

07/01/2026	M.NAGAPRASANNA	ADJOURNED
	Heard the learned counsel Sri P Prasanna Kumar, appearing for the petitioner. The petitioner, resident of Panchagiri Ashram is now at the doors of this Court calling in question registration of a crime in Crime No. 201 of 2025 by the Bangalore Metropolitan Task Force Police alleging offences punishable under Section 192A of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964. The backdrop of registration of the crime is an order passed by the Division Bench in a petition filed in public interest, wherein it was alleged that the respondents therein had encroached upon the public lands to some extent and even constructed property on a Rajakaluve. The Division Bench observes that the map indicates that certain constructions have been raised in Survey Nos.164/2, 163/3 and 161/7 and 160 of Kaggalipura Village, Uttarahalli Hobli, Bangaluru South Taluk. Additionally, a large part of Survey No.150, which is indicated to be a tank, has also been encroached. The Division Bench clearly directs that in view of the Government's stance that in fact there has been encroachment of public lands, we consider it apposite to dispose the present petition by directing action to be taken against encroachers as is warranted, albeit, in accordance with law. The present petitioner was respondent No.5 in the said case along with other persons who have now been arrayed as accused in the aforesaid crime. The learned counsel Sri P. Prasanna Kumar submits that the petitioner has nothing to do with the activities of the other accused. He neither owns any property nor has encroached any land and therefore the proceedings or investigation must be stayed against the petitioner. He would further emphasize that the order of the Division Bench was based upon a report of the Government which was placed along with a memo and the map appended to it. The memo does not name the petitioner, as the petitioner is in no way concerned with the alleged encroachments done by other persons who were parties in the public interest petition. However, to stall any kind of investigation now would be running counter to what the Division Bench observes and permitting the appropriate authorities to act against the encroachers. Therefore, without looking into the records, it would not be appropriate to pass any protective order at this juncture. Petitioner is at liberty to move, in the event any notice of investigation is issued upon the petitioner. List the matter on 12.01.2026 in the fresh matters list. Issue emergent notice to respondent No.2. The learned Additional State Public Prosecutor is directed to accept notice for respondent No.1, secure the entire records and place it before the Court on the next date of hearing. Last Updated On: 2026-01-07 18:35:15	