



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA

WRIT PETITION NO. 22456 OF 2025 (GM-RES)

R

BETWEEN:

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI KARIAPPA N.A., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE REGISTRAR GENERAL
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BENGALURU – 560 001.
2. THE REGISTRAR,
CITY CIVIL COURT,
BENGALURU – 560 009.
3. STATE OF KARNATAKA BY
HEBBAL POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU – 560 024





CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

(ALL THE R-1 TO R-3 ARE
REPRESENTED BY LEARNED
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU – 560 001)

4. GOOGLE INC-NO-3,
REGISTERED UNDER COMPANIES ACT
REPRESENTED BY MANAGER
OLD MADRAS ROAD,
SADANANDANAGAR
BENNIGANAHALLI,
BENGALURU – 560 016.
5. THE INDIAN KANOON
REGISTERED UNDER COMPANIES ACT
REPRESENTED BY MANAGER
PROPRIETOR SUSHANT SINHA,
OFFICE ADDRESS AT NO.724, 1ST FLOOR,
9TH CROSS, 10TH MAIN ROAD, INDIRANAGAR,
BENGALURU – 560 038

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI T.P.VIVEKANANDA, ADVOCATE FOR R-1 AND R-2;
SRI K.NAGESHWARAPPA, HCGP FOR R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA READ WITH SECTION 528 OF
BNSS, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR A WRIT
OR ORDER OR DIRECTION OF APPROPRIATE IN NATURE TO
RESPONDENT NO.1 TO 5 WITH A DIRECTION TO DELETE AND



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

MASK HER NAME FROM THE DIGITAL RECORDS OF S.C NO.547/2015 ON THE FILE OF HON'BLE LXVIII ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE, BANGALORE CITY, WHICH IS ARISING OUT OF CRIME NO.29/2014 OF HEBBAL POLICE STATION, BANGALORE CITY, AS PER ANNEXURE-B.

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

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA**

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner is before the Court seeking the following prayer:

"WHEREFORE, the petitioner most humbly prays that this Hon'ble court be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus or a writ or order or direction to appropriate in nature to respondent No.1 to 5 of S.C.No.547/2015 on the file of Hon'ble LXVIII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bangalore City, which is arising out of Crime No.29/2014 of Hebbal Police Station, Bangalore City, as per Annexure - I and grant such other relief or reliefs as this Hon'ble court deems fit to grant in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the ends of justice."

2. Heard Sri. Kariappa N.A., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner; Sri. T.P. Vivekananda, learned counsel



CNR: KAHC010498112025

appearing for respondents No.1 and 2 and Sri. K. Nageshwarappa, learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for respondent No.3.

3. The petitioner was drawn as accused No.3 in crime No.29/2014 for offences punishable under Sections 4, 5 and 7 of the Immoral Traffic (prevention) Act, 1956, Section 14 of the Foreigners Act, 1946 and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 along with offences under Sections 370, 370A(2) and 292 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('the IPC' for short).

4. A charge sheet comes to be filed and the matter was committed to the Court of Session and was tried as SC.No.547/2015. The petitioner along with others stood acquitted of the offences in terms of the order dated 28.03.2019. The acquittal has become final. The subject petition concerns the issue in the interregnum *i.e.*, registration of the crime in crime No.29/2014 till the date of acquittal, as observed hereinabove.



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

5. At the very threshold of the investigation, the petitioner had approached this Court by filing Criminal Petition No.1628/2014 connected with Criminal Petition Nos.1637/2014 and 1979/2014, seeking the protective umbrella of liberty through enlargement on bail. This Court, upon consideration of the circumstances then obtaining, allowed the petitions and granted the relief sought. The criminal proceedings thereafter traversed the entire course of trial and ultimately culminated in an order of acquittal, the prosecution having failed to establish the allegations against the petitioner. It is the petitioner's emphatic assertion that she was, in truth, not the perpetrator of the crime but one of its unfortunate victims.

6. Freed from the shackles of criminal prosecution, the petitioner sought to rebuild a life that had been irretrievably scarred by the ordeal of standing as an accused before a criminal court. She approached the United Nations seeking recognition as a refugee. Her application came to be favourably considered and accepted, culminating in the grant of refugee status and permanent residence in Sweden. The petitioner has since made Stockholm her residence.



CNR: KAHC010498112025

**NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025**

7. While browsing the internet through commonly accessed search platforms such as Google and the legal repository *Indian Kanoon*, the petitioner was confronted with an unsettling reality. Despite the unequivocal acquittal that had attained finality, her name continued to surface in the digital ecosystem as though she remained an accused in a pending criminal prosecution. The electronic footprints of the criminal proceedings, preserved in digital records and legal databases maintained by respondent Nos.1 to 5, continued to portray the petitioner as accused No.3, unmindful of the judicial declaration of her innocence. The acquittal had restored her legal status, but the digital world remained frozen in time, perpetuating a narrative that the justice delivery system itself had long erased.

8. The petitioner asserts that these indelible digital imprints have cast a long and ominous shadow over her prospects in Sweden. Prospective employers, upon conducting routine background searches, are greeted not by the judgment of acquittal, but by the lingering spectre of criminal prosecution. The consequence is both immediate and profound:



CNR: KAHC010498112025

**NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025**

opportunities for meaningful employment are either withheld or silently denied, as the digital stigma eclipses the judicial vindication that ought to have restored her reputation.

9. Sri. Kariappa, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, would vehemently contend that despite the acquittal of the name of the petitioner still figures in the digital records, let alone employment, even living with dignity becomes difficult, as a click of the name reveals pendency of the criminal case. Therefore, the petitioner's name must be masked in the websites maintained by respondent Nos.1 to 5. Therefore, would seek appropriate direction to the respondents.

10. Sri. T.P. Vivekananda, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 and 2 would submit that if such masking is allowed, it would open flood gates and result in opening of a Pandora's box, where every litigant may tomorrow come and seek masking of the name. This should not be permitted in the petition, it should be dismissed.



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

11. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective learned counsel and have perused the available material on record.

12. The petitioner being accused No.3 in SC.No.547/2015 is a matter of record. The offences alleged against the petitioner are the ones punishable as afore-narrated. The order of acquittal of the petitioner reads as follows:

"ORDER

Acting under Sec.235(1) Cr.P.C., accused No.1 - **Bidu Bhushan Mohapathra @ Rakesh @ John**, accused No.2 - **Atefeh Abolzadeh @ Sara** and accused No.3 - **xxxxxx**, are acquitted for the offences punishable under Secs.4, 5, 7 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act 1956, Sec.14 of Foreigners Act 1946, Sec. 67 of Information Technology Act 2000 and Secs. 370, 370A (2), 292 of I.P.C.

Their bail bonds and surety bonds stand cancelled. The accused Nos.1 to 3 are directed to execute personal bond along with a surety for a sum of Rs.25,000/- each, as required under Sec.437(a) of Cr.P.C.

MOs. 1 to 13, are ordered to be preserved in view of split-up case against accused No.4- Gevin Medis."



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

The reasons rendered by the concerned Court is that the prosecution has miserably failed in driving home the guilt beyond all reasonable doubt. Therefore, the petitioner along with others stood acquitted.

13. The acquittal of the petitioner has attained unquestionable finality. The curtain has thus fallen upon the criminal prosecution, and with it, every cloud of suspicion that once hovered over the petitioner stands judicially dispelled. An acquittal that has become final is not a mere procedural culmination of a criminal trial; it is a solemn judicial declaration that the prosecution has failed to establish guilt and, consequently, a reaffirmation of the presumption of innocence that the law cherishes. The dignity that had lain eclipsed under the long and oppressive shadow of criminal prosecution stands restored to its rightful pedestal, and the insignia of innocence, momentarily obscured by the pendency of proceedings, once again adorns the individual in full measure.

(Emphasis supplied)



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

14. A Court of law may pronounce innocence in its judgment, but if the virtual world continues to portray the individual as an accused, the acquittal risks becoming a paper declaration, bereft of any meaningful consequence in the lived realities of the individual. The law cannot countenance such a paradox. It thus becomes not merely appropriate, but constitutionally imperative that the respondents take all necessary measures to ensure that the names of persons who stand honourably acquitted, and whose acquittal has attained finality, are suitably masked from digital records and searchable platforms wherever circumstances so warrant. A final acquittal bears the imprimatur of innocence. It is a judicial seal that must receive equal recognition in the digital sphere as it does within the four walls of a courtroom. **To permit obsolete digital records to perpetually resurrect allegations that have long been buried by a judgment of acquittal would amount to allowing technology to defeat justice and memory to triumph over judicial truth.**

(Emphasis supplied)



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

15. The case at hand is a poignant illustration of such injustice. The consequences are neither illusory nor speculative. They strike at the very foundation of the petitioner's professional aspirations, reputation and ability to lead a life of dignity. The persistent digital association of the petitioner with a criminal prosecution, despite the finality of acquittal, undoubtedly places her career in jeopardy and visits upon her a continuing civil disability for no fault of hers. The law, having restored her innocence, cannot remain a silent spectator while the digital world continues to perpetuate a narrative that stands judicially extinguished.

16. This Court, in plethora of cases, comes about issues where crimes are registered without any rhyme or reason and lead to quashment of those proceedings in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., sometimes on the sole score that it was frivolous or an act of wreaking vengeance, *inter alia*. It is therefore, after the accused gets blame-free by a process of law, she cannot be seen to be carrying the sword of her being accused on her head, for all her life. Right to oblivion; right to be forgotten are the principles



CNR: KAHC010498112025

evolved by the democratic nations, as one being a facet of right to informational privacy. Countries like France and Italy, had by themselves evolved the concept of right to oblivion, which dates back to 19th century. Europe, in the European Union has, over privacy and personal data, evolved the principle of right to be forgotten, as a right to be a part of ones right to personality, which encompasses dignity, honour and right to a private life. The aforesaid principles evolved from time to time, can be paraphrased into what could become right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. It becomes apposite to refer to the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **JUSTICE K.S. PUTTASWAMY(RETD) v. UNION OF INDIA**¹. The Apex Court considers various facets of privacy; one such privacy is informational privacy. On informational privacy, the Apex Court observes as follows:

"Informational privacy

629. The right of an individual to exercise control over his personal data and to be able to control his/her own life would also encompass his right to control his existence on the internet. Needless to say that this would not be an absolute right. The existence of such a right does not imply that a criminal can obliterate his past, but that there are variant degrees of mistakes,

¹ (2017) 10 SCC 1



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

small and big, and it cannot be said that a person should be profiled to the nth extent for all and sundry to know.

630. A high school teacher was fired after posting on her Facebook page that she was “so not looking forward to another [school] year” since the school district's residents were “arrogant and snobby”. A flight attendant was fired for posting suggestive photos of herself in the company's uniform. [Patricia Sánchez Abril, “Blurred Boundaries: Social Media Privacy and the Twenty-First-Century Employee”, 49 Am Bus LJ 63 at p. 69 (2012).] In the pre-digital era, such incidents would have never occurred. People could then make mistakes and embarrass themselves, with the comfort that the information will be typically forgotten over time.

631. The impact of the digital age results in information on the internet being permanent. Humans forget, but the internet does not forget and does not let humans forget. Any endeavour to remove information from the internet does not result in its absolute obliteration. The footprints remain. It is thus, said that in the digital world preservation is the norm and forgetting a struggle [Ravi Antani, “the resistance of memory : could the European union's right to be forgotten exist in the united states?”, 30 Berkeley Tech LJ 1173 (2015).] .

632. The technology results almost in a sort of a permanent storage in some way or the other making it difficult to begin life again giving up past mistakes. People are not static, they change and grow through their lives. They evolve. They make mistakes. But they are entitled to re-invent themselves and reform and correct their mistakes. It is privacy which nurtures this ability and removes the shackles of unadvisable things which may have been done in the past.

633. Children around the world create perpetual digital footprints on social network websites on a 24/7 basis as they learn their “ABCs” : Apple, Bluetooth and chat followed by



CNR: KAHC010498112025

download, e-mail, Facebook, Google, Hotmail and Instagram. [Michael L. Rustad, Sanna Kulevska, "Reconceptualizing the right to be forgotten to enable transatlantic data flow", (2015) 28 Harv JL & Tech 349.] They should not be subjected to the consequences of their childish mistakes and naivety, their entire life. Privacy of children will require special protection not just in the context of the virtual world, but also the real world.

634. People change and an individual should be able to determine the path of his life and not be stuck only on a path of which he/she treaded initially. An individual should have the capacity to change his/her beliefs and evolve as a person. Individuals should not live in fear that the views they expressed will forever be associated with them and thus refrain from expressing themselves.

635. Whereas this right to control dissemination of personal information in the physical and virtual space should not amount to a right of total eraser of history, this right, as a part of the larger right to privacy, has to be balanced against other fundamental rights like the freedom of expression, or freedom of media, fundamental to a democratic society.

636. Thus, the European Union Regulation of 2016 [Regulation No. (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27-4-2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive No. 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation).] has recognised what has been termed as "the right to be forgotten". This does not mean that all aspects of earlier existence are to be obliterated, as some may have a social ramification. If we were to recognise a similar right, it would only mean that an individual who is no longer desirous of his personal data to be processed or stored, should be able to remove it from the system where the personal



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

data/information is no longer necessary, relevant, or is incorrect and serves no legitimate interest. Such a right cannot be exercised where the information/data is necessary, for exercising the right of freedom of expression and information, for compliance with legal obligations, for the performance of a task carried out in public interest, on the grounds of public interest in the area of public health, for archiving purposes in the public interest, scientific or historical research purposes or statistical purposes, or for the establishment, exercise or defence of legal claims. Such justifications would be valid in all cases of breach of privacy, including breaches of data privacy."

(Emphasis supplied)

The Apex Court considers the entire spectrum the right to privacy and the 'right to be forgotten' evolved in the European Union Regulation of 2016, by the European Parliament. The Apex Court recognizes the right to be forgotten to be a basic right under the right to informational privacy. It has observed the right of an individual to exercise control over his/her personal data and, to be able to control his or her own life would encompass her right to control over its existence on the internet. The Apex Court observes that the impact of digital age results in information on the internet being permanent. Humans forget, but the internet does not forget and does not



CNR: KAHC010498112025

let humans forget. Therefore, the soul of the judgment of the Apex Court quoted *supra* is that the footprints in certain circumstances should not be permitted to remain, as it is an anti-thesis to right to be forgotten.

17. The High Court of Delhi in the case of ***SJ v. UNION OF INDIA***², has held as follows:

"3. The petitioner is a 33-year-old XXXXX graduate who unfortunately got embroiled in a criminal case in relation to which XXXXX was registered under Section 384 of the Penal Code, 1860, Sections 66-A and 67-A of the Information Technology Act, 2000. The said FIR resulted in a settlement and the same was quashed in Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No. 1207 of 2022 vide order dated 2-6-2022. The said order records that the petitioner and Respondent 2 therein, had friendly relations for the last 18 years and due to an immature prank of the petitioner, the FIR got to be registered. The relevant portion of the order quashing the FIR is set out below :

"6. This petition is filed for quashing of FIR No. 293 of 2021 under Section 384IPC registered at PS Chittranjan Park, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom. Although, the FIR was initially registered under Section 384IPC but later on Sections 66-C and 67-A of the Information and Technology Act were also invoked while filing the charge-sheet.

7. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner and Respondent 2 are childhood friends and have good/friendly relations since 18 years, however an immature prank went out of hand and led to filing of the present FIR on 23-9-2021. The

² 2023 SCC OnLine Del.3309



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

complainant and the present petitioner have settled the dispute vide settlement dated 29-9-2021. The petitioner has remained in custody for about a week before he was bailed out on the strength of the said settlement. The petitioner undertakes not to repeat the act in future. The affidavit of the complainant is also on record, which stands verified.

8. The complainant/Respondent 2 is present through videoconferencing and has been duly identified by the investigating officer, who states the matter has been settled with the petitioner and she has no objection if the FIR is quashed against the petitioner. The learned APP for the State has also no objection, if this petition is allowed.

9. Considering the above settlement between the parties and chances of conviction of the petitioner are bleak, there is no use to continue with the proceedings of the present FIR as complainant has settled all the disputes and has received the settled amount from the petitioners.

10. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. Consequently, XXXXX under Section 384IPC registered at XXXXX Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of cost of Rs 10,000 in lawyers' welfare fund, XXXXX or association and the receipt be handed over to the IO within one week from today. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of."

... ..

6. This Court, in a matter relating to removal of a court order from the internet, observed as under :

"8. The question as to whether a court order can be removed from online platforms is an issue which requires examination of both the right



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

to privacy of the petitioner on the one hand, and the right to information of the public and maintenance of transparency in judicial records on the other hand. The said legal issues would have to be adjudicated by this Court.

9. The right to privacy is well recognised by the Supreme Court in the Constitution Bench judgment in K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India [K.S.Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1]. In Zulfiqar Ahman Khan v. Quintillion Business Media (P) Ltd. [Zulfiqar Ahman Khan v. Quintillion Businessman Media (P) Ltd., 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8494] this Court had examined this issue and while granting an interim order, this Court had held as under :

'8. In fact, it is the submission of learned counsel for the plaintiff that the plaintiff's personal and professional life has been hampered irreparably and further damage is likely to be caused if appropriate relief is not granted against the republication of these two articles. The original publisher having already agreed to pull down the same, this Court having directed that the same ought not to be republished, the plaintiff, thus, has a right to ensure that the articles are not published on multiple electronic/digital platforms as that would create a permanent atmosphere of suspicion and animosity towards the plaintiff and also severely prejudice his personal and professional life. The printouts of the articles from www.newsdogapp.com, which have been shown to the court, leave no doubt in the mind of the court that these are identical to the articles published on www.thequint.com, which have already been pulled down.

9. Accordingly, recognising the plaintiff's right to privacy, of which the "right to be forgotten" and the "right to be left alone" are inherent aspects, it is directed



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

that any republication of the content of the originally impugned articles dated 12-10-2018 and 31-10-2018, or any extracts/or excerpts thereof, as also modified versions thereof, on any print or digital/electronic platform shall stand restrained during the pendency of the present suit.

10. The plaintiff is permitted to communicate this order to any print or electronic platform including various search engines in order to ensure that the articles or any excerpts/search results thereof are not republished in any manner whatsoever. The plaintiff is permitted to approach the grievance officers of the electronic platforms and portals to ensure immediate compliance of this order.'

10. Recently, the Orissa High Court in Subhranshu Rout v. State of Odisha [Subhranshu Rout v. State of Odisha, 2020 SCC OnLine Ori 878] , decided on 23-11-2020, has also examined the aspect and applicability of the 'right to be forgotten' qua right to privacy, in a detailed manner including the international law on the subject.

11. It is the admitted position that the petitioner was ultimately acquitted of the said charges in the case levelled against him. Owing to the irreparable prejudice which may be caused to the petitioner, his social life and his career prospects, in spite of the petitioner having ultimately been acquitted in the said case via the said judgment, prima facie this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner is entitled to some interim protection, while the legal issues are pending adjudication by this Court.

12. Accordingly, Respondents 2 and 3 are directed to remove the said judgment dated 29-1-2013 in Custom v. Jorawar Singh Mundy [Custom v. Jorawar Singh Mundy, 2013 SCC OnLine Del 359] from their search results. Respondent 4



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

Indian Kanoon is directed to block the said judgment from being accessed by using search engines such as Google/Yahoo, etc. till the next date of hearing. Respondent 1 to ensure compliance of this order.”

7. In the opinion of the court, the fact that the entire career of the petitioner, who is a young executive, is likely to be jeopardised due to the continued presence of the impugned articles on the internet would weigh in favour of directing the removal of these publications. Moreover, the court has to draw a balance between the right to access information, in general on the one hand and the petitioner's well-being, mental health, career prospects and prospects in life and family on the other hand. The fulcrum of any society following the rule of law would be to reform a person and not condemn a person permanently. While bearing these factors in mind and considering the order extracted above, it is deemed appropriate to direct all the publishers i.e. Respondents 3 to 10 to remove the articles which have been collectively attached to the petition as Annexure P-1.

8. In addition, access to the said articles shall also be blocked by Respondent 2/Google LLC.

9. MeitY shall also issue directions for blocking of any articles relating to the petitioner and the FIR which has been quashed, within 48 hours. The present order shall be communicated by Mr Rakesh Kumar learned CGSC, to MeitY for necessary compliance.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner shall provide learned counsel for the respondents all the specific URLs of the articles of which removal is sought. The list shall be communicated by the end of day to the respondents.

11. The said URLs shall be removed within 48 hours and the access to the same shall be blocked by the respondents.



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

12. Insofar as the Indian Express is concerned, one week's time is granted to the said respondent to remove the articles."

(Emphasis supplied)

The High Court of Delhi permits masking of the name of the accused in all the search engines. In the light of the declaration of law by the Apex Court and that of the High Court of Delhi, the petitioner becomes entitle to the relief that is sought in the case at hand.

18. The submission advanced by the learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 and 2 deserves only to be noticed, to be rejected without hesitation. The apprehension that granting the relief sought by the petitioner would open the floodgates of similar claims or unlock a proverbial *Pandora's box* is an argument more of expediency than of constitutional principle. **Courts do not adjudicate rights by counting the number of those who may seek justice in the future. They adjudicate them by testing the legitimacy of the claim against the touchstone of the Constitution.**

19. If, indeed, the recognition of such a right were to result in many more similarly placed citizens approaching



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

constitutional Courts seeking identical relief, **so be it**. If the so-called *Pandora's box* is opened by the enforcement of a fundamental right, **so be it**. The spectre of multiplicity of litigation can never be employed as a constitutional alibi to deny relief to one who demonstrably establishes an invasion of her fundamental rights. **Constitutional guarantees are not to be rationed for fear that others may invoke them.**

20. The right to dignity and the right to live with dignity are not ornamental expressions adorning Article 21 of the Constitution; they constitute its very soul. The Constitution does not merely guarantee life—it guarantees a life worthy of living, a life free from unwarranted stigma, perpetual suspicion and needless humiliation. Once a competent Court has restored the petitioner's innocence by a judgment of acquittal that has attained finality, every repository of judicial information is under a corresponding obligation to ensure that such judicial vindication is not rendered illusory by the relentless memory of the digital world.



CNR: KAHC010498112025

NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025

21. The contention that the relief sought should be declined lest it encourage others similarly situated is, therefore, an argument **in terrorem**—one founded upon the fear of consequences rather than the command of constitutional values. Such a submission cannot be permitted to eclipse, much less extinguish, the petitioner's legitimate plea for protection of her dignity. **In an age where a few keystrokes often substitute for human inquiry and digital search results frequently shape public perception, the continued visibility of an obsolete accusation inflicts a civil consequence far graver than the criminal proceedings themselves.**

22. Therefore the petitioner's prayer for masking her identity in the peculiar facts of the case, therefore, cannot be sacrificed at the altar of such unfounded apprehensions.

23. For the aforesaid reasons, the following:

ORDER

- (i) The criminal petition is ***allowed***.
- (ii) Mandamus issues to respondent Nos.1 to 5 to forthwith mask the name of the petitioner in



CNR: KAHC010498112025

**NC: 2026:KHC:38819
WP No. 22456 of 2025**

the digital records pertaining to SC.No.547/2015 or Criminal Petition No.1628/2014 connected with Criminal Petition Nos.1637/2014 and 1979/2014, failing which, the petitioner is at liberty to initiate proceedings seeking to unleash the coercive arm of law.

Ordered accordingly.

**Sd/-
(M.NAGAPRASANNA)
JUDGE**

JY
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 205