



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G.S. KAMAL

WRIT PETITION NO.22577 OF 2022 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
KARNATAKA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT
CORPORATION (KSRTC)
CENTRAL OFFICE, KSRTC
K.H ROAD, SHANTHINAGAR
BENGALURU -560 027
HEREIN REPRESENTED BY
THE CHIEF LAW OFFICE K.S.R.T.C.
CENTRAL OFFICE
K H ROAD SHANTHINAGAR
BENGALURU -560 027.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SANJEEV B L.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI RAJU
S/O LATE SRI TAMMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
RTD TRAFFIC CONTROLLER
R/O HONGANUR VILLAGE
CHAMARAJANAGAR TALUK
CHAMARAJANAGAR DISTRICT -571 117.
2. THE COMMISSIONER
KARNATAKA STATE SCHEDULED CASTES
AND SCHEDULED TRIBES COMMISSION
NO.14/3, 2ND FLOOR, CFC BUILDING
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD
BANGALORE -560 001.





3. THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
KARNATAKA STATE SCHEDULED CASTES
AND SCHEDULED TRIBES COMMISSION
NO.14/3, 2ND FLOOR CFC BUILDING
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD
BANGALORE -560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MANJUNATHA A C.,ADVOCATE FOR R2 AND R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE KARNATAKA STATE SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES COMMISSION, BANGALORE (R2 HEREIN) IN CASE NO.DOURJANYA/103/2017, WHICH CULMINATED IN THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 06.10.2022, PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-L AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G.S. KAMAL

ORAL ORDER

The short grievance of the petitioner-KSRTC in this matter is that respondent No.1, who was earlier working as a Traffic Controller under the petitioner-KSRTC, had opted for voluntary retirement scheme on 22.02.2014. However, two years thereafter i.e., on 20.12.2016, he filed a complaint before the respondent No.2-Commission alleging that he was forced and coerced to opt voluntary retirement scheme.



2. Pursuant to which respondent No.2-Commission initiated the proceedings in Case No.Dourjanya/103/2017 as per Annexure-L against the petitioner-KSRTC. Though the petitioner had duly authorized and delegated powers in favour of Chief Security and Vigilance Officer representing before the respondent No.2-Commission. The respondent No.2-Commission has insisted the personal presence of the petitioner-Managing Director.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner drawing attention of this Court through a Circular No.1186 dated 02.02.1999 and the annexure enclosed therewith, submits that the Head of the Department/Unit is empowered to execute the Vakalath and represent on behalf of the petitioner-Managing Director and in the instant case, the Chief Security and Vigilance Officer had been duly authorized. As such there was no need or requirement for the personal presence of the petitioner-Managing Director, which is otherwise insisted by the respondent No.2-Commission. Therefore, he seeks for quashing of the order.



4. There is no representation on behalf of the respondents.

5. Perusal of the circular dated 02.02.1999 and the annexure to the said circular indicate that delegatee on behalf of the Corporation to defend any suit or proceedings before Lower Courts and other authorities, is Chief Law Officer/Unit Head. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner-Managing Director, in the proceeding before the respondent No.2-Commission, Unit Head of the concerned Department namely Chief Security and Vigilance Officer has already represented.

6. In that view of the matter, respondent No.2-Commission is directed to proceed with the matter without insisting the personal presence of the petitioner-Managing Director. Accordingly, following:



ORDER

(i) Petition is ***allowed***.

(ii) Impugned order dated 06.10.2022 by the respondent No.2-Commission is hereby quashed.

**Sd/-
(M.G.S. KAMAL)
JUDGE**

RL
List No.: 1 SI No.: 45