

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2020

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR.ABHAY S. OKA, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ASHOK S. KINAGI

WRIT PETITION NO. 9201 OF 2020 (GM-RES-PIL)

BETWEEN:

G.SHIVASHANKAR
S/O S.D.GUNASHEKAR
AGED 38 YEARS
OCCUPATION: ENGINEER AND
SOCIAL WORKER, R/AT NO.62
OPP. NAVODAYA SCHOOL
SIDDHARUDH NAGAR,
ADAR KUNCHI
HUBBALI-530 024.

... PETITIONER

(BY SHRI RODDA VEERSHETTY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BENGALURU-560 001.

2. HOMBALE FILMS LLP's LLP
REPRESENTED BY CHALUVE
GOUDA AND VIJAYAKUMAR
THIMMEGOWDA, PARTNER AND
PRODUCER, II FLOOR, 1312,

11TH MAIN, VIJAYANAGAR
BENGALURU-560 040.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI VIJAYAKUMAR A PATIL, ADDL.
GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE FOR R-1)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226B AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS, DIRECT OR ORDER TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO CANCEL THE LICENCE OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT REGARDING KGF-2 KANNADA FILM VIDE ANNEXURE-A DATED 30.07.2020, AND ETC.

THIS WRIT PETITION COMING ON FOR ORDERS THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING THIS DAY, **CHIEF JUSTICE** MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER

The grievance of the petitioner is that the first respondent has allowed the third respondent to act in a film made by the second respondent. It is stated that the third respondent has been convicted for the offences concerning Mumbai bomb blasts.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that notwithstanding the fact that the third respondent has been convicted and the conviction has been upheld by the Apex Court, the third respondent was permitted to act in the film *KGF-2* and with the help of the first respondent, the film has been allowed to be released.

His submission is that the people of Karnataka are opposing this move of permitting the third respondent to act in the film.

3. We have considered the submissions. The petitioner has not shown any provision of law under which the third respondent incurs a disqualification from acting in the films. Similarly, the petitioner has not shown any provision of law which prevents the first and second respondents from allowing the third respondent to act in the film. There is nothing placed on record to show that such a permission of the first respondent was necessary.

4. No illegality is pointed out in the present case. There is absolutely no merit in the petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
JUDGE