HC-KAR



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT DHARWAD**

**DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF JULY, 2026**

**BEFORE**
**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM**

**WRIT PETITION NO.105339 OF 2026 (GM-POLICE)**

**BETWEEN:**

SURESH S/O. GURUNATH BHAJANTRI
AGE: 34 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS,
R/O. YARAGATTI, TQ: YARAGATTI,
DIST: BELAGAVI-590001.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI R.H. ANGADI, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REP. BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
   HOME DEPARTMENT,
   VIDHAN SOUDHA-590001.

2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
   BELAGAVI, DIST. S.P OFFICE,
   DIST: BELAGAVI-590001.

3. THE CIRCLE POLICE INSPECTOR
   MURGOD POLICE STATION,
   TQ: MURGOD, DIST: BELAGAVI-590001.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI SHARAD V. MAGADUM, AGA)

Digitally signed by MOHANKUMAR B SHELAR
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A DIRECTION IN THE NATURE OF WRIT OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATIONS DATED 11.06.2026, VIDE ANNEXURE-G AND H IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW AND CONSEQUENTLY DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO REMOVE THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER FROM THE LIST OF ROWDY SHEETER MAINTAINED BY R-3, MURGOD POLICE STATION DIST:BELAGAVI, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

**ORAL ORDER**

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)

Learned Additional Government Advocate accepts notice for respondents.

2. The petitioner in the captioned writ petition is seeking a mandamus against respondents to consider petitioner's representation dated 11.06.2026 as per Annexures-G and H and accordingly, remove petitioner's name from the list of rowdy-sheeter maintained by respondent No.3.

3. The issue in regard to inclusion of maintaining a citizen's name in the rowdy sheeter, is squarely addressed and decided by this Court in a reported judgment rendered in the case of ***Sri.B.S.Prakash Vs State of Karnataka and Others*** reported in ***2022 (4) KCCR 3648***. Therefore, it would be appropriate for this Court to extract the guidelines to test the order impugned, which reads as under;

***GUIDELINES FOR ROWDY/HISTORY SHEETING:***

*i. Before entering the name of an individual to the Register of Rowdies, the jurisdictional police shall collect and collate the material information*

*concerning him and frame the proposal for registration on that basis.*

*ii. A brief proposal notice shall be sent to the individual concerned in a sealed cover with an option to submit his representation within two weeks as to why his name should not be registered as a rowdy. However, there is no need to afford a personal hearing. In exceptional cases notice may be dispensed with for reasons to be recorded in the Register of Rowdies.*

*iii. In terms of Clause (5), Order 1059 of the Manual, the Superintendent of Police or the Sub – Divisional Police Officer shall not accord approval for entering the name of individual concerned to the Register of Rowdies without calling for records and objectively considering the same. He shall briefly record his reasons for according the approval and mark a copy thereof to the individual forthwith, with a mention that he may petition the Police Complaints Authority, against the same.*

*iv. The jurisdictional Police shall compulsorily once in two years, undertake a periodic review of entries in the Register of Rowdies suo motu, as provided under Clause (2), Order 1057 of the Manual. However, it is open to the aggrieved, to make a representation at any time after one year of registration, seeking deletion of name from the Rowdy Register on the basis of changed circumstances such as rectitude, good conduct, social/community service, etc.*

*v. The representation for review shall be considered by the jurisdictional Police at the initial level within a period of 30 days, during which necessary inputs may be obtained through the available sources as to merits of the claim. The recommendation shall be sent to the jurisdictional Superintendent of Police or the Sub – Divisional Police Officer, within 15 days along with the representation & the material collected thereon. Such recommendation along with the result of consideration of the representation shall*

*be communicated to the individual concerned within next 15 days.*

*vi. Any individual aggrieved by the rejection of his representation or continuation of his name in the Register may petition to the Police Complaints Authority ordinarily within 30 days. However, no personal hearing shall avail. The petition shall be disposed off by recording reasons within an outer limit of 60 days, after considering the material on record or the fresh inputs that may be requisitioned, by the authority.*

*vii. The entire process of Rowdy/History Sheeting from the stage of issuance of proposal notice as specified above, up to the issuance of the orders on the petition if any to the Police Complaints Authority, shall be done only in a sealed cover procedure and that nothing therein shall be disclosed nor made available to anyone, except to the aggrieved, nor any Right To Information (RTI) application shall be entertained in this regard.*

*viii. The violation of these guidelines shall constitute a major misconduct and an adverse entry on proof thereof shall be made by the Disciplinary Authority in the Service Register of the erring official after hearing him and a copy thereof shall be marked to the victim of Rowdy Register/History Sheet, without brooking any delay.*

*ix. Whatever guidelines herein above laid down shall be applicable to the case of History Sheeters as well, mutatis mutandis and subject to the provisions of Karnataka Police Manual, 1965."*

4. In the light of guidelines issued by this Court, the petitioner has made out case for issuance of a mandamus. Accordingly, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

**ORDER**

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

ii. The respondents are hereby directed to remove the name of the petitioner from the Rowdy Sheet and Modus Operandi Bureau Register maintained at Murgod Police Station, Dist: Belagavi within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

iii. Liberty is, however, reserved to the respondents/State to initiate appropriate proceedings against the petitioner, if the circumstances so warrant, strictly in accordance with law. In the event of such action being contemplated, the respondents shall scrupulously adhere to the guidelines laid down by this Court in ***Sri B.S. Prakash v. State of Karnataka and Others,*** reported in ***2022 (4) KCCR 3648***.

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

AM/-
CT:GSM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 55