

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2022

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. NAGAPRASANNA

**BETWEEN:**

XXXXXXXXX

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI VIKAS M., ADVOCATE (PHYSICAL HEARING))

**AND:**

1. THE REGISTRAR GENERAL  
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA  
BENGALURU – 560 001.
2. STATE OF KARNATAKA  
BY WOMEN POLICE STATION,  
EAST RANGE BANGALORE CITY,  
REPRESENTED BY HCGP,  
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,  
BENGALURU – 560 001.
3. THE INDIAN KANOON  
PROPRIETOR SUSHANT SINHA,  
OFFICE ADDRESS AT

NO.724, 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR, 9<sup>TH</sup> CROSS,  
10<sup>TH</sup> MAIN ROAD,  
INDIRANAGAR,  
BENGALURU – 560 038.

4. WWW.LAWYERSERVICES.IN  
FOUNDER. PARIKSHIT A. ADVANI,  
OFFICE ADDRESS AT 7E,  
2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR, OLD ORIENTAL BUILDING,  
OPPOSITE HIGH COURT,  
FORT, MUMBAI, MAHARASHTRA – 400 001.

.. RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI RICAB CHAND, ADVOCATE FOR R4;  
R1 TO R3 ARE SERVED))

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA READ WITH 482 OF CR.P.C., PRAYING TO DIRECT THE R1 TO REMOVE/MASK THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONER, IN THE DIGITAL RECORDS MAINTAINED BY THE HONBLE HIGH COURT, IN CRL.P.NO.5685 OF 2020 AS INDICATED IN THE RANK OF R2 IN THE ORDER DATED 21.12.2020 PASSED BY THIS HONBLE COURT AND ALSO REMOVE/MASK THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER AT PARA NO.3 AND PARA NO.4 OF THE SAID ORDER, TO THE EXTENT OF THE SAME NOT BEING VISIBLE FOR THE SEARCH ENGINE INCLUDING IN HIGH COURT WEBSITE, GOOGLE OR OTHER SEARCH ENGINES VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.,

THIS WRIT PETITION COMING ON FOR ADMISSION THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

**ORDER**

The petitioner, in substance, seeks name of the petitioner to be masked in the database of the respondents.

2. Heard Sri.Vikas.M., learned counsel appearing for petitioner and Sri.Ricab Chand, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.4.

3. Petitioner was respondent No.2 in CrI.P No.5685/2020 and on settlement being arrived at, in the said proceeding, on account of a mutual divorce therein, this Court by order dated 21.12.2020 quashed the entire criminal proceeding against one petitioner No.1 in CrI.P.No.5685/2020. Petitioner comes across her name still being figured as wife of despite closure of the proceedings by seeking mutual divorce. The name was found in the databases of this Court, Indian Kancon and lawyerservices.in. Seeking a direction to mask the name of the petitioner, the present petition is preferred.

4. This Court has redressed the grievance of the petitioner by masking the name. The 4<sup>th</sup> respondent lawyerservices.in have withdrawn the judgment from their database. It is the Indian Kanoon that has not carried out the masking as is

requested. It is in that light, the petitioner has preferred the subject petition.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in CrI.P.No.5685/2020 and that having been terminated on account of divorce between one and the petitioner herein on 21.12.2020, the name of the petitioner should be deleted or masked from display, if the judgment has to be kept in the database of Indian Kanoon, as it would affect the personal right of the petitioner, since the petitioner has remarried and does not want her name to be shown as wife of

6. For the aforesaid reasons, the following:

ORDER

- (i) Writ Petition is allowed.
- (ii) The 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent/Indian Kanoon shall mask the name of the petitioner in CrI.P.No.5685/2020, if the

same has to remain in the database of Indian  
Kanoon.

**Sd/-  
JUDGE**

bkp  
CT:MJ