

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF 2026

(@ Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No. 7100/2025)

YUSUF S

...APPELLANT(S)

*VERSUS*

STATE OF KARNATAKA & ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

Leave granted.

2. The appellant has preferred the present appeal being aggrieved by the final judgment dated 28.01.2025 passed by the High Court of Karnataka in Criminal Petition No.9592 of 2023 which was filed by respondent Nos.2 to 4 (hereinafter, collectively referred to as "respondents") which was allowed by the High Court and thereby quashed the proceedings arising out of FIR No.124/2022 dated 19.09.2022 filed at Malleshwaram Police Station, Bengaluru under Sections 141, 149, 384, 420, 448, 504 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as "IPC") and Sections 25(1A) of the Arms Act, 1959.

3. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant filed FIR No.124/2022 against the respondents alleging that:

- i. On 12.08.2021, when the appellant was at his home, the respondents, along with the fifty unknown persons barged into his house with revolvers, made obscene videos of him and threatened him into entering into a sale agreement with respect to the property situated at Municipal No.44/1, Old Municipal No.2428, P.I.D. No.8-21-41, Coconut Avenue Road, Malleshwaram, Bangalore.
- ii. The said property was already encumbered with a bank loan.
- iii. The respondents forcefully took an amount of Rs.1,17,00,000/- and threatened the complainant of dire consequences if he did not make additional payment of Rs.67,00,000/-.

4. Aggrieved by initiation of criminal proceedings through FIR No.124/2022, the respondents preferred the petition seeking quashing of the same before the High Court in Criminal Petition No.9592 of 2023.

5. By the impugned order dated 28.01.2025, the High Court allowed the said Criminal Petition and thereby quashed the proceedings arising out of the impugned FIR by observing that upon perusal of the FIR, it was apparent that the necessary ingredients to constitute commission of offence punishable under Sections 506, 504, 149, 384, 420, 448 and 141 IPC were not made out; there was a delay in filing the complaint as the incident allegedly had occurred on 12.08.2021 whereas the complaint was

filed only on 19.09.2022; the said delay was not satisfactorily or properly explained by the complainant (the appellant in the present appeal); and therefore, it was a fit case was made out for the quashing of proceedings arising out of the impugned FIR No.124/2022.

6. Aggrieved by the impugned order dated 28.01.2025, the appellant has preferred the present appeal.

7. Learned senior counsel Sri Nikhil Goel appearing for the appellant drew our attention to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the impugned order dated 28.01.2025 to contend that the said order is highly cryptic and lacking in reasoning and the petition seeking quashing of the criminal complaint has been allowed. He therefore, submitted that only on the said ground, the impugned order may be set aside and if this Court is so inclined may remand the matter to the High Court for a reconsideration of Criminal Petition No.9592 of 2023.

8. *Per contra*, learned senior counsel Sri Nuli appearing for the respondent(s) contended that the material on record would indicate that this was a fit case where the High Court exercised its discretion justly in quashing the criminal complaint. Although the order may be short, it cannot be said that it is one without reasoning. He therefore contended that there is no merit in this appeal.

9. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submitted that having regard to the arguments advanced by the learned senior counsel for the respective parties, appropriate orders may be made in this appeal.

10. We have considered the arguments advanced at the Bar and perused the material on record including the impugned order dated 28.01.2025.

11. On a perusal of the impugned order, we note that relief has been granted by the High Court on the basis of what has been stated in paragraphs 3 and 4 thereof which do not indicate any reason as to why the criminal petition had to be allowed and the complaint had to be quashed. We observe that lack of reasoning in the impugned order while allowing the criminal petition is sufficient ground to set aside the impugned order. Consequently, we set aside the impugned order and restore Criminal Petition No.9592 of 2023 on the file of the High Court.

12. We request the High Court to consider the same in accordance with law and on the basis of the material on record and after hearing learned counsel for the respective parties. While doing so, we also place reliance upon the observations made by this Court in *Shree Mahavir Carbon Ltd. v. Om Prakash Jalan*, (2015) 12 SCC 653, wherein the Court, while setting aside the order of the High Court quashing the proceedings arising out of a complaint case, observed that the principal objective in giving judgment is to make an effective, practical and workable decision. It was further observed that while recording the decision with clarity, the Court is also supposed to record sufficient reason in taking a particular decision or arriving at a particular conclusion and the reasons should be such that they demonstrate that the decision has been arrived at on an objective consideration.

It is needless to observe that all contentions on both sides are left open to be advanced before the High Court.

The present Appeal is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

.....J.  
[B.V. NAGARATHNA]

.....J.  
[UJJAL BHUYAN]

NEW DELHI  
MAY 20, 2026

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). 7100/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 28-01-2025 in CRLP No. 9592/2023 passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru]

YUSUF S

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF KARNATAKA &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 20-05-2026 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Nikhil Goel, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Zulfiker Ali P. S, AOR  
Ms. Naveen Goel, Adv.  
Ms. Siddhi Gupta, Adv.  
Mr. Aditya Koshy Roy, Adv.  
Ms. Lakshmi Sree P., Adv.  
Ms. Lebina Baby, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Sanchit Garga, AOR

Mr. Anand Sanjay M. Nuli, Sr. Adv.  
M/S. Nuli & Nuli, AOR  
Mr. Suraj Kaushik, Adv.  
Mr. Nanda Kumar K.B., Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Leave granted.

The present Appeal is allowed and disposed of in terms of the signed order.

Pending application(s) shall stand disposed of.

(NEETU SACHDEVA)  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(KOMAL)  
BRANCH OFFICER

(signed order is placed on the file)