

Reserved on : 21.04.2026  
Pronounced on : 05.06.2026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 5<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026**

**PRESENT**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND**

**WRIT PETITION No. 8337 OF 2023 (S-KSAT)**

**BETWEEN:**

1. LOKAYUKTA,  
REPRESENTED BY REGISTRAR,  
OFFICE OF THE KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTHA,  
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,  
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE ADDITIONAL REGISTRAR OF  
(ENQUIRIES-15),  
OFFICE OF THE KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTHA,  
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,  
BENGALURU-560001.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. K. PRASANNA SHETTY, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. SRI D.K. RANGAPPA,  
S/O KARIYAPPA,  
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,  
OCC: FDA, TALUK OFFICE,  
CHIKKANAYAKANAHALLI TALUKA,  
TUMAKURU DISTRICT,  
R/AT 10<sup>TH</sup> CROSS,  
KANCHAGATTA BADAVANE,



STELLA MARY'S SCHOOL ROAD,  
TIPTUR-572201.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,  
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,  
M.S. BUILDING,  
BENGALURU-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. J.S. HALASHETTI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;  
SRI. V. SHIVAREDDY, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING/SET-ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 11.06.2021 PASSED IN APPLICATION No.6082/2019 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE KARNATAKA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU (ANNEXURE-B).

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, **K.V. ARAVIND J.**, MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT  
and  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

**C.A.V. ORDER**

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND)

Heard Sri K. Prasanna Shetty, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, Sri J.S. Halashetti, learned counsel for respondent No.1 and Sri V. Shivareddy, learned Additional Government Advocate for respondent No.2.

2. The Registrar, Karnataka Lokayukta, is before this Court assailing the order dated 11.06.2021 passed in Application

No.6082/2019 by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal (for short "the Tribunal").

3. The brief facts of the case are that a complaint was filed against respondent No.1 alleging irregularities in certain activities and purchase of land in the name of the wife of respondent No.1 wife while he was working as First Division Assistant in the Taluk Office at Chikkanayakanahalli, Tumakuru District.

3.1 Pursuant thereto, the Lokayukta Police conducted investigation and submitted a report under Section 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984 (for short, 'the Act'). Based on the said report, disciplinary enquiry was entrusted against respondent No.1 under Rule 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957 (1957 Rules). An Inquiry Officer was appointed and articles of charge were framed.

3.2 The order entrusting the enquiry and the articles of charge were challenged by respondent No.1 before the Tribunal. The Tribunal, under the impugned order, after discussing each of the articles of charge, set aside the order of entrustment and the articles of charge. However, the matter

was remitted to the disciplinary authority for re-examination of the entire complaint and to take appropriate action, if there was violation of any provisions of the Karnataka Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1966, including violations relating to submission of assets and liabilities statements or purchase of property in the name of the wife of respondent No.1 while working as Village Accountant.

4. Sri K. Prasanna Shetty, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, submits that the report under Section 12(3) of the Act is based on a preliminary enquiry and *prima facie* material collected during the course of investigation. It is contended that the interference by the Tribunal at the stage of entrustment of enquiry and framing of articles of charge is premature.

4.1 It is further submitted that the Delinquent Government Officer (DGO) had sufficient opportunity to raise all defences in the disciplinary enquiry. Learned counsel submits that the DGO would have adequate opportunity to rebut the evidence adduced by the department and also to lead defence evidence. It is contended that the Tribunal, without examining the basis on which the entrustment order was made and the articles of charge were framed, prematurely and incorrectly interfered

with the proceedings by examining the correctness or otherwise of the articles of charge.

5. Sri V. Shivareddy, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent No.2, supports the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

6. *Per contra*, Sri J.S. Halashetti, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1, submits that the enquiry report and the report submitted under Section 12(3) of the Act, are wholly baseless and unsustainable. It is submitted that the articles of charge are founded on an incorrect report submitted under Section 12(3) of the Act.

6.1 It is further contended that the Tribunal, after noticing that the order entrusting the enquiry was passed without application of mind and that the articles of charge were vague, rightly interfered and set aside the order of entrustment and the articles of charge.

6.2 Learned counsel further submits that, even after remand of the matter to the disciplinary authority for fresh consideration, no action has been initiated for the last five years, as the disciplinary authority did not find any material

indicating violation on the part of respondent No.1. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the writ petition.

7. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, we are not inclined to entertain this writ petition for the following reasons.

8. A complaint was filed before the petitioners alleging that respondent No.1 had indulged in illegal activities by purchasing agricultural lands in the name of his wife on the basis of an affidavit stating that there was no Government servant in the family. Pursuant to a preliminary enquiry, a report under Section 12(3) of the Act was submitted recommending initiation of enquiry and departmental action. Accordingly, under Rule 14-A of the 1957 Rules, the enquiry was entrusted and articles of charge were framed. An Inquiry Officer was also appointed.

8.1 The Tribunal, while examining the correctness of the findings recorded in the report submitted under Section 12(3) of the Act and the articles of charge framed pursuant thereto, found that the articles of charge were vague and unsupported by *prima facie* material. Upon examination of the findings recorded in the report under Section 12(3) of the Act and noticing deficiencies in the articles of charge, the Tribunal set

aside the same. However, the Tribunal remitted the matter to the disciplinary authority for re-examination of the entire complaint and for taking further action, if required.

8.2 The said order was passed on 11.06.2021. When the matter was taken up before this Court on 17.04.2026, this Court directed the learned Additional Government Advocate to furnish information regarding compliance with the order passed by the Tribunal.

8.3 Pursuant thereto, a memo dated 21.04.2026 was filed along with certain documents. The first document is a notice dated 07.02.2022 issued to respondent No.1 by respondent No.2. Another document is a communication addressed by respondent No.2 to the petitioners seeking information regarding further action pursuant to the order of the Tribunal dated 11.06.2021. A reply dated 10.03.2022 submitted by respondent No.1 in response to the show-cause notice dated 07.02.2022, enclosing details relating to assets and liabilities, is also produced.

8.4 Another document produced is a communication dated 17.03.2022 addressed by the petitioners to respondent No.2 intimating that authorization had been issued to the Standing

Counsel to file a writ petition/appeal before this Court. An endorsement dated 12.05.2022 issued by respondent No.2 in favour of respondent No.1 indicates that the order of the Tribunal dated 11.06.2021 could not be complied with in view of the proposed writ petition by the Karnataka Lokayukta.

8.5 However, the present writ petition came to be filed only on 10.04.2023. Even thereafter, respondent No.2 did not take steps either to secure clarification from the petitioner-Lokayukta or to give effect to the order of the Tribunal dated 11.06.2021. It is only after a query was raised by this Court that correspondence dated 17.04.2026 came to be addressed to the District Collector, Tumakuru District, calling upon the authority to take a decision on the show-cause notice dated 07.02.2022 and the reply dated 10.03.2022.

8.6 We find that, but for the query raised by this Court, the directions issued by the Tribunal would have remained in cold storage. The correspondence between the petitioners-Lokayukta and respondent No.2 regarding the further course of action pursuant to the order of the Tribunal, coupled with the endorsement dated 12.05.2022 awaiting the outcome of the proposed writ petition before giving effect to the Tribunal's

order, clearly reflects unwillingness and reluctance on the part of the competent authorities either to proceed against respondent No.1 or to implement the findings and directions issued by the Tribunal.

8.7 When a direction is issued by the Tribunal requiring re-examination within a reasonable time, the authorities are duty-bound to comply with the same unless the order is stayed or modified by a competent Court. Failure to do so would amount to disobedience of a binding judicial order. After issuance of the endorsement dated 12.05.2022, the authorities remained completely silent for more than four years regarding compliance with the order of the Tribunal. Had this Court not raised a specific query, such silence would have continued indefinitely to the advantage of respondent No.1.

8.8 Such prolonged inaction cannot be attributed to mere oversight. The conduct of the authorities *prima facie* reflects intentional inaction and a deliberate reluctance to proceed further in the matter concerning respondent No.1. The inaction on the part of respondent No.2 cannot be presumed to be inadvertent. Respondent No.2 was served with notice on 28.07.2023. Further, even prior to filing of the writ petition,

advance copies are ordinarily served in the office of the learned Additional Government Advocate.

8.9 In the light of the repeated conduct of the Government authorities in not complying with the orders passed by the Tribunal and this Court, the present writ petition is not an isolated instance. We have noticed several similar instances of non-compliance and disobedience by Government authorities to the directions issued by the Tribunal.

8.10 Whenever such instances of non-compliance are brought to the notice of the authorities through the learned Additional Government Advocate, certain explanations are filed indicating contemplated action. In our considered view, such action would not have been initiated but for the explanation sought by this Court.

8.11 In several matters where directions issued by the Tribunal remain uncomplied with for nearly four to five years, the authorities continue to remain silent. It appears to us that, but for the intervention and query raised by this Court, the authorities would not awaken from their slumber to comply with judicial orders. Such non-compliance or disobedience not only introduces indiscipline in administration but also results in

breakdown of administrative accountability and rule of law. Once an order or direction is issued by a competent judicial forum, unless it is challenged further it is incumbent upon the authorities to comply with the same. There is no option of deliberate disobedience or prolonged non-compliance. When orders of the Court or the Tribunal remain uncomplied with, particularly without any *bona fide* reason and on account of negligent attitude of the authorities, the same deserves to be viewed seriously.

9. By order dated 17.04.2026, the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, was directed to furnish information as to whether the order of the Tribunal had been complied with and, if not, to indicate the reasons for such non-compliance. In response thereto, a memo dated 21.04.2026 has been filed enclosing copies of notices, replies, endorsements and correspondence. However, the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, has failed to furnish the information specifically directed to be furnished by this Court. The memo dated 21.04.2026 does not constitute compliance with the order dated 17.04.2026. The said order was clear, specific and unambiguous.

9.1 **Firstly**, there is clear disregard of the order passed by this Court. **Secondly**, the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, has failed to furnish any explanation or justification for non-compliance with the order passed by the Tribunal. The correspondence produced along with the memo appears to have been maintained only for record purposes and not with any genuine intention either to comply with or to give effect to the order of the Tribunal.

9.2 In the light of the serious instances of disobedience noticed by us, we are constrained to make the above observations. On more than two occasions, we requested the presence of senior officers of the Revenue Department, including the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, to apprise this Court regarding the persistent disobedience and non-compliance of orders passed by the Court and the Tribunal. Assurances were made that the orders would be complied with. However, we have not noticed any substantial change in the approach of the authorities.

9.3 This Court cannot continue to monitor compliance of every order passed by the Court or the Tribunal, which otherwise is the bounden duty of the authorities concerned. The

instances of non-compliance and disobedience to judicial orders are no longer isolated or insignificant. Hence, we are constrained to make the aforesaid observations and also to impose heavy costs on the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, failing which we see little hope for ensuring compliance with and obedience to the orders passed by the Court and the Tribunal. Though it is a case for imposing heavy costs, hoping that situation may improve taking note of the observations made hereinabove, we impose nominal costs of Rs.25,000/- on respondent No.2.

10. So far as the present writ petition is concerned, we find that the order of the Tribunal is dated 11.06.2021, whereas the writ petition came to be filed nearly after twenty-two months. No satisfactory explanation is forthcoming for the inordinate delay in filing the writ petition.

11. The petitioners are essentially challenging the order of the Tribunal setting aside the entrustment of enquiry and the articles of charge. However, while setting aside the same, the Tribunal has adequately protected the interest of the State by directing re-examination of the entire matter by the disciplinary authority.

11.1 Admittedly, the exercise of re-examination directed by the Tribunal has not been undertaken by the State authorities. Even though the report submitted under Section 12(3) of the Act was interfered with by the Tribunal, in view of the order of remand, respondent No.2 ought to have reconsidered the matter by taking into consideration the report submitted under Section 12(3) of the Act along with the other materials and the complaint available on record.

11.2 In the light of the inaction on the part of the competent authority, the petitioner has an alternative statutory remedy under Section 12(5) of the Act. It is always open to the petitioner to initiate appropriate action under Section 12(5) of the Act in the event of non-compliance of the directions issued by the Tribunal by the competent authority. Liberty to that effect deserves to be reserved.

12. For the aforesaid reasons, we pass the following:

**ORDER**

- (i) The writ petition stands ***disposed of***.
- (ii) Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to initiate appropriate proceedings under Section 12(5) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984.

- (iii) Respondent No.2 – the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, State of Karnataka – shall pay costs of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) for inaction to comply with the directions issued by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal in Application No.6082/2019, dated 11.06.2021.
- (iv) The said costs shall be deposited before the Karnataka State Legal Services Authority within a period of four weeks from the date of uploading of this order.

**Sd/-  
(S.G.PANDIT)  
JUDGE**

**Sd/-  
(K. V. ARAVIND)  
JUDGE**

MV\*