though this Court would have been justified in imposing exemplary costs to deter such frivolous and misconceived litigation, it refrains from doing so and instead deems it appropriate to caution the petitioner against indulging in such practices in future.



Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit and not maintainable, stands ***dismissed***.

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

HDK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 21