

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 18850/2025

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 24-09-2025 in WP No. 29290/2025 passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru]

PRAJWAL REVANNA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF KARNATAKA

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 300975/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 300976/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No. 300972/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date : 11-12-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Siddhartha Dave, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AOR  
Ms. Kanishka Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Kartikeye Dang, Adv.  
Mr. Tanisha Kaushal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. The instant special leave petition is directed against the order dated 24.09.2025 passed by the High Court of Karnataka, declining the petitioner's prayer for transfer of the trials pending before the learned Presiding Judge of LXXXI Additional City Civil and Sessions Court, Bengaluru (exclusive Special Judge for MP/MLA cases). The prayer was to transfer the case to any other Sessions Court in Bengaluru.

2. The ground on which the transfer was sought is based upon certain observations made by the learned Presiding Officer in his judgment dated 01.08.2025 convicting the petitioner under Section 376(2) (k), 376(2) (n), 354-A, 354-B, 354-C, 506 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 66(E) of the Information Technology Act, 2000. We have perused the observations made by the learned Presiding Officer with the able assistance of Shri Siddharth Luthra and Siddharth Dave, learned senior counsel representing the petitioner. It seems to us that these observations are contextual with reference to the record of the particular trial and keeping the observations made by the High Court in a previous judgment rendered in Writ Petition No.13645/2025. Be that as it may, these observations by the Presiding Officer cannot be the foundation of forming a definite opinion of bias or prejudging the issues.

3. We have no reason to doubt that the learned Presiding Officer shall not be swayed by the fact that he found the petitioner guilty in an earlier case, and obviously, he shall evaluate the evidence in the pending trials and will confine his conclusions on the basis of the evidence led in the pending trials only. In other words, no inference shall be drawn against the petitioner on the basis of the previous conviction or the evidence led in the trial which led to his conviction, more so, when the appeal by the petitioner is statedly pending before the High Court. All the contentions, like the expunging of remarks by the Presiding Officer, can be raised by the petitioner before the High Court in the pending appeal. We request the High Court to consider all such submissions in the

light of the facts and circumstances and the material on record.

4. The special leave petition is, accordingly, disposed of with pending application(s), if any.

(NITIN TALREJA)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI T.C.)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR