



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF MAY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 1880 OF 2026

(439(Cr.PC)/483(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

SRI. PRASHANTH KAREEPA TALAVAR
S/O SKAREEPA GULAPPA TALVAR
AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS
R/AT POST YALIWAR,
VITHALAPUR, YALIWAL,
DHARWAD – 581 207

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MANOJ S N., ADVOCATE)

AND:

STATE OF KARNATAKA BY
CYBER CRIME POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU CITY,





REPRESENTED BY THE SPP,
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU - 560001

...RESPONDENT

(BY SMT. PUSHPALATHA B., ADDL. SPP)

THIS CRL.P FILED U/S 439 CR.PC (FILED U/S 483 BNNS)
BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING TO
ENLARGE THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.3 ON BAIL IN CRIME
NO.69/2025 FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S 67 AND 66(C) OF THE IT
ACT, 2000 AND U/S 351(3), 352, 75(3), 351(2), 79 R/W
SECTION 3(5) OF THE BNS 2023 PENDING ON THE FILE OF
THE 45TH ADDL.JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE IN CRIME NO.69/2025.

THIS CRIMINAL PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND
RESERVED ON 08.04.2026, COMING ON FOR
PRONOUNCEMENT OF JUDGMENT, THIS DAY, THE COURT
MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH



CAV JUDGMENT

1. This criminal petition is filed by the petitioner who is arrayed as accused No.3 in Crime No.69/2025 filed by the respondent – Police for the offences punishable under Section 67, 66(C) of Information Technology Act, 2000 and under Section 351(3), 352, 75(3), 351(2) and 79 read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (*for short BNS*).

Factual matrix of the case:

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant is the wife of an eminent film actor. A film in which her husband played the lead role was released on 11.12.2025. The complainant was participated in a programme at Davangere on 21.12.2025 and made certain statements during the event. However, her statements were allegedly misinterpreted, leading to derogatory comments being posted on various social media platforms by unknown persons. Upon reviewing these comments, the complainant lodged a complaint with the respondent-Police.



3. Based on the said complaint, the respondent - Police registered a case and conducted investigation. The investigation is in progress.

4. Heard Sri. Manoj S.N. learned counsel for the petitioner and Smt. Pushpalatha B., learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor for respondent – State of Karnataka.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations made against the petitioner is that he has posted a comment on an existing social media. It is not the case of the prosecution that the petitioner has uploaded any contents or any disseminated materials. It is further submitted that to attract the ingredients of Section 67 of the IT Act, 2000, it requires a publication or a transmission of obscene material by the accused person. The act of posting a comment on an existing post without uploading or disseminating any obscene material does not satisfy the essential ingredients of the said provision. The petitioner is a reputed person and he has deep roots in the society. He is aged about 22 years and he is a resident of Yaliwal, Dharwad. He will abide by the conditions to be imposed by this Court in the event of his release on bail.



Making such submission, learned counsel for the petitioner prays to allow the petition.

6. Learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor for respondent – State vehemently submitted that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence. He made certain derogatory comments against the victim. The investigation is under progress. Cyber crimes have become a menace to the Society. A person sitting in a different place with a device in his hands feels entitled to do anything and everything according to his whims and fancies, troubling innocent persons/innocent citizens. In order to regulate such a menace to the Society, it is necessary to regulate it.

7. It is further submitted that the petitioner made comments in the social media against the complainant which are obnoxious and it contained derogatory comments against the woman in the Society. The said comments certainly would cause mental agony and also cause irreparable injuries. Therefore, the petition has to be rejected in the interest of not only a particular complainant but also society at large. Making



such submission learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor for respondent – State prays to reject the petition.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and on perusal of the averments of the complaint, it appears that, as per the averments of the remand application, the petitioner herein is arrayed as accused No.3. He is having an instagram account in the name of "halakat_randimunde". On 21.12.2025, the complainant was participated in the promotion of a kannada film by name "the devil". In respect of the said promotion, the petitioner commented through his account in a vulgar language which is not in a position to be mentioned in this order. Such comments against woman is ridiculous and unpardonable. The manner in which, the petitioner commented on the complainant would indicate his -mentality towards the woman in the country.

9. No doubt, freedom of speech of expressions are guaranteed to its citizens under the constitution of India. However, every such right has its reasonable restrictions. Exceeding such restrictions or invading the personal liberty of



another person, certainly would be an offence and it would be dealt with in accordance with law.

10. It is needless to state that the Social Media as its responsibility to maintain decorum and also to instill the confidence in the mind of the citizens of this Country. The persons who are making comments on any issues have to maintain public peace and order. Making a baseless, false, frivolous and intimidating messages are required to be regulated by the Company itself, if not, Courts are required to secure the confidence of the citizens of this Country by way of interfering with such comments on the social media which violates the fundamental rights of any citizens of this Country.

11. It is significant to state that Courts are not mute spectators. Whenever interference is required, the Courts without hesitation, will step into safeguarding the rights and interests of individuals or the public, guaranteed under the Constitution of India.

12. In the light of the observations made above, I hold that the petition deserves to be rejected.



NC: 2026:KHC:26048
CRL.P No. 1880 of 2026

13. Ordered, accordingly.

Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE

NM/-
List No.: 1 SI No.: 2