



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M

WRIT PETITION NO.111230 OF 2019 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

SMT. TARA GOUDA W/O LAXMAN GOUDA,
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCC: HOUSE WIFE,
R/O. #162, AANESALU, BILGI, TQ: SIDDAPUR,
DIST: UTTARA KANNADA-581 322.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. H.M. DHARIGOND, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. RAVI HEGDE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. PANCHAYAT DEVELOPMENT OFFICER (PDO),
BILGI GRAMA PANCHAYAT, TQ: SIDDAPUR,
DIST: UTTARA-KANNADA,
REPRESENTED BY PRESENT, PDO.
2. PRESIDENT,
GRAMA PANCHAYAT BILGI,
TQ: SIDDAPURA,
DIST: UTTARA-KANNADA.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SANJAY S. KATAGERI, ADVOCATE FOR R1-R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND
227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, SEEKING CERTAIN
RELIEFS.





THIS WRIT PETITION IS LISTED FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:

ORAL ORDER

Sri.Ravi Hegde., counsel for the petitioner and Sri.Sanjay S.Katageri., counsel for respondents have appeared in person.

2. The Writ petition is filed seeking the following reliefs.

"a) Issue writ of certiorari or any other writ or order quashing the notification dated: 06.03.2019 published on 07.03.2019 in the in the local news paper KARAVALI MUNJAVU bearing number: GRA PAM. BA. SIBBANDI NEMAKATI: 2018-19, issued by the Respondents no.1 and 2 vide Annexure-C.

b) Consequent upon quashing the afore said notification issue writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents 1 and 2 to re-issue the notification/advisement strictly as per the Government order at Annexure-D, and

c) Issue any other writ or order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in circumstances of the case including the cost, in the ends of justice."

3. Counsel for the respective parties urged several contentions.

Counsel for the respondents submits that a memo has been filed furnishing a copy of the notification dated 29.09.2020



to contend that the notification dated 10.09.2014 has been withdrawn. It is submitted that the memo may be taken on record and an appropriate order passed. Counsel further submits that, owing to the interim order, no cleaner has been appointed to date.

The memo is placed on record.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the papers with care.

5. The petitioner contends that the post of cleaner is a single post and, therefore, the reservation policy does not apply to such a post. In view of the withdrawal of the notification dated 10.09.2014, the notification dated 06.03.2019, published on 07.03.2019 in the local newspaper *Karavali Munjavu*, insofar as it relates to the post of cleaner, is quashed. The respondents are directed to fill the post of cleaner by following the due process of law.



6. Resultantly, the writ petition stands ***disposed of.***

**Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE**

AM/-
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 72