

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

M.A. NO. _____ of 2026

IN

WRIT PETITION (CRL.) NO. 159 OF 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

DARSHAN ... PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA ... RESPONDENT

AND IN THE MATTER OF: -

DARSHAN ... ORIGINAL PETITIONER/APPLICANT

**AN APPLICATION SEEKING A LIMITED MODIFICATION
OF THE ORDER DATED 15.05.2026 PASSED BY THIS
HON'BLE COURT IN THE CAPTIONED WRIT PETITION
BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT**

PAPER – BOOK

[FOR INDEX: KINDLY SEE INSIDE]

ADVOCATE FOR THE APPLICANT : M/S LAWFIC

INDEX

<u>SL.NO.</u>	<u>PARTICULARS</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1.	M.A. No. _____ of 2026: An Application seeking a limited modification of the Order dated 15.05.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in the captioned Writ Petition by the Petitioner/Applicant with affidavit.	1-19
2.	<u>ANNEXURE A-1:</u> Copy of the Order dated 15.05.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition (Crl.) 159 of 2026	20-27
3.	Vakalatnama with NOC	28

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

M.A. NO. _____ of 2026

IN

WRIT PETITION (CRL.) NO. 159 OF 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

DARSHAN ... PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA ... RESPONDENT

AND IN THE MATTER OF:-

Darshan
S/o. Late Toogudeepa Srinivas,
Residing at No.217, Toogudeepa
Nilaya, F Road, Ideal Home
Township, Rajarajeshwarinagar,
Bengaluru -560 098,
KarnatakaOriginal Petitioner/Applicant

VERSUS

The State Of Karnataka
By the Station House Officer,
Kamakshipalya Police Station,
Bengaluru,
Represented by Secretary Home Department
Vidhan Soudha,
Bengaluru,
KarnatakaRespondent

**AN APPLICATION SEEKING A LIMITED MODIFICATION
OF THE ORDER DATED 15.05.2026 PASSED BY THIS
HON'BLE COURT IN THE CAPTIONED WRIT PETITION
BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT**

TO,

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF INDIA

AND HIS HON'BLE COMPANION JUSTICES OF
THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

THIS HUMBLE APPLICATION OF
THE APPLICANT ABOVE-NAMED

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

1. That the present Miscellaneous Application is being preferred by the Applicant/Original Petitioner seeking a limited clarification/modification of Paragraph 15 of the Order dated 15.05.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in the above-captioned proceedings. Copy of the Order dated 15.05.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition (Crl.) 159 of 2026 is marked hereto and annexed as **ANNEXURE A-1** at pages 20 to 27.
2. That the Applicant states/declares that the instant miscellaneous Application has been necessitated as the Order passed in the captioned Writ Petition/main proceeding being executory in nature, it has become impossible to be implemented because of subsequent events or developments.
3. That at the outset, it is most respectfully submitted that the present Application is neither a Review Petition nor an attempt to seek a recall, reconsideration, modification of findings/observations or reopening of issues already adjudicated by this Hon'ble Court.
4. The Applicant accepts and remains bound by the findings, observations and directions contained in the Judgment dated 14.08.2025 as well as the subsequent Order dated 15.05.2026. The Applicant/Petitioner's bail had been cancelled by this

Hon'ble Court vide Judgment dated 14.08.2025 in SLP (Crl.) 516-522 of 2025. The present application is confined solely to seeking clarification regarding the scope, ambit and legal effect of Paragraph 15 of the Order dated 15.05.2026.

5. It is respectfully submitted that while disposing of the proceedings in the Writ Petition on 15.05.2026, this Hon'ble Court was pleased to take note of the progress of the Trial and was further pleased to observe that in the event there is no substantial progress in the trial within one year, it would be open to the Applicant to seek bail before the competent Court.
6. It is respectfully submitted that the aforesaid observation was made by this Hon'ble Court with the object of preserving the liberty of the Applicant and ensuring meaningful progress of the Trial. The said observation was intended to operate as a constitutional safeguard in favour of the Applicant in the event the Trial failed to progress at the pace expected by this Hon'ble Court.
7. The Applicant respectfully submits that since August 2025, the Applicant has remained continuously incarcerated and has dutifully complied with all directions issued by the Courts concerned. At no point has the Applicant attempted to delay the proceedings or obstruct the progress of trial. The Applicant has throughout, cooperated with the judicial process and has remained available to face Trial in accordance with law.
8. It is submitted that even at the time when the matter was considered by this Hon'ble Court on 15.05.2026, this Hon'ble

Court was conscious of the pace of the trial and the substantial number of witnesses cited by the Prosecution. The concern of this Hon'ble Court regarding delay in Trial formed the very basis of the observations contained in Paragraph 15.

9. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Prosecution has cited an extraordinarily large number of witnesses and despite passage of considerable time, only a limited number of witnesses have been examined. The Applicant had specifically pointed out before this Hon'ble Court that the prosecution proposed to examine approximately 262 witnesses and that only a small fraction thereof had been examined despite substantial lapse of time, thereby indicating that the Trial was likely to continue for an extended duration, upto several years. The Applicant had also specifically raised concerns regarding prolonged incarceration and the constitutional implications arising therefrom.
10. The Applicant had further brought to the notice of this Hon'ble Court the severe prejudice caused by continued incarceration to his livelihood, profession and family life. The Applicant had specifically demonstrated that prolonged detention pending trial was having a devastating impact upon his professional career and constitutionally protected right to livelihood. The Applicant had also placed before this Hon'ble Court the serious medical condition of his mother who is suffering from advanced oncological ailments and whose health continues to deteriorate due to the prolonged incarceration of the Applicant.
11. That it is respectfully submitted that subsequent to the Order dated 15.05.2026, a genuine apprehension has arisen that

Paragraph 15 in the said Order may be construed by the prosecuting agencies or subordinate Courts as creating an implied embargo against consideration of any future bail application before expiry of one year irrespective of emergence of fresh and supervening circumstances affecting the liberty of the Applicant.

12. That the Applicant respectfully submits that such an interpretation was never intended by this Hon'ble Court and would produce consequences contrary to the settled constitutional principles. If Paragraph 15 is interpreted as a complete prohibition, the Applicant would effectively be rendered totally remediless even in circumstances where prolonged incarceration assumes oppressive proportions, where extraordinary delay occurs in the Trial, where serious medical circumstances arise or where other supervening events materially affect the Applicant's constitutional rights.
13. That it is respectfully submitted that the settled jurisprudence governing personal liberty recognizes that subsequent events and changed circumstances may themselves give rise to a fresh cause of action independent of earlier Orders. The Applicant is made aware that rejection or cancellation of bail does not create a perpetual bar against future consideration of liberty upon emergence of supervening circumstances and that constitutional remedies remain available whenever subsequent events warrant judicial scrutiny.
14. The Applicant herein, respectfully submits that the liberty granted by this Hon'ble Court after one year, was intended to be

an additional safeguard available to the Applicant and not an exclusion of remedies otherwise available in law. However, in view of the ambiguity which may arise in future proceedings, the Applicant is constrained to **seek a limited clarification/modification** from this Hon'ble Court so that Paragraph 15 is not construed in a manner which inadvertently curtails constitutional remedies relating to personal liberty.

15. The present application is therefore being preferred *bona fide* and in the interests of justice solely for clarification of the scope and effect of Paragraph 15 without seeking any alteration of the substantive findings recorded by this Hon'ble Court.

GROUNDS

- a. **Because** Paragraph 15 of the Order dated 15.05.2026 is enabling in nature and was intended to preserve liberty rather than postpone or suspend consideration of liberty-based remedies irrespective of future developments. The liberty granted by this Hon'ble Court after one year constitutes an additional safeguard and cannot be construed as an implied prohibition against consideration of fresh circumstances arising prior thereto.
- b. **Because** the observations contained in Paragraph 15 do not expressly prohibit filing, consideration or adjudication of a subsequent bail application founded upon changed circumstances. In the absence of clear and express language, no restriction upon constitutional remedies can be inferred by implication.

- c. **Because** it is a settled principle of criminal jurisprudence that every subsequent bail application founded upon fresh circumstances constitute a distinct and independent cause of action. The maintainability of such proceedings does not arise from disagreement with an earlier Order but from emergence of new facts materially altering the legal and factual position.
- d. **Because** rejection or cancellation of bail does not create a perpetual disability against future consideration of liberty. The doctrine of supervening circumstances is firmly embedded in bail jurisprudence and recognizes that subsequent developments may require fresh judicial evaluation and intervention notwithstanding earlier orders.
- e. **Because** Article 21 of the Constitution of India, 1950 guarantees a continuing and dynamic right to personal liberty and speedy trial. The constitutional validity of continued detention cannot be frozen with reference to circumstances existing on a particular date but must remain open to scrutiny in light of subsequent developments.
- f. **Because** every additional day of incarceration has independent constitutional significance. The legality and proportionality of continued detention necessarily depends on evolving circumstances including progress of Trial, duration of custody, conduct of parties and other relevant factors which may arise after the passing of an earlier order.
- g. **Because** an interpretation treating Paragraph 15 as an absolute embargo would lead to manifestly unjust consequences by

preventing judicial scrutiny even in situations involving extraordinary delay, prolonged incarceration, severe medical emergencies, humanitarian considerations or other exceptional circumstances affecting liberty.

- h. **Because** constitutional remedies concerning personal liberty cannot be excluded by implication. Any restriction upon access to judicial remedies must be express, unambiguous and incapable of any alternative interpretation. Paragraph 15 contains no such restrictive language.
- i. **Because** the Order dated 15.05.2026 itself proceeds on the premise that progress of Trial is a relevant constitutional consideration. Once this Hon'ble Court has recognized the Trial progress as relevant, subsequent developments concerning trial progress must necessarily remain open to judicial examination.
- j. **Because** the Applicant has remained continuously incarcerated since August 2025 and the constitutional implications of prolonged detention become progressively more serious with the passage of time, particularly where the prosecution proposes to examine an exceptionally large number of witnesses and early conclusion of Trial remains totally uncertain.
- k. **Because** prolonged incarceration impacts not only physical liberty but also dignity, livelihood, professional engagements, reputation, family responsibilities and other facets of life protected under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Applicant

had specifically placed such circumstances before this Hon'ble Court and the same continue to assume greater significance with passage of time.

- l. **Because** the Applicant had also brought to the notice of this Hon'ble Court the grave medical condition of his mother and the severe hardship suffered by the family owing to his continued incarceration. Such humanitarian circumstances are dynamic in nature and may themselves constitute supervening circumstances requiring future judicial consideration and intervention.
- m. **Because** the ambiguity concerning personal liberty ought to be resolved in favour of preserving access to justice and constitutional remedies rather than restricting them. Where two interpretations are possible, the interpretation advancing liberty must prevail.
- n. **Because** the clarification/modification sought would neither review, dilute nor modify any substantive finding recorded by this Hon'ble Court and would merely ensure proper interpretation and implementation of the Order dated 15.05.2026.
- o. **Because** the clarification sought would avoid multiplicity of proceedings, prevent conflicting interpretations by subordinate courts and ensure that future proceedings, if any, are decided on their merits rather than on avoidable objections concerning maintainability.

- p. **Because** no prejudice whatsoever would be caused to the Respondent if the clarification sought herein is granted, whereas refusal of such clarification may result in serious prejudice to the Applicant's constitutional right to seek judicial redress upon emergence of future supervening circumstances.
- q. **Because** the present application raises a substantial question concerning preservation of constitutional remedies and deserves consideration in the interests of justice, equity and fair administration of criminal law.
- r. **Because** the observations contained in Paragraph 15 were intended to operate as a constitutional safeguard and not as a restriction upon future exercise of judicial powers concerning personal liberty. It is respectfully submitted that the Order dated 15.05.2026 was passed by this Hon'ble Court while balancing the competing considerations of personal liberty and the interest of a fair trial. The liberty reserved in favour of the Applicant after one year was clearly intended as a protective mechanism to ensure that prolonged incarceration does not continue indefinitely in the event meaningful progress is not achieved in the trial. The said observation was therefore beneficial and enabling in nature.
- s. **Because** any interpretation treating the said observation as an absolute embargo against consideration of subsequent developments would invert the very object sought to be achieved by this Hon'ble Court and convert a protective direction into a restrictive one. Such an interpretation would

be contrary to the spirit, purpose and constitutional foundation underlying the Order dated 15.05.2026.

- t. **Because** subsequent to the passing of the Order dated 15.05.2026, the progress of Trial has remained substantially unsatisfactory. Despite the concern expressed by this Hon'ble Court regarding expeditious conduct of Trial, only two witnesses have been examined after the said Order. Significantly, both witnesses are merely formal/mahazar witnesses whose evidence does not advance the substantive adjudication of the prosecution case. No material witness, eye witness, complainant witness, investigating officer or other crucial witness has been examined after the Order dated 15.05.2026. The proceedings have thereafter been adjourned and the matter presently stands posted on 15.06.2026. It is respectfully submitted that this Hon'ble Court, while passing the Order dated 15.05.2026, proceeded on the expectation that the trial would progress expeditiously and that substantial evidence would be recorded within a reasonable period. However, the subsequent order sheets reveal that after the said order only two witnesses have been examined and both are merely formal/mahazar witnesses. No material witness has entered the witness box and no substantive prosecution evidence has been recorded. The matter presently stands adjourned to 15.06.2026. These subsequent developments indicate that the very concern which weighed with this Hon'ble Court while passing the Order dated 15.05.2026 continues to persist. In such circumstances, Paragraph 15 ought not to be interpreted in a manner which forecloses

consideration of future liberty-based remedies arising from continued delay or lack of meaningful progress in trial.

- u. **Because** the foundation upon which continued incarceration was justified has undergone a material change owing to prolonged custody and lack of meaningful progress in trial, thereby giving rise to a fresh cause of action requiring constitutional scrutiny under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, 1950.
- v. **Because** the Applicant unreservedly accepts and remains bound by the findings and directions issued by this Hon'ble Court. The present Application is necessitated solely on account of an ambiguity which has arisen regarding the scope and effect of Paragraph 15 of the Order dated 15.05.2026 and the substantial prejudice which may result if the said paragraph is interpreted as creating an embargo against consideration of any future application for bail or liberty-based relief before expiry of one year irrespective of subsequent developments.
- w. **Because** the concern of this Hon'ble Court was evident from the observations recorded regarding the progress of the Trial and the consequent direction that in the event substantial progress was not made within one year, it would be open to the Applicant to seek bail before the competent Court. The said observation was intended as a safeguard for protection of liberty and as a mechanism to ensure expeditious conduct of the trial.

- x. **Because** the Applicant is apprehensive that the said observation may be construed as an implied prohibition against consideration of any bail application before expiry of one year even in situations where extraordinary and supervening circumstances arise affecting the liberty of the Applicant.

- y. **Because** the law recognizes that every subsequent development affecting liberty may give rise to a fresh and independent cause of action warranting judicial scrutiny. The Applicant respectfully submits that the settled jurisprudence governing successive bail applications proceeds upon the doctrine of changed circumstances. It is a well-established principle that rejection or cancellation of bail does not create a permanent bar against future consideration of bail where subsequent developments materially alter the factual or legal landscape.

- z. **Because** if Paragraph 15 is construed as an absolute embargo, then even in circumstances where the Trial remains stagnant, where the prosecution repeatedly fails to produce witnesses, where prolonged incarceration assumes oppressive proportions, where extraordinary medical circumstances arise, or where constitutional prejudice becomes evident, the Applicant would stand remediless until expiry of one year. Such a consequence would be inconsistent with the constitutional obligation of Courts to continuously safeguard personal liberty and would render the constitutional guarantee under Article 21 illusory.

- aa. **Because** the concern is not merely academic. The prosecution has cited an extraordinarily large number of witnesses. At the time of consideration by this Hon'ble Court, only a small fraction of the cited witnesses had been examined. Even thereafter, the progress of the trial has remained far from satisfactory and substantial evidence is yet to be recorded.
- bb. **Because** the liberty granted by this Hon'ble Court after one year is an additional safeguard and not an exclusion of remedies otherwise available under law. The said paragraph neither expressly states nor impliedly suggests that constitutional courts or competent forums would be denuded of jurisdiction to consider fresh circumstances arising prior to expiry of one year. In the absence of express language, no such restriction can be inferred, particularly when the subject matter concerns personal liberty protected under Part III of the Constitution of India, 1950.
16. It is most respectfully submitted that when this Hon'ble Court set aside the order granting bail, the expectation was that the criminal Trial would proceed expeditiously and that the prosecution evidence would be recorded within a reasonable period. However, subsequent events have materially altered the factual landscape.
17. That the Applicant has remained continuously incarcerated since August 2025 and has undergone substantial pre-trial detention. Despite the concern expressed by this Hon'ble Court regarding the pace of trial and despite directions for expeditious proceedings, meaningful progress has not been

achieved. Even after the Order dated 15.05.2026, only formal/mahazar witnesses have been examined and the principal prosecution witnesses, including material witnesses and other crucial witnesses, remain unexamined. The prosecution case continues to be at a nascent stage despite prolonged incarceration of the Applicant.

18. That the continued detention of the Applicant, coupled with the absence of substantial progress in Trial, has therefore given rise to a fresh and independent constitutional cause of action distinct from the issues considered while cancelling bail.
19. The Applicant therefore seeks only a limited clarification from this Hon'ble Court that the observations contained in Paragraph 15 shall not be construed as creating an embargo against consideration of bail or any other liberty-based relief upon emergence of fresh and supervening circumstances before expiry of one year. Such clarification would not alter the merits of the Order, would not dilute any finding recorded by this Hon'ble Court and would not prejudice the Respondent in any manner. On the contrary, it would ensure that the Order-dated 15.05.2026 is implemented in its true spirit and would prevent unnecessary litigation concerning interpretation of the said order. This would ensure proper implementation of the Order and avoid unnecessary jurisdictional objections in future proceedings.
20. The instant Application is being filed *bona fide* and in the interest of justice.

PRAYER

In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it is therefore most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to:

- a. Pass an Order modifying Paragraph 15 of the Order dated 15.05.2026 in W.P. (Crl.) 159 of 2026 to a limited extent and thereby clarifying that the liberty granted therein after expiry of one year is an additional safeguard available to the Applicant and shall not be construed as restricting, prohibiting or otherwise affecting the Applicant's right to seek bail or any other appropriate relief in accordance with law upon emergence of fresh and supervening circumstances prior to expiry of the said period **and/or**;
- b. Pass an Order clarifying that Paragraph 15 of the Order dated 15.05.2026 was not intended to create any embargo upon the jurisdiction of competent courts or constitutional courts to consider subsequent developments affecting the Applicant's liberty in accordance with settled principles of law **and/or**;
- c. Pass an Order clarifying that where subsequent developments disclose lack of meaningful progress in Trial, prolonged incarceration, examination of only formal witnesses, continued pendency of material prosecution evidence, medical exigencies, humanitarian circumstances or any other supervening event affecting personal liberty, the Applicant shall be entitled to seek appropriate relief in accordance with law and such proceedings shall be

considered on their own merits uninfluenced by any interpretation of Paragraph 15 as creating a bar or embargo **and/or**;

- d. Pass any other Order as this Hon'ble Court may deem appropriate in the interest of justice and/or equity.

**AND FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS THE APPLICANT AS
IN DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY**

FILED BY



**M/s LAWFIC
ADVOCATE FOR THE APPLICANT/
ORIGINAL PETITIONER**

Drawn on: 12.06.2026
Filed on: 13.06.2026
New Delhi

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
(CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION)

M.A. No. _____ OF 2026

IN ⁴

WRIT PETITION (CRL) NO. 159 OF 2026

IN THE MATTER OF: -

Darshan

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

The State of Karnataka

...Respondent

AFFIDAVIT

I, Vijayalaxmi Darshan W/o Darshan Aged about 43 years, R/o 217 Toogudeepa Nilaya F Road near SS Hospital, Rajarajeshwarinagar Dist. Bengaluru, Karnataka do hereby solemnly affirm and state as under: -

1. That I am the Pairokar/Wife of the Petitioner/Applicant in the abovesaid matter, and I am well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case and as such I am duly authorized to swear this affidavit.
2. That I have read and understood the contents of the accompanying application and say that the facts stated therein are true and correct to best of my knowledge and belief as derived from the record of the case.
3. I also state that the copies of the documents/annexures filed along with the accompanying application are true copies of their respective originals.

Vijayalaxmi Darshan
DEPONENT



No of Corrections one only

VERIFICATION:

I the abovenamed deponent, do hereby solemnly verify that the contents of the aforesaid affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing has been concealed therefrom.

Verified at Mysuru on this 13th day of June 2026.

[Signature]
DEPONENT

No of Corrections Three



Solely Affirmed & Declared
Before me on 13/6/2026
[Signature]
NOTARY MYSORE DISTRICT

Document No: 95/2026
Page No: 27/2026

ANNEXURE A-1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) NO.159 OF 2026

DARSHAN

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. Our order dated 04.05.2026 reads thus:-

"1. Heard the learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioner.

2. Issue notice, returnable on 15th May, 2026.

3. The Registry is directed to call for a Report from the 56th Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge (CCH-57), Bengaluru, as regards the status of Sessions Case No. 1319 of 2024.

4. We would like to know from the trial court how many witnesses have been examined so far over a period of time and how many more witnesses the State proposes to examine. We would also like to have a fair idea how much more time the trial court is likely to take before the trial is concluded. We would also like to know from the State whether the basic amenities which an under-trial prisoner is otherwise entitled to is being provided to the petitioner or not.

5. The Registry shall see to it that the Report is received within a period of one week from today. One set of the entire paper book shall be furnished to the Standing Counsel appearing for the State at the earliest."

2. In pursuance of our order, referred to above, we have received a Report from the 56th Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge (CCH-57), Bengaluru. The State has also filed a Report indicating the progress of trial and examination of witnesses before the Trial Court.
3. It appears from the Report that charge came to be framed on 03.11.2025. In last seven months, the prosecution has been able to examine 10 witnesses.
4. The Report further indicates that the prosecution proposes to examine around 60 witnesses on priority basis, who according to the State are vital to indicate the role played by the accused persons.
5. As such in the charge-sheet, 272 witnesses have been shown. The report further indicates that approximately the State may examine 150 witnesses in all.
6. We are of the view that the progress insofar as trial is concerned is very slow. It may be true that the defence counsel may be taking a long time to complete the cross examination of the witnesses. But if the trial is proceeding at this pace then it is going to take a long time even before the 60 important witnesses are examined.

7. In such circumstances, it is now for the Trial Court to see that the witnesses are examined on regular basis and the trial is not adjourned on any flimsy ground here or there.
8. If need be, the Trial Court may proceed to examine the witnesses on day-to-day basis.
9. We would like to observe the progress of the trial for a further period of one year. At the end of one year from today, if there is no substantial progress in the trial then we may look into the matter accordingly.
10. We want the defence side also to cooperate with the Trial Court and see to it that the witnesses are examined on regular basis as fast as possible.
11. There is one another issue which has been raised in this petition and this is with respect to providing the basic amenities in the prison to the petitioner.
12. As regards providing basic amenities, there is an exhaustive affidavit filed duly affirmed by the Chief Superintendent of Prison, Central Prison Bengaluru.
13. In the affidavit, the following has been stated:

"3. It is submitted that the said under-trial prisoner and his co-accused prisoners have been confined in Central Prison, Bengaluru, New Building, Block-1, Barrack No. 1 since their admission till today, to ensure their safety and security.

4. It is submitted that, for the day shift duty, one Assistant Jailor and one Warder are deputed and for the night shift duty, two Head Warders are deputed, to guard the corridor in front of his barrack. Strict, safety and security measures have been implemented to prevent other inmates from entering the corridor and to avoid disturbances or security lapses. CCTV cameras have been installed in the corridor in front of his barrack, to ensure that no unwanted intrusion occurs by other inmates. These cameras are closely monitored in the CCTV Command Centre.

5. It is submitted that, the barrack in which they are housed is well-equipped with all basic infrastructure and facilities, including adequate sunlight and ventilation. The windows and doors are fitted with mosquito mesh. The room is spacious and equipped with both Indian and Western toilet facilities, along with ceiling fans.

6. It is submitted that, Carpets, Blankets, Bed Sheets, Stainless Steel - Plate, Cup, Bowl and Glass have been issued to the said prisoner, as to any other inmates. Further, in accordance with the directions of the Hon'ble 56th Addl. City Civil & Sessions Court, Bengaluru (CCH-57), Order dated 19.11.2025, the said prisoner has also been provided with chadar / kambli.

7. It is submitted that, in accordance with the Karnataka Prisons & Correctional Services Manual - 2021, Provision No. 578 (ii)(b), an interview facility is provided to the said prisoner, from the date of his admission to this prison on 14.08.2025 till 05.05.2026.

8. It is submitted that, in accordance with the Karnataka Prisons & Correctional Services Manual - 2021, Provision No. 604 - Prison Call System Facility (Telephone facility), the said prisoner is provided with the facility from the date of his admission to this prison on 14.08.2025 till 05.05.2026.

9. It is submitted that, from 14.08.2025 to 05.05.2026, the petitioner had, in total availed 70 interviews with his family and friends and during this period the petitioner had, in total availed 73 phone calls. It is submitted that, at the time of availing interview, 6 persons (in case of blood relatives) and 5 persons (in other cases) are permitted to meet the inmates in person.

10. It is submitted that the petitioner has also been permitted to meet his Advocates for legal consultation regularly. It is submitted that, there is no restriction on the number of times, Advocates are permitted to meet the inmates. From 20.08.2025, the petitioner herein has met his Advocates 28 times.

11. It is submitted that, at the time of admission, the said prisoner underwent health screening in accordance with the NHRC guidelines. Further, the said prisoner has also been provided with medical assistance, as and when required.

12. It is submitted that, in accordance with the Physiotherapist's advice, a chair has been provided to the said prisoner which is being used by the petitioner.

13. It is submitted that, in accordance with the advice of the CFTRI, Mysuru; the Director, University of Agricultural Sciences, Nutrition Department; and the Medical Superintendent, Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Victoria Hospital, Bengaluru, the State Government of Karnataka has issued revised diet charts vide Order No: HD 126 PRA 2014, dated 13.10.2014, and Order No: HD 88 PRA 2025, dated 13.05.2025.

14. It is submitted that the diet also provides various types of breakfast from Monday to Sunday for all prisoners. Non-vegetarian meals are provided to non-vegetarian prisoners, i.e., mutton on the first, third and fifth Fridays of the month and chicken on the second and fourth Fridays of the month. Vegetarian prisoners are provided with sweets as per the existing diet chart. All prisoners are provided with a boiled egg (for non-vegetarian prisoners) and a banana (for vegetarian prisoners) once a week on every Tuesday. Special food on special days (festivals) is also provided as per the prescribed scale.

15. It is submitted that as per the recommendation of the Medical Officer, Central Prison, Hospital, Bengaluru dated: 14.10.2025 extra diet like eggs, bread and milk are also being provided to the said prisoner.

16. It is submitted that during interviews (Mulakath), fresh fruits, dry fruits, bakery and confectionery items, clothing and bedding (on request) from private sources are also being

provided in accordance with Circular No. ADM-2/CR-20/2026 dated 23.01.2026.

17. It is submitted that the Prison has a Canteen, Bakery and Hopcoms facility for the prisoners. Necessaries and essential items, baked products, fruits, etc., from these are even taken to the said prisoner's corridor and provided as per rules.

18. It is submitted that in accordance with the directions of the Hon'ble 56th Addl. City Civil & Sessions Court, Bengaluru (CCH-57), Order dated 04.12.2025, the said prisoner has also been provided with a TV facility.

19. It is submitted that for recreational purposes, facilities such as carom, daily newspapers, monthly magazines and books are also being provided to the said prisoners.

20. It is submitted that for personal hygiene and cleanliness, bath soap, laundry soap, coconut oil, toothpaste, phenyl and bleaching powder are provided to the said prisoners, as to any other prisoners.

21. It is submitted that the said prisoner is allowed to walk in the sunlight in the corridor area. The said prisoner is also allowed to practice Yoga in the morning from 07.30 AM to 08.30 AM. Again, he is allowed to walk in the corridor near the barrack from 10.00 AM to 01.00 PM and in the evening from 03.00 PM to 06.00 PM.

22. It is submitted that all facilities, including basic amenities, are being provided to the said prisoner in accordance with the Karnataka Prisons Rules 1974, the Karnataka Prisons & Correctional Services Manual - 2021 and the orders passed by the Hon'ble Trial Court.

14. All that we want to say is that the petitioner shall be provided with all basic amenities which any other under-trial prisoner is entitled to in accordance with the Jail Manual.

15. If there is no substantial progress in the trial in next one year, it shall be open for the petitioner to once again pray for bail before the Trial Court.
16. We are further informed that the Presiding Officer of the Trial Court is holding an additional charge because the regular court, i.e., Court No. 57, is vacant. The High Court shall look into this issue on its administrative side at the earliest.
17. We would like to observe in the last that State should make all endeavours to see that at least the 60 important witnesses according to them are examined in this period of one year from today.
18. With the aforesaid, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.
19. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

.....J.
[J.B.PARDIWALA]

.....J.
[VIJAY BISHNOI]

New Delhi
15th May, 2026.

ITEM NO.3

COURT NO.7

SECTION X

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Writ Petition (Criminal) No.159/2026

DARSHAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 129718/2026 - INTERIM BAIL

Date : 15-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAY BISHNOI

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Ranjeeta Rohatgi, AOR
Mr. Jackie Minish S, Adv.
Mr. Sunil Kumar S., Adv.
Mr. Lakshmikanth G., Adv.
Mr. Yuvraj Kashyap, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. D.L.chidanand, Adv.
Mr. Sanchit Garga, AOR
Mr. Sachin C, Adv.
Mr. Kunal Rana, Adv.
Mr. Shashwat Jaiswal, Adv.
Ms. Diksha Arora, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The Writ Petition is disposed of in terms of the signed order.
2. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(CHANDRESH)

ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POOJA SHARMA)

COURT MASTER (NSH)

(Signed order is placed on the file)

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL/CRIMINAL APPELLATE /ORIGINAL JURISDICTION
S.T.P./W.P./R.P./F.P./ (CRL.) No: 159 OF 2026**

SRI DARSHAN

...Petitioner

VERSUS

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

...Respondent

V A K A L A T N A M A

I Sri Darshan S/o Late Toogudeepa Srinivas, R/o 217 Toogudeepa Nilaya, F Road, Ideal Home Township, Rajarajeshwarinagar, Bengaluru, Karnataka presently confined in Bengaluru Central Jail the Petitioner in the above Petition / Suit / Reference / Appeal do hereby appoint and retain M/s. LAWFIC, to act and appear for me/us in the above Petition/Suit/Reference/Appeal and on my/our behalf to conduct and prosecute (or defend) the same and all proceedings that may be taken in respect of any application connected with the same or any decree of order passed therein, including proceedings in taxation and application for Review, to file and obtain return of documents and to deposit and receive money on my/our behalf in the said Petition/Suit/Reference/Appeal and in applications for Review and to represent me/us and to take all necessary steps on my/our behalf in the above matter. I/We agree to ratify all acts done by the aforesaid Advocate in pursuance of this authority.

Dated this the 10th day of June 2026

Accepted, Identified, Verified & Satisfied:

*No objection**Ranjeeva Bahagi*
9/6/26

[Signature]
Signed
M/s. LAWFIC
Advocate on Record/Advocates
57 Lawyers Chambers
Supreme Court of India
New Delhi
(Code No. 2843)

"Before me"

[Signature]
Asst. Superintendent
Central Prison
BENGALURU

[Signature]
(DARSHAN)
Signature

Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)/Respondent(s)

U.P.R. No. 7314/25

MEMO OF APPEARANCE

The Registrar
Supreme Court of India
New Delhi

Sir,
Please enter my appearance for the Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)/Respondent(s) in the above-mentioned petition/case/appeal/matter.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

M/S. LAWFIC
Advocate on Record

Dated:12.06.2026