

**IN THE COURT OF THE XLII ACJM, AT BENGALURU**

*Present: Shri. K.N. SHIVAKUMAR, B.Sc.(Agri), L.L.M.,  
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC*

*Dated this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2025*

**PCR.No. 3876/2025**

**COMPLAINANT** : **Mr. Kiran. N**  
S/o. R. Nagaraj  
Aged about 36 Years,  
Advocate  
No.628/14 (2),  
9<sup>th</sup> Main Road, 4<sup>th</sup> Cross,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Block, BSK 1<sup>st</sup> Stage,  
Next to Navarathna Gold Palace,  
BENGALURU – 560050.

**-VS-**

**ACCUSED** : **Sri. Siddaramaiah,**  
S/o. Late. Siddaramegowda,  
Aged about 76 Years,  
  
**Hon'ble Chief Minister,**  
**Government of Karnataka,**  
No.235, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Vidhanasoudha,  
Bengaluru – 560001.

*Presently R/at 'ANUGRAHA'*  
Kumarakrupa,  
Bengaluru – 560001.

*Permanent R/of No.32,*  
Siddaramana Hundi,  
Varuna Hobli,  
Mysore Taluk,  
Mysore – 570010.

**ORDER**

This is a complaint filed U/Sec. 223 of Bharathiya  
Nagarika Suraksha Sanhitha,2023 (for Short BNSS,2023)  
against the accused for the offences punishable U/Sec.

299, 352 & 356(2) of Bharathiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for Short BNS, 2023).

2. It is alleged in the complaint that, the complainant is an advocate by profession practicing in different Hierarchical courts in Bengaluru, Kolar, Ramanagar & other Districts as well as Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. He was born in city of Bengaluru & used to attend the drill & exercise activities in Sairanga playground during his early schooling days, which was being carried by *Rastriya Swayam Sevaka Sangha* ( in short RSS). Said RSS stands for National Volunteer Union or National Volunteer Corps founded on 27/09/1925. The initial impetus of said organization was to provide character training & to instill Hindu discipline in order to unite Hindu community and to establish a Hindu Rashtra. The organization aims to spread ideology of Hinduthwa to strengthen the Hindu Community and to promote an ideal of upholding an Indian culture and its civilizational values. Other than the activities of promoting religious awareness, the RSS actively engages in community outreach, disaster relief & cultural preservation through its widespread *Shakhas* and service initiatives. It focuses on education, rural development & promoting Indian traditions including youth empowerment through

leadership programs and skill development initiatives. The *Rastrothana Parishath* is an institute managed by said RSS, which provides various opportunities to the students to study and conducted research on the academic subjects. The complainant is also an alumnus of said Rastrothana Parishath during early 90's & benefited by their service. As such in his perception RSS is a divine organization which has created bright future to the en number of poor students.

3. The accused – Mr. Siddaramaiah is an elected representative decorating highest constitutional position of the State Legislature. On 17/03/2025 at Vidhana Soudha, Bengaluru, while admiring their Governance in Curbing the Crime rate in the state he has accused the RSS & Bhajarangadala organizations as the perpetrators of crime in the state by saying “ಅಪರಾಧಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವವರೇ ನೀವು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ, ಆರ್. ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್ . ನವರು, ಬಜರಂಗದಳದವರು ”

4. The above statement of the accused was aired in social media & News media, which was viewed by him in YouTube Channel on 18/03/2025. Alleged statement made by the accused about the RSS & Bhajarangadal organizations not only hurt his sentiments, but also portrayed divine RSS as crime organization and its volunteers as criminals. Thus, the

said statement made by the accused was not only derogatory, libelous, maligning, but also assassinating the dignity of RSS organization and also hurting the religious and emotional sentiments of the complainant. As such, the accused has committed the offences punishable U/Sec.299, 352 & 356 (2) of BNS, 2023.

5. On the basis of complaint averments and also upon hearing the complainant, as the allegations of complaint prima-facie make out the offences alleged U/Sec.299, 352 & 356(2) of BNS, 2023, the complainant was examined under Sec.223 of BNSS, 2023 as CW1 & got marked a document titled *Kiriyara Vedhi*, the extract of website information about RSS, the extract of the Hindu Newspaper e-news copy along with Certificate U/Sec.63 of *Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023* ( in Short BSA, 2023) and a CD containing alleged audio video recording along with certificate U/Sec.63 of BSA, 2023 and also the complaint given to the Commissioner of Police, Bengaluru City as per Ex.C1 to C7 respectively. Thereafter, to give an opportunity of hearing to the accused before taking cognizance as provided under the proviso to Sec.223 of BNSS, 2023, a notice was issued to the accused. Upon service of said notice the accused has represented through a counsel and filed objections.

6. In the objections, the accused has denied the allegations of complainant and contended that, the statement made by the accused in the session of the Legislative house of the state is protected under *Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India* and as such there is an overarching constitutional bar for this complaint. Hence, this complaint is not maintainable. Further, the complainant is admittedly an advocate by profession and self-proclaimed member of RSS. But, there are no materials to show that he is the member of said RSS. More so, alleged statement made by the accused was against RSS organization and as such under the law, except said RSS organization nobody can lodge complaint against the accused. As such, the present complainant is neither the *authorized person* nor the *aggrieved person* to file this complaint. Hence, the complainant is not having locus standi to take action against the accused for the alleged defamatory statements. Further, the allegations made against the accused in the complaint, would not satisfy the essential legal ingredients to constitute the offences alleged against the accused U/Sec.299, 352 & 356(2) of BNS, 2023. Similarly, the words used in the alleged statement if read in the context they were used does not amount to any such imputation as to constitute

the ingredients of defamation, rather they would amount to critics on the law & order record of certain groups like, RSS & Bhajarangadal. Said statement is nothing but the reflection of view point of the accused as a Chief Minister of the state on the security challenges posed by certain organization. Further, there is no specific allegation as to any such intention on the part of the accused to defame or derail the reputation of complainant individually or said RSS organization. Therefore, such remarks cannot by any stretch of legal interpretation be construed as defamatory or punishable under law.

7. Heard both side and perused the complaint, statement of CW1 & the materials produced by the complainant at Ex.C1 to 7 and objections filed by the accused.

8. On perusal of the complaint and materials available on record i.e., Ex.C1 to C7, prima-facie it appears that, all the facts that are referred to by the complainant-Cw1 in his sworn statement and the document produced by the complainant along with his complaint i.e., the extract of website information about RSS, the extract of the Hindu Newspaper e-news copy along with Certificate U/Sec.63 of BSA, 2023 and a CD containing alleged audio-video recording along with certificate U/Sec.63 of BSA, 2023 as per Ex.C3 to C6

respectively, corroborate the contents / allegations of the complaint filed by the complainant. In his objection the accused has neither denied nor disputed making alleged statement in the legislative assembly on 17/03/2025. However, he has taken the contention that alleged statement was made by him during the on going session of Karnataka Legislative Assembly in his capacity as the Hon'ble Chief Minister of the State & while responding to the motion of thanks moved in respect of the address delivered by his excellency the Hon'ble Governor of Karnataka to the Joint sitting of State Legislature commending the Governments performance and implementation of welfare schemes, Administrative policies by the Government including maintenance of law & order in the state, which was interrupted by some of the Members of opposition party by making commotion and provocation on the floor of the house, which made the accused to give spontaneous and extemporaneous reply, wherein in the course of addressing such continuous disruptions, the accused made alleged statements. As such alleged statement or remarks were an intrinsic part of a legislative debate on the governance and law & order. Thus, the same is squarely within the sphere of proceedings in the legislature. As such, said remarks or statement made by the accused in the session was

protected under Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India, which says no member of the legislature of the state shall be liable to any proceedings in any court in respect of anything said or any vote given by him in the legislature. Further, the alleged reference to RSS & Bhajarangadal arose in the context of law enforcement and public order subjects under discussion. As such the same formed part of accused's policy rebuttal on the floor as the Chief Minister of the state. The speech had a clear nexus to governance issues being debated and therefore the same remains firmly within the scope of immunity under Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India. On the other hand, the complainant has argued that, there is no such absolute privilege under Article 194 of the Indian Constitution to any member of Legislature to speak whatever he want and against whom ever he wishes to. Rather, any such speech to attract the immunity under said Article 194(2) should have nexus with the on going subject of legislative debate. But, said RSS & Bhajarangadal organizations are neither the political parties nor the participants in the said debate nor there was any such subject about said organization under the said debate. As such, the alleged statement made by the accused in the said session would not get any immunity under the Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India. The privileges and



immunity envisaged under said Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India would be applicable only if any act done or anything said is essential for exercising the legislative functions of the members of assembly. But, in the present case alleged statement made by the accused was neither required nor essential towards discharge of any of his legislative functions. As such, said act of the accused is not protected under Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India. In support of his contention he also relied on the decision of **Hon'ble Apex court** in the case of **State of Kerala V/s K. Ajith & Others** reported in **(2021) 6 SCR 774**, wherein the **Hon'ble Apex court** as held as follows;

*“Privileges and immunities are not not gateways to claim exemptions from the general law of the land, particularly, the criminal law which governs the action of every citizen – To claim an exemption from the application of criminal law would be to betray the trust which is impressed on the elected representatives as the makers and enactors of the law- Withdrawal application is based on a fundamental misconception of the constitutional provisions contained in Art. 194 – Alleged act of destruction of public property within the House by the members to lodge their protest against the presentation of the budget cannot be regarded as essential for exercising their legislative functions, nor can be equated with the freedom of speech in the legislature, thus, not covered by the privileges guaranteed under the Constitution”.*

9. In the light of the rival contentions, on careful consideration of the place, time & the circumstance under which alleged statement was made by the accused and also the position of the accused at the time of making alleged statement, it appears very clear that, said statement was made by the accused in the course of his reply to the Motion of thanks on the floor of the assembly moved in respect of the address delivered by his excellency Hon'ble Governor of the state to the joint session of State Legislature in his capacity as the Chief Minister of the State. Further, it is revealed that while he was addressing the matter pertaining to the law & order situation in the state, certain members of opposition party start interrupting proceedings of the house by making some uproar & commotion with some political considerations on the floor of the house making provocations and under such commotion & provocations while giving some spontaneous & extemporaneous response, the accused appears to have made said stray statement in the house. On careful consideration of the circumstance under which said statement got generated from the mouth of the accused, it is very clear that when one of the opposition member claims to belong to said RSS organization at the time of accused giving reply to the efforts that are being made by the Government for maintenance of law & order

in the state and on the subject of the law enforcement & public order discussion, he replied to said member by saying that you the RSS & Bhajarangadal are the ones who commit more offences. Thus, it appears that said speech made by the accused had clear nexus with the governance issue that was being debated in the said session. As such, said speech appears to be squarely within the sphere of proceedings in the legislature and as such covered within the ambit of the immunity or privilege under Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India. Further, as revealed from the News article published in the Hindu News at Ex.C3 the said opposition party leader Sri. R. Ashok himself makes a statement at the same time in the session saying *“let the Chief Minister say these things against the RSS in public, if he has courage, instead of making such allegations within the shelter of house”*, which clearly demonstrate that the accused was making alleged statement in the Legislative Assembly because of such immunity. Therefore, as rightly argued by the defence counsel the alleged statement made by the accused being the Chief Minister of the State in the Legislative Assembly during his reply to the Motion of thanks moved in the Joint session of both the houses to the address delivered by his excellency Hon’ble Governor of the state about the Governance of the state and in the

course of discussion on the subject of maintenance of law & order and law enforcement, appears to be within the sphere of *proceedings of the Legislature* and intrinsic part of a *legislative debate* and as such it is aptly covered by the privilege or immunity as provided under Article 194(2) of the Constitution of India.

10. The 2<sup>nd</sup> contention raised by the defence counsel is that, present complainant is not having any *locus standi* to file this complaint in respect of alleged statement made by the accused. It is specific contention of the defence counsel that the accused is only a self-proclaimed member of said RSS organization. He has not produced any materials to show that he is the member of said organization. As such, he is not a person affected by the alleged statement made by the accused against said RSS organization. It is well settled position of law that, only an *aggrieved person* is entitled to initiate prosecution for the offence of defamation punishable U/Sec.356(2) of BNS, 2023. Further, there is no specific allegation as to whether the accused made any individual defamatory statement against the complainant. That being the case, the present complainant may not be an aggrieved person as contemplated under said Sec.356(2) of BNS, 2023. In this regard, the accused in his complaint claims that he is

an alumnus of Rashtrothana parishath in early 90's & benefited by their service. He also claims that said Rashtrothana parishath is an institute managed by said RSS. In support of the same, he got produced a document titled as *Kiriyara Vedhi* as per Ex.C1. Further, he claims that during his early schooling days, he used to attend the drill and exercise activities which are being carried by said RSS organization. But, except claiming so he has neither produced any documents nor adduced any evidences to substantiate the same. Similarly, though he has produced the document at Ex.C3, which shows his name and the rank of school, he has not produced any materials to show that said Parishath is the institution run by RSS organization. More so, he has not produced any materials to show that, any student of said Rashtrothana parishath is deemed to be Member of said RSS organization. Admittedly, as revealed from the website extract about said RSS & its establishment and functioning, said organization is an unregistered organization and there is no formal procedure of membership in the said organization. If so, any one can claim to be the Member of RSS when the question of any right arises and he may disclaim to be member of said RSS when any question of liability arises. Therefore, unless there is some proper proof or materials at least prima-facie to establish any

such person to be member of said organization, it may not be proper to accept that he is a member of said organization merely on the basis of his claim. However, it says that any one can join said organization by joining the nearest Shakha which is a basic unit & activity of said RSS. That being the case, it may not be possible to ascertain as to whether a person is the Member of said organization or not without any other supporting materials or evidences. If at all, this complainant is member of said organization at any point of time, he should have mentioned any such Shakha - the basic unit, through which he used to do alleged activities in his schooling days.

11. Further, for a person to claim as an *aggrieved person*, he should have been affected by any such statement made by the accused directly or indirectly. Admittedly, and as revealed from plain reading of alleged statement, it is very clear that, the accused made said statement about said RSS and Bhajarangadal organizations. No doubt, as provided under explanation-2 to Sec.356(2) of BNS, 2023, any such imputation made against a company or an association or collection of persons would also amount to defamation. As such any member of such association or collection of persons can

maintain complaint on behalf of such juristic entity. Similarly, as the said RSS organization is a determinate body of persons and a definite and identifiable body as held by **Hon'ble Apex court** in the case of **G. Narasimhan & Others V/s T.V. Chokkappa**, reported in **(1972) 2 SCC 680**, any member of said organization can maintain the complaint for the offence of defamation against said organization. But, in the present case though the complainant claims to a member of said RSS, he has not stated his position & authority to file this complaint on behalf of said RSS organization.

12. Further, it is contended by the defence counsel that the allegations of the complaint & the materials produced along with the complaint would not satisfy the ingredients of the offences P/U/Sec. 299 & 352 of BNS, 2023 and as such no cognizance of said offences could be taken by this court. In this regard on careful reading of Sec.299 of BNS, 2023, it appears very clear that to attract said offence, there must a deliberate & malicious act on the part of the accused & such act should be with the intention of insulting the religion or the religious belief of any class of citizens of India. But, the content of alleged speech made by the accused would not touch upon any religion or religious belief at all as rightly argued by the

defence counsel. Further, said RSS organization is admittedly not a religious organization and said organization doesn't use the word *Hindu* as religion, as revealed from the extract from the Official website of said RSS, produced by the complainant himself. Hence, the alleged remarks made against said RSS would not in any manner refer to any religion or any religious belief of any such religion. That being the case, said statements in no manner satisfy the ingredients of an Offence P/U/Sec.299 of BNS, 2023.

13. With regard to the offence Under Sec.352 of BNS, 2023 (Sec.504 of IPC), it is pertinent to note that, both the offence Under Sec. 352 Of BNS & Sec.356 of BNS cannot co-exist. Because, any such act, if it causes the effect of insulting may not have the effect of harm to reputation. Because, insult is self generated, whereas harm to reputation would be in the eye of public/society. Further to attract the offence Under Sec.352 of BNS, it necessary to show that such act of the accused was committed with the intention to insult the complainant & to give provocation to him with the intention or knowledge that such provocation would cause him to break public peace or to commit an offence. But, in case of defamation the only intention is to harm the reputation or damage the



reputation or dignity of the complainant in the eyes of public or the society. Thus, to attract an offence under Sec.352 of BNS, such act of the accused should be directed towards a particular person coupled with an intention to provoke such person to break public peace or to commit an offence. But in the complaint there is no such specific allegation as to any such intention of accused to insult any individual & to so provoke such individual. Therefore as rightly argued by the defence counsel there are no ingredients of offence under U/Sec. 352 of BNS, 2023 in the allegation of the complaint as well as alleged statement made by the accused.

14. Similarly, with regard to the offence U/sec. 356 of BNS, 2023, it appears more important at this stage to examine as to whether alleged statements/ imputation would satisfy the ingredients of offence Under Sec.356 of BNS, 2023. In this regard it appears proper to state the important ingredients of Sec.356 of BNS,2023. As held by **Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta** in the case of **Sunilakhya V/s H.M. Jadwet**, reported in **AIR 1968 Cal 266**, the offence of defamation consists of following 3 essential ingredients; (1) *making or publishing any imputation concerning any person* (2) *such imputation must have been made by words either spoken or intended to be*

*read or by signs or by visual representation and (3) the said imputation must have been made with the intention to harm or with knowledge or having reason to believe that it will harm the reputation of the person concerned. Therefore, the intention to cause harm is the most essential 'sine qua non' of an offence U/sec. 499 of IPC (Sec.356 of BNS).*

15. Further what is reputation of a parson?. It is measured in the eye of public/ society. In this regard, It is pertinent to refer the dictum of **Hon'ble High Court of karnataka** in the case of **Mrs.Tara Ajai Singh V/s Mr.R.P.Sharma**, reported in **ILR 2012 KAR 5619**, wherein the *Hon'ble High Court* has held that *'the character of a person is what a person actually is, while reputation is what neighbors and others say what he is. The person against whom the allegations are made must have a reputation and that a damage is caused to it on account of false allegations. Damage to reputation of a person should be in the estimation of others. Therefore, the complainant has to specify as to how his reputation is damaged in the estimation of others'*. As such to test as to whether the alleged remarks would directly or indirectly harm the reputation of the complainant, it is necessary to show that the complainant has been identified with such organization or association in the society and he is

identified as a man of said organization in the society or his friends or relatives as on or subsequent to publication of such remarks. If not, how could it be tested that alleged remarks would harm or caused any such harm to the reputation of complainant. Mere having some perspective about some organization or certain perception about an organization would not confer any such right as a member of such organization. More over on careful reading of the allegations made in the complaint, it appears very clear that no where either in the complaint or in his statement under Sec.223 of BNSS, 2023, he states that alleged remarks made by the accused have lowered or harmed or damaged his reputation in the society or among his family or relatives & friends. Rather, he states that alleged statement is derogatory, libelous, maligning & assassinating the dignity of said RSS organization and is hurting his religious & emotional sentiments. For reference said portions in his complaint & statement are extracted herein below;

*“the statement of the accused against the geneous organization which works on the principles of 'Service before Self ' is not only derogatory, libelous, maligning. assassinating to the dignity of the R.S.S. Organization, and hurting the religious and emotional sentiments of the complainant”.*

" ಆ ರೀತಿ ಆರ್.ಎಸ್. ಎಸ್ ಸಂಘಟನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವಹೇಳನಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಸಂಘಟನೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರ್ತನಾದ ನನಗೆ

ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ನೋವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಸದರಿ ಸಂಘಟನೆಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಮಾನಹಾನಿ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ".

16. As held by **Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka** in the case of **Mrs.Tara Ajai Singh V/s Mr.R.P.Sharma**, **stated supra**, *'it is necessary that the complainant has to specify in his complaint as to how his reputation is damaged in the estimation of others'*. But, as extracted herein above, there are no such specific averments in the complaint as to how the reputation of the complainant was damaged by alleged statement made by the complainant in the estimation of others, like his family members or relatives or friends or professional colleagues.

17. Further as rightly argued by the defence counsel, and also as held by Hon'ble Apex Court in a catena of decisions including the land mark decision on the law of defamation in the case of **Subramanian Swamy V/s Union of India & Others**, reported in **(2016) 7 SCC 221**, intention to harm the reputation is sine qua non of an offence of defamation. In the said decision **Hon'ble Apex court** has held as follows;

*'Causing harm to the reputation of a person is the basis on which the offence is founded and mens rea is a condition precedent to constitute the said offence'.*

18. Further, in judging whether the accused had such intention or knowledge, the circumstances under which and the main object with which such imputations or defamatory statements were made or published are material as held by **Hon'ble High Court of Orissa** in the case of **Chaithan Charan Dass V/s Raghunath Singh**, reported in **AIR 1959 Ori 141**.

19. As such, it necessary to show that accused had any such intention in making such defamatory imputations or remarks. Though, it may not be necessary prove the same at this stage, it appears necessary to prima facie show such an intention of the accused. But, even on thorough search of the complaint allegations as well as the statement of the complainant, not even a single word or phrase or sentence that would give any such inference as to the accused having such an intention at the time making alleged statement could be found. Rather, it is simply stated in the complaint at para 7 that the accused *while admiring* their governance in curbing the crime rate in the state has so accused the RSS &

Bajarangdal organizations. Similarly in his statement at para 3 also the complainant states that the accused *unnecessarily* pulled the name of said organization & made such defamatory accusation. For reference relevant portion of the same are extracted as follows;

"ಸದರಿ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿ ಸಂಧರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಅನವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಸಂಘಟನೆಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಎಳೆದು ತಂದು ಅದರ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿ ಉಂಟಾಗುವಂತೆ ಆರೋಪ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ".

*"on 17-03-2025 at Vidhanasoudha, Bangalore, while admiring their governance in curbing the crime rate in the state, Mr.Siddaramaiah has accuses the R.S.S. and Bhajarangadala organizations are the perpetrators of the crime in the state by uttering the following statement".*

20. Further, in the light of the dictum of the **Hon'ble High Courts** and the **Hon'ble Apex court** in the decisions stated supra, it is very clear that the intention of the accused to cause harm to the complainant is the most essential element of an offence of defamation. More so, in understanding or judging such an intention of the accused, it is material to look into the circumstances under which and the object with which such defamatory imputations or remarks or statements were made or published. Therefore, in the light of the above ratio, on

Careful consideration of the alleged statements made by the accused and the allegations made in the complaint and also the publications in News agencies about alleged statement made by the accused, as already discussed herein above, the accused in the course of his reply to the motion of thanks to the Hon'ble Governor and in the course of brushing aside the opposition's allegations with regard to maintenance of law & order in his governance and in the context of the discussion on the subjects of law enforcement & public order, made said statement. As such, no such intention as to harming the reputation or dignity of said RSS organization could be drawn from such statement, which had come in the circumstances as stated herein above.

21. In view of all the above discussed reasons, it can be concluded that no such *intention to harm the reputation of the complainant* could be gathered or judged from the alleged speech/ statement / imputations, rather an *intention to brush aside the oppositions allegations about the maintenance of law & order in the Governance and also in the context of discussion on the subjects of law enforcement & public order as an intrinsic part of legislative debate in the proceedings of the legislature*. As such the allegations of the complaint as well as the documents

annexed to it, would not prima-facie satisfy the ingredients of alleged offences P/U/Sec.299, 352 & 356(2) of BNS, 2023 and as such do not make out any case for taking cognizance of said offences as against the accused. Accordingly, this court proceeds to pass the following;

**ORDER**

***The complaint filed by the complainant  
Under Sec.223 of BNSS, 2023 for the offences  
P/U/Sec.299, 352 & 356(2) of BNS, 2023, as  
against the accused is hereby rejected.***

*(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2025).*

(K.N. Shivakumar)  
XLII Addl. CJM, Bengaluru  
(Spl.Court for trial of cases against MPs/MLAs, in  
the State of Karnataka)



*(Order pronounced in the Open Court  
(Vide Separate order)*

**ORDER**

*The complaint filed by the complainant Under Sec.223 of BNSS, 2023 for the offences P/U/Sec.299, 352 & 356(2) of BNS, 2023, as against the accused is hereby rejected.*

**XLII Addl. CJM**  
(Spl.Court for trial of cases against  
MPs/MLAs, in the State of Karnataka)

