



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. 1890 OF 2026

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

BETWEEN:

SRI. NITHIN G.B.
S/O BASABARAJAPPA B.C.,
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
R/AT NO.840/13,
NITHIN NILAYA,
SARASWATHI NAGARA
A BLOCK, NITTUVALLI,
DAVANGERE – 577 004



...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 – 560 001

...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.2 ON BAIL IN CRIME
NO.69/2025 REGISTERED BY CYBER CRIME P.S. 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. CHIEF
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE BENGALUR 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.2 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 eminent film actor. The film in which her husband played a lead role was released on 11.12.2025. The complainant had participated in the programme held at Davangere on 21.12.2025 and made certain statements in the said event. However, her statement has been misinterpreted and it is alleged that derogatory comments were allegedly posted on social media platforms by some unknown persons. On going through the said comments, the complainant had lodged a complaint before the respondent – Police. The respondent - Police registered a case and conducted investigation. The investigation is in progress.



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

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations made against the petitioner are that the petitioner has posted a comment on an existing social media. However, mere posting the comments on the platform already existed would not attract the ingredients of the provisions stated in the F.I.R.

5. It is further submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences. He had no intention to disrespect any individual, in fact, he does not know the consequences of commenting to the post which reflected in social media.

6. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the earning member of the family and he is a permanent resident of the address stated in the cause title. He will abide the conditions 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.



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

8. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the averments of the complaint. As per the averments of the remand application, the petitioner herein is arrayed as accused No.2. He is having an instagram account in the name of "nithin_gb_official". He made a derogatory comment from his account against the complainant in such a way that it has directly affected the dignity of the complainant.



9. No doubt, social media is designed to facilitate communication and allow individuals to express their ideas and share views that contribute favorably to the development of the nation. However, some miscreants misuse the liberty of speech and expression conferred under the Constitution by exceeding their legitimate limits. In other words, they act beyond the acceptable norms of society.

10. In the present case, the petitioner has used social media as a tool for harassment and intimidation by deploying filthy and abusive language, which is unpardonable. The self-esteem and dignity of a woman must be protected by exercising the inherent jurisdiction of the Constitutional Courts. Once confidence is instilled in the minds of women that the Courts stand ready to protect their fundamental rights and interests, they can live in society peacefully, without fear or hesitation.

11. The derogatory words used by the petitioner on his Instagram account against the complainant must be dealt with strictly. To send a strong message to deter such evil minds and



regulate such menace in society, it is appropriate to reject the bail application.

12. Hence I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

i. The Criminal Petition stands ***rejected***.

**Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE**

NM



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



**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. 1921 OF 2026
(439(Cr.PC)/483(BNSS))**

BETWEEN:

SRI. CHANDRASHEKAR B
S/O SHARABHAYYA,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
R/AT NO.442/2, 1ST MAIN,
17TH CROSS,
KTJ NAGAR, BASAVANAHALU,
DAVANGERE – 577 002.



...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 – 560 001.

...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.1 ON BAIL IN CRIME NO.69/2025 OF CYBER CRIME POLICE STATION FOR THE OFFENCES P/U/S 67 AND 66(C) OF THE IT ACT, 2000 AND U/S 351(3), 352, 75(3), 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.1 in Crime No.69/2025 filed by the respondent – Police for the offences punishable under Section 67, 66(C) of Information Technology Act, 2000 (*for short IT Act*) 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 eminent film actor. The film in which her husband played a lead role was released on 11.12.2025. The complainant had participated in the programme held at Davangere on 21.12.2025 and made certain statements in the said event. However, her statement has been misinterpreted and it is alleged that derogatory comments were allegedly posted on social media platforms by some unknown persons. On going through the said comments, the complainant had lodged a complaint before the respondent – Police. The



respondent - Police registered a case and conducted investigation. The investigation is under progress.

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

4. 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 post. It is not the case of the prosecution that the petitioner has uploaded any post, created any content or disseminated any material. 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 the 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 46 years and he is a resident of Basavanahalu, Davanagere. He will abide by the conditions 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.

5. Learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor for respondent – State vehemently submitted that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence. He has made certain derogatory comments against the victim. The investigation is under progress. The cyber crime has become a menace to the society. A person sitting in a different place with a device in their hands feels entitled to do anything and everything according to their means and chances by troubling innocent persons/innocent citizens. In order to regulate such menace to the society, it is necessary to reject the bail petition. Making such submission learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor for respondent – State of Karnataka prays to reject the petition.

6. 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.1. He is having a instagram account in the name of "Chandra Shekhar". It is alleged that his comments in the social media turned into an



intimidation and also harassment. The vulgar language used against the complainant relating to sexual assault. The manner in which, the petitioner utilized the public platform to make derogatory comments would show his mentality towards the community of the women at large.

7. 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.

8. 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



the social media which violates the fundamental rights of any citizens of this Country.

9. 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.

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

11. Ordered, accordingly.

Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE

NM/-
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 4



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. 1857 OF 2026

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

BETWEEN:

SRI. NINGARAJ GULAPPA
TALAVAR
S/O GULAPPA TALVAR
AGED ABOUT 25 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 – 560 001

...RESPONDENT

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

THIS CRL.P FILED U/S 439 CR.PC (FILED U/S 483 BNSS)
BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING TO
ENLARGE THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.4 ON BAIL IN
CR.NO.69/2025 FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S 67 AND 66(C) OF I.T
ACT 2000 AND U/S 351(3), 352, 75(3), 351(2), 79 R/W 3(5)
OF BNS 2023 PENDING ON THE FILE OF 45TH ADDL. JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE BENGALURU IN CR.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.4 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 eminent film actor. The film in which her husband played a lead role was released on 11.12.2025. The complainant had participated in the programme held at Davangere on 21.12.2025 and made certain statements in the said event. However, her statement has been misinterpreted and it is alleged that derogatory comments were allegedly posted on social media platforms by some unknown persons. On going through the said comments, the complainant had lodged a complaint before the respondent – Police. The respondent - Police registered a case and conducted investigation. The investigation is under progress.



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

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations made against the petitioner is that he has posted a comment on one existing social media post. It is not the case of the prosecution that the petitioner has uploaded any post, created any content or disseminated any material. 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 the 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 route in the society. He is aged about 25 years and he is a resident of Yaliwal, Dharwad. He will abide the conditions 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.



5. Learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor for respondent – State of Karnataka vehemently submitted that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence. He has made certain derogatory comments against the victim. The investigation is under progress. The cyber crime has become a menace to the society. A person sitting in a different place with a device in their hands feels entitled to do anything and everything according to their means and chances by troubling innocent persons/innocent citizens. In order to regulate such menace to the society, it is necessary to reject the bail petition. Making such submission learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor for respondent – State of Karnataka prays to reject the petition.

6. 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.4. He is having a Facebook account in the name of "Prince Chinna". He made a derogatory comment from his account against the complainant in such a way that it has directly affected her decent life.



7. It is further stated that the mobile phone of the petitioner was seized by the respondent police and the preliminary investigation would indicate that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence and disrepute the character of the complainant.

8. 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.

9. It is needless to state that the Social Media as its responsibility to maintain decorum and also to instill the confidence in the minds 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.

10. 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.

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

12. Ordered, accordingly.

**Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE**

NM