

ITEM NO.49

COURT NO.7

SECTION II-C

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 (CrI.) No(s). 472-474/2020

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 11-11-2019 in CRLP No. 6689/2019 11-11-2019 in CRLP No. 6691/2019 11-11-2019 in CRLP No. 6692/2019 passed by the High Court Of Karnataka At Bengaluru)

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SREEKUMAR SUNDERMOORTHY

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 10472/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

WITH

SLP(CrI) No. 6649/2020 (II-C)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 114786/2020
FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA
130802/2020

SLP(CrI) No. 729-731/2020 (II-C)

IA No. 180043/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 14085/2020 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

SLP(CrI) No. 2215/2020 (II-C)

IA No. 35246/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 25-08-2023 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. BOPANNA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH

For Parties(s)

Mr. Guru Krishnakumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. R. Basant, Sr. Adv.
Mr. R. Chandrachud, AOR
Mr. D. Venkata Krishna, Adv.
Mr. Akshay Sahky, Adv.
Mr. Ashwin, Adv.

Mr. Aman Panwar, A.A.G.
Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR
Mr. Shivam Singh Baghal, Adv.
Mr. Akash Panwar, Adv.
Mr. Manendra Pal Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Aman Sanjeev Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Srinivas Rao, Adv.
Mr. Mayank Pandey, AOR
Mr. Rudra Pratap Singh Solanki, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Kumar Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Harish Kumar Tripathi, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Heard the learned senior counsel for the petitioner(s) as also the learned senior counsel for the respondent(s). Though, contentions in detail have been urged, the same need not be adverted in detail. However, we are of the opinion that any of the observations contained in the impugned order should not be taken as binding, on any other proceedings as in a normal circumstance, the reasoning adopted would have called for interference. But, keeping in view that the impugned orders were passed on 11.11.2019 and 14.10.2019 respectively and sufficient time has elapsed by now after the discretion being exercised was for grant of anticipatory bail/ regular bail, we see no reason to interfere at this point.

With the above observations, the petitions stand disposed of along with the pending application(s), if any.

(NISHA KHULBEY)
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(DIPTI KHURANA)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR