VERDICTUM.IN

HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:62244
CRL.P No. 1863 of 2021
C/W CRL.P No. 1548 of 2021
CRL.P No. 1870 of 2021

CNR: KAHC010091882021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 1863 OF 2021 (482(Cr.PC) / 528(BNSS))
C/W
CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 1548 OF 2021 (482(Cr.PC) / 528(BNSS))
CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 1870 OF 2021 (482(Cr.PC) / 528(BNSS))

IN CRL.P No. 1863/2021:

BETWEEN:

MANU C.
S/O LATE CHANDREGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
RESIDING AT SHANTIGRAMA HOBALI
MADENUR, HASSAN-573 225
KARNATAKA.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. DHANANJAY JOSHI, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. VIKRAM UNNI RAJAGOPAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY ASHOKNAGAR POLICE STATION,
   BENGALURU-560 025
   REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
   HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
   BENGALURU-560 001.

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY SUBRAMANYAPURA POLICE STATION,

VERDICTUM.IN

BENGALURU-560 061
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001.

3. NANDISH N M
S/O LATE N S MANJUNATH
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
RESIDING AT
NO.56/1, DOOR NO.07, JNK LAYOUT
BEL LAYOUT, 1ST STAGE
ANJANA NAGARA
BENGALURU-560 091.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MOHAMMED AYUB ALI, ADDL. SPP FOR R1 & R2,
SRI. ALLAH BAKASH M., ADVOCATE FOR R3 (ABSENT))

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482 CR.P.C PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED FIR DATED 22.01.2021 IN CRIME NO.20/2021 (ANNEXURE-A) REGISTERED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 POLICE (TRANSFERRED TO RESPONDENT NO.2 POLICE) AND IMPUGNED COMPLAINT DATED 22.01.2021 (ANNEXURE-B) FILED BY RESPONDENT NO.3, PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE LXX ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND SPECIAL JUDGE (CCH-71), CITY COURT COMPLEX, BENGALURU IN RELATION TO OFFENCE P/U/S 3(10) OF SC/ST (POA) ACT, 1989 AND ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT THERE TO.

IN CRL.P NO. 1548/2021:

BETWEEN:

RAGHAVENDRA R
S/O LATE SRI RAJASHEKHARA H K
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,

VERDICTUM.IN

PRESENTLY WORKING AS
BUSINESS HEAD OF
ZEE KANNADA CHANNEL
RESIDING AT FLAT NO.B 110
ARUN PATIOUS APARTMENT
KENCHANAHALLI
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN
BENGALURU-560 064

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. DHANANJAY JOSHI, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. VIKRAM UNNI RAJAGOPAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ASHOKNAGAR POLICE STATION
BENGALURU-560 025
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001.

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SUBRAMANYAPURA POLICE STATION
BENGALURU-560 061
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001.

3. NANDISH N M
S/O LATE N S MANJUNATH
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.56/1
DOOR NO.07, JNK LAYOUT
BEL LAYOUT, 1ST STAGE
ANJANA NAGARA
BENGALURU-560 091.

...RESPONDENTS

VERDICTUM.IN

(BY SRI. MOHAMMED AYUB ALI, ADDL. SPP FOR R1 & R2,
SRI. ALLAH BAKASH M., ADVOCATE FOR R3 (ABSENT))

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S. 482 CR.P.C PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED FIR DATED 22.01.2021 IN CRIME NO.20/2021 (ANNEXURE-A) REGISTERED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 POLICE (TRANSFERRED TO RESPONDENT NO.2 POLICE) AND IMPUGNED COMPLAINT DATED 22.01.2021 (ANNEXURE-B) FILED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3, PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE LXX ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND SPECIAL JUDGE (CCH-71), CITY COURT COMPLEX, BANGALORE AND ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT THERETO.

IN CRL.P NO. 1870/2021:

BETWEEN:

1. SATISH H M
   S/O MUDDA LINGAIAH
   AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
   PRESENTLY WORKING AS
   SENIOR EXECUTIVE PRODUCER OF
   ZEE KANNADA CHANNEL
   RESIDING AT NO.141,
   1ST MAIN, CAUVERY NADHI ROAD
   BANGALORE SOUTH
   GAVIOPURAM EXTENSION
   BENGALURU-560 019.

2. KUMARA G
   S/O GOPAL SHETTY
   AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
   PRESENTLY WORKING AS
   ASSOCIATE PRODUCER OF
   ZEE KANNADA CHANNEL

VERDICTUM.IN

RESIDING AT DG KOPPALU VILLAGE
KITTURU POST
BETTADAPURA HOBLI
PERIYAPATNA TALUK
DODDE GOWDANA KOPPALU
MYSORE-571 617.

3. DILIP KUMAR M
S/O MANJUNATH B
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS
PRODUCTION MANAGER
AT ZEE KANNADA CHANNEL
RESIDING AT NO.1011, 2ND MAIN, 2ND CROSS
BANASHANKARI 1ST STAGE, 1ST BLOCK
HANUMANTHANAGAR
BENGALURU-560 050.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. DHANANJAY JOSHI, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. VIKRAM UNNI RAJAGOPAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ASHOKNAGAR POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU-560 025
REPRESENTED BY
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001.

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SUBRAMANYAPURA POLICE STATION
BENGALURU-560 061
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001.

VERDICTUM.IN

3. NANDISH N M
S/O LATE N S MANJUNATH
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.56/1, DOOR NO.07,
JNK LAYOUT, BEL LAYOUT
1ST STAGE, ANJANA NAGARA
BENGALURU-560 091.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MOHAMMED AYUB ALI, ADDL. SPP FOR R1 & R2,
SRI. ALLAH BAKASH M., ADVOCATE FOR R3 (ABSENT))

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482 CR.P.C PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED FIR DATED 22.01.2021 IN CRIME NO.20/2021 (ANNEXURE-A) REGISTERED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 POLICE (TRANSFERRED TO RESPONDENT NO.2 POLICE) AND IMPUGNED COMPLAINT DATED 22.01.2021 (ANNEXURE-B) FILED BY RESPONDENT NO.3, PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE LXX ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND SPECIAL JUDGE (CCH-71), CITY COURT COMPLEX, BENGALURU, IN RELATION TO OFFENCE P/U/S 3(10) OF SC/ST (POA) ACT, 1989 AND ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT THERE TO.

THESE PETITIONS COMING ON FOR ADMISSION THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH

VERDICTUM.IN

ORAL ORDER

Heard learned counsel for petitioner and also the learned counsel appearing for the State i.e. for R1 and R2. and though complainant is represented through counsel and counsel is not pursuing the matter and the same is noted in the order sheet dated 17.01.2026. Hence matter is heard in the absence of counsel appearing for the respondent no. 3 complainant.

2. These petitions are filed by the accused nos.1 to 5 wherein prayer is sought for quashing of registration of FIR against all the petitioners and FIR is registered based on the complaint given by complainant i.e. respondent No.3 and in the complaint, a specific accusation is made that on 16.01.2021 at 09:00 p.m., in Z TV Kannada Channel while playing "Comedy Kiladigalu" program" one of the comedian used the word "*Kokke Korava"* and the same is insulting to a particular community, which has resulted humiliating the persons belonging to particular

VERDICTUM.IN

community. Hence prayer is sought in the complaint to take action against him as well as Z TV Kannada Channel i.e. Director, Organizers and other persons who have played the role in the said skit in the Z TV Kannada Channel. The complaint is marked as Annexure-B, wherein allegations are also made that, it amounts to abusing by taking the caste name and it attracts the offences under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter referred to as the 'SC/ST POA Act'). Hence, case was registered in Crime No.20/2021 for the offences punishable 3(10) of SC/ST POA Act. The petitioner in Crl.P.No.1863/2021 is only accused no.1/Manu, Crl.P.No.1548/2021 is the channel head and in Crl.P.No.1870/2021 filed by the accused Nos.3 to 5.

3. Learned counsel appearing for petitioner submits that as usual the skit was going on and the same was earlier it was recorded wherein the word is used as *Kokke Korava* and counsel contend that there is no such caste as

VERDICTUM.IN

Kokke Korava but only word used is *Kokke Korava* and not particularly called as *Korama* and no such word is used using the word of *Korama* that he belongs to the *Korama* and it is only mentioned as *Kokke Korava* and Kokke means hooked and Korava is fish widely available in the particular district and TV show is demeaning to the Korama community is alleged by the respondent no. 3/complainant is baseless. When the said dialogue is viewed in the proper context, it is difficult to reach the conclusion that it contains any insult to any caste or community whatsoever. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioners knowledge that upon learning about the impugned FIR coming into the knowledge of the channel and its official's, the channel on 23.01.2021 decided to edit (remove the allegedly offensive words from the episode dated 16.01.2021) and to that effect also re-telecasted expressing that there was no any such intention to humiliate any persons belongs to particular community. Learned counsel also in the subsequent petitions

VERDICTUM.IN

mentioned the same in the paragraph no.12 and 13 of the petition, with regard to the subsequently telecasted the same and produced the CD at Annexure-E and counsel would submit that the petitioner in Crl.P.No.**1863/2021** only while playing the skit used that word and not with any intention to humiliate any person and while invoking the offence under Section 3(10) of SC/ST POA Act there must be an intentional humiliation that too in a public view and though it was in the Z TV Kannada Channel Programme but not having any intention and the owner of Z TV Kannada Channel Programme is also arrayed as accused No. 2 and Director of Comedy Kiladigalu Program is arrayed as accused No.3 and Dialogue Writer Comedy Kiladigulu Programme is the petition No.2 that is in Crl.P.No.1870/2021 is arrayed as accused No.4 and Organizer of the Comedy Kiladigalu program , petitioner No.3 who has been arrayed as accused No.5, and counsel would vehemently contend that the *Kokke Korama* which is the very basis of the registration of the present FIR, the

VERDICTUM.IN

same will not attract the ingredients of the offence under Section 3(10) of SC/ST POA Act, and when there was no such any intention to humiliate any person, and even not called only the particular community, but it is mentioned as Kokke Korava and the same gives different meaning as explained above, and there cannot be any criminal prosecution, and only criminal prosecution in a case of if intentional act was done, and no basic ingredients of Section 3(1)(r) of SC/ST POA Act or any other intentional insult and intimidation within the meaning of the offence which have been invoked. Hence counsel would contend that this Court has to exercise the power under Section 482 of CrPC or otherwise it amounts to an abuse of process.

4. Per contra, the counsel appearing for the State would submits that the word *Kokke Korama* was used in a skit and the same was recorded earlier and subsequently it was telecasted and though *Kokke Korama* is not the particular caste but it is mentioned as ***Kokke Korava*** and

VERDICTUM.IN

it amounts to an abuse of a person belongs to the particular community and that too in a public view while telecasting the said skit and hence matter requires investigation. The counsel also submits that whether they were having any intention or not, cannot be considered in a petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., and the counsel also vehemently contend that though these petitions are filed by them and subsequently telecasted that they were not having any intention to humiliate, the particular caste and the same also to be investigated by the Investigating Officer. Hence it is not a fit case to invoke Section 482.

5. Having heard the counsel appearing for the petitioner and also the counsel appearing for the respondent and though complainant filed the complaint but the counsel who appeared on behalf of him did not choose to make any submission before this court. However, in the light of the allegations made in the complaint, court has to look into the material on record and having perused the contents of the complaint, which is

VERDICTUM.IN

marked as Annexure B wherein it is stated that on 16.01.2021 at 09:00 p.m., it was telecasted and the word is used as *Kokke Korama* but it is the contention of the counsel appearing for the petitioner that they were not having any knowledge about the particular caste and though complainant belongs to the particular community of *Korama* but the word is used as *Kokke Korava* that means hooked fish which is Kokke means hooked and Korama means fish and there was no such any intention to humiliate and so also counsel would contend that it will not attract Section 3(10) of SC/ST POA Act and even if any such hurt by using that word, subsequently it was telecasted on 07.02.2023 That they were not having any intention to humiliate any person and to that effect also specific averments are made in the petition also and it is also to be noted that that was a skit in a special programme on the title of Comedy Kiladigalu and the petitioner in Crl.P.No.1863/2021 had used the said word in the said skit and the accused No.2 is also a head of the

VERDICTUM.IN

said channel and others are story writer and script writer and having perused the document of Annexure-D, no such script is also found by using the same. When such caste name is also not found in the script and in a slip of tongue, the same is used and not having any intention, it does not attract the provisions of Section 3(10) of SC/ST POA Act and there must be an intention to humiliate a person particularly belonging to particular caste and all of them should know that he belongs to the particular caste, then only it attracts the same. But this is only a skit which was telecasted and the same was earlier was recorded and subsequently it was telecasted. Having considered the material on record, continuing of the criminal proceeding is nothing but a serious matter and also Apex Court in the judgment of ***Pepsi Foods Ltd., Vs Special Judicial Magistrate reported in (1998) 5 SCC 749*** case categorically held that or otherwise, if the complaint is on face value, it doesn't contains any ingredients of the offence, as well as in the judgment of the Apex Court in

VERDICTUM.IN

State of Haryana and Others vs. Bhajanlal and Others reported in 1992 SCC (Cri) 426 case in paragraph No.102, a categorical observation is made that if it is complaint, only with an intention to wreak vengeance, there cannot be any criminal prosecution. Keeping the principles laid down in these both judgments and also under the circumstances, in the case on hand, when the skit of *Comedy Kiladigalu* was telecasted and the very intention of that skit is also to make the people to laugh, but that doesn't mean to hurt anybody belongs to if any particular community and while doing the same also there must be an intention and the same must be in public view that too with an intention to humiliate a person. When such being the case in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Hitesh Verma Vs State of Uttarakhand (2020) 10 SCC 710*** case reported in 2020 as well as subsequent judgments of ***Ramesh Chandra Vaishya Vs State of U.P., (2023) 17 SCC 615*** *the* Apex Court held that there must be an intention to humiliation. If such act

VERDICTUM.IN

is done, then it attracts the particular offence and having considered the material on record, hence it is a fit case to exercise the power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., or otherwise it amounts to miscarriage of justice.

In view of the discussions made above, I pass the following order:

Petitions are ***allowed*** and the FIR dated 22.01.2021 in Crime No.20/2021 registered by Ashoknagar police station, Bengaluru city is hereby quashed.

Sd/-
(H.P.SANDESH)
JUDGE

AKV
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 21