



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF APRIL, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2550 OF 2025 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. PROF. GOVINDAN RANGARAJAN
S/O ALAGAR THIRUMALAI GOVINDAN
AGED 61 YEARS
DIRECTOR
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
2. CAPT. SRIDHAR WARRIER
(RETD.) S/O MR. EASWARA VARRIER
AGED 52 YEARS
REGISTRAR
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
3. MR. SENAPATHY KRIS GOPALAKRISHNAN
S/O P.G. SENAPATHY
AGED 69 YEARS
CHAIR, GOVERNING COUNCIL
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
4. PROF. ANIL KUMAR P.
S/O MR. P.G. PILLAI
AGED 54 YEARS
DEAN (ADMIN AND FIN.)
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
5. PROF. DIPSHIKHA CHAKRAVORTTY
D/O LATE S.K.CHAKRAVORTTY
AGED 53 YEARS

Digitally signed by
R HEMALATHA
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



DEPARTMENT OF MCB
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.

6. PROF. NAMRATHA GUNDAIH
W/O PROF. SANJAY PRAFULLACHANDRA SANE
AGED 53 YEARS
DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU-560 012.
7. DR. NIRMALA
W/O MR. P. ANAND KUMAR
AGED 52 YEARS
MEDICAL OFFICER
MEDICAL CENTRE
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
8. PROF. SANDHYA S VISWESWARIAH (RTD.)
W/O LATE SRIKANT VISWESWARIAH
AGED 67 YEARS
BIO-ENG. DEPARTMENT
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU 560 012.
9. PROF. K.V.S. HARI
S/O MR. K.T. HARI
AGED 62 YEARS
ECE DEPARTMENT
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
10. PROF. S. DASAPPA
S/O MR. SRINIVASAIAH
AGED 64 YEARS
DEPARTMENT OF CST
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
11. DR. P. BALACHANDRA
S/O MR. P. NARAYANA RAO



AGED 61 YEARS
CHIEF RESEARCH SCIENTIST
DEPT. MANAGEMENT STUDIES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.

12. PROF. BALARAM P
S/O LATE K.S.A.PADMANABHAN
AGED 76 YEARS
FORMER IISC DIRECTOR
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
13. PROF. ANJALI A. KARANDE (RETD.)
D/O MR. SUDHAKAR S. MANJREKAR
AGED 71 YEARS
BIOCHEMISTRY
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE
BENGALURU - 560 012.
14. PROF. CHATTOPADHYAY .K (RETD.)
S/O LATE MUKUL CHATTERJI
AGED 74 YEARS
NO.410/411, BLOCK
NO.3, RMV II STAGE
10/11A DEVINAGAR EXTN. L.T. HALLI
BENGALURU - 560 094.
15. MR. PRADEEP S. SAWKAR
S/O MR. S.B. SAWKAR
AGED 67 YEARS
ADVOCATE
SUNDARASWAMY AND RAMDAS
KESHAVA NIVAS, NO.24
KALIDASA ROAD, GANDHINAGAR
BENGALURU - 560 009.
16. MR. ABHILASH RAJU
S/O LATE V. MOHANARAJU
AGED 40 YEARS
ADVOCATE
NO.209, SWISS COMPLEX



33, RACE COURSE ROAD
BENGALURU - 560 001.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. S.S. RAMDAS, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. SYED KASHIF ALI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. DR. D. SANNA DURGAPPA
S/O HANUMANTHAPPA .D
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
LAST KNOWN ADDRESS
ANSHUMAN, NO.12, MADHU PLAZA
OPP RIMS NEW BEL ROAD
BENGALURU-560 094.

ALSO AT
ARASIKERE POST
MARAPPANAHALLI TALUK
DAVANAGERE DISTRICT
KARNATAKA - 583 125.

2. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
SHESHADRIPURAM SUB-DIVISION
SADASHIAVANAGARA PS
SIR C.V. RAMAN ROAD, NEW BEL ROAD
BENGALURU-560 080.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.MANOJ S.N, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SRI.M.R.PATIL, HCGP FOR R.2)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO CALL FOR THE RECORDS IN P.C.R NO. 1/2025 ON THE FILE OF THE LXX ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND SPECIAL JUDGE, BENGALURU (CCH-71) AND QUASH THE COMPLAINT DATED 09.01.2025 (ANNEXURE-AA) ORDERS DATED 09.01.2025 AND 17.01.2025 PASSED IN PCR NO. 1/2025 ON THE FILE OF LXX ADDL. CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND



SPECIAL JUDGE BANGALORE (ANNEXURE-BB) TAKING COGNIZANCE AS ALSO THE SAID PROCEEDINGS AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR

ORAL ORDER

1. The petitioners challenge the registration of the FIR for the offences punishable under Sections 3(1)(ii)(x), 3(1)(ix)(v), 3(1)(vii), 3(1)(ix), and 3(2)(i)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

2. Respondent No.1, the complainant, filed a private complaint under Section 200 of the Cr.P.C., alleging that he was appointed as a Lecturer and later promoted to Assistant Professor at the Indian Institute of Science. Since he belongs to the Scheduled Caste community, he was allegedly subjected to cruelty by the accused persons. It was further alleged that the petitioners, in connivance with each other, filed a complaint against him alleging sexual harassment, and without conducting a fair and proper inquiry, he was terminated from his service. Additionally, accused Nos.16 and 17, who are the advocates for the



institution, allegedly threatened the complainant to quit the institute and resign from his position during the pendency of the complaint before this Court. Furthermore, it was alleged that the said accused did not allow the case to be decided on its merits and filed a complaint with the Bar Council to cancel the complainant's advocate's license.

3. Upon perusal of the complaint, the learned Magistrate referred the matter to the police for investigation under Section 156(3) of the Cr.P.C. The police, thereafter, registered the FIR for the offences mentioned.

4. Sri S.S. Ramdas, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, submitted that the dispute between the parties pertains to the termination of respondent No.1 from the institution, and that the private complaint was filed with the intention to exact vengeance, by giving a criminal color to the matter in order to pressure the petitioners to settle the dispute. He further submitted that the offences alleged against the petitioners are cognizable, and as such, before filing the private complaint, respondent No.2 was required



to comply with the provisions of Sections 154(1) and 154(3) of the Cr.P.C. Since these mandatory provisions were not complied with, the private complaint was not maintainable.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the allegations in the complaint disclose the commission of cognizable offences, and the veracity of these allegations requires investigation. It was submitted that at this stage, the truthfulness of the allegations cannot be assessed and, therefore, the petition should be dismissed.

6. The arguments presented by the learned counsel for both parties have been duly considered.

7. On perusal of the complaint, it is clear that the allegations made against the petitioners do not constitute offences under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. Respondent No.1 was terminated from service for sexual harassment after a departmental inquiry, which was later converted into resignation. The termination was challenged by respondent No.1 before this Court



in W.P. No.19594/2015. In that proceeding, the parties filed a joint memo, and as per the terms of the settlement, the termination was converted into resignation. Respondent No.1 was entitled to all terminal benefits arising from the resignation.

8. Respondent No.1 also agreed to withdraw all the proceedings and complaints lodged with various authorities, such as the National Commission for SC/ST, the Karnataka State Commission for SC/ST, the Additional DGP Directorate of Civil Rights Enforcement, and the Dy.SP CRE Cell, among others. Following the settlement, all terminal benefits were released in favor of the complainant. The disposal of the writ petition based on the joint memo has attained finality. Despite this, respondent No.2 filed two similar complaints under Section 200 of the Cr.P.C. The registration of the crime based on these complaints was challenged by some of the petitioners/accused before this Court in W.P. Nos.63878/2016 and 10835/2017. This Court, by orders dated 30.10.2023 and 07.06.2022, quashed the registration of the FIR, holding that the dispute between the parties arose out of the termination of respondent No.1, which was later



converted into resignation, although the matter was given a criminal color.

9. The present private complaint, which makes similar allegations except for the inclusion of additional accused Nos.16 and 17, who allegedly threatened the complainant to quit the service, is an abuse of the process of law. The filing of a third complaint with similar allegations is clearly a vexatious attempt to harass the petitioners for having terminated the complainant's service, which was subsequently converted into resignation. Therefore, the dispute between the parties is essentially civil in nature, albeit presented with a criminal color.

10. In light of the above facts and circumstances, I find that the filing of the impugned private complaint is an abuse of the process of law. Accordingly, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i) Writ Petition is allowed.
- ii) The impugned First Information Report in Crime No.17/2025 registered by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sheshadripuram Sub-



Division, Sadashivanagar Police Station, Bengaluru, is hereby quashed insofar as it relates to the petitioners.

iii) Liberty is reserved with the petitioners - accused to file appropriate petition before the Advocate General seeking permission from initiating criminal contempt proceedings against respondent No.1.

iv) As the main matter is disposed of, pending I.As. does not survive for consideration.

Sd/-
(HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR)
JUDGE