

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF MARCH 2018

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR.H.G.RAMESH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.DINESH KUMAR

WRIT PETITIONS No.13617-13627/2017
& WRIT PETITION No.14529/2017 (S-RES) PIL
C/W
WRIT PETITION No.11342/2017 (S-KAT)

IN WRIT PETITIONS No.13617-13627/2017
& WRIT PETITION No.14529/2017

BETWEEN:

1. RENUKAMBIKE R
D/O SRI REVANNA H
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.53, SHIVAMMA
REVANNA BUILDING, 13TH CROSS
KEMPEGOWDA NAGAR
MAGADI ROAD, BEDARAHALLI
BENGALURU-560 091
2. CHANDRAKANTH S. MALAPUR
S/O SRI S.G.MALAPUR
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.D-62, JEEVAN BHEEMA NAGAR
MAIN ROAD, P.W.D. QUARTERS
BENGALURU -560 064
3. MALATESH ADIVEPPA DODDAMANI
S/O SRI ADIVEPPA DODDAMANI
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS
RESIDENT OF BOGAVI



HIREKERUR TALUK
HAVERI-581 109

4. BASAVARAJ SIDDAPPA DANOJI
S/O SRI S.B.DANOJI
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
RESIDENT OF MODAGA POST
BELGAUM-591 103
5. RAMESH D.O
S/O LATE ONKARAPPA G
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
RESIDENT OF DASUDI POST
C.N.HALLI TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 218
6. RAGHU KUMAR
S/O MUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.53, 2ND FLOOR
MOOKAMBIKA LAYOUT
PARAMA HAMA NAGAR
UTTARAHALLI
BENGALURU-560 061
7. PRAMILA S
W/O P.M.KRISHNA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
RESIDENT OF ASHRAMA ROAD
MULBAGAL
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 131
8. NAGARAJ B
S/O BEERAPPA
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
RESIDENT OF KADIRANAGARI KOTE
CHAKRAVELU POST, BAGEPALLI TALUK
CHIKKABALLAPUR DISTRICT-563 124
9. JOHN VAZ
S/O G.P.VAZ
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.197, 9TH CROSS ROAD
SHANTHI NAGAR, SHIMOGA-577 204

10. SOMASHEKAR
S/O PARAMASHIVIAIAH
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.71, 3RD FLOOR
SUMERU APARTMENT, 4TH CROSS
R.P.C LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BENGALURU -560 040
11. HAKIM FAIZAL
S/O FAIZAL AHMED HAKIM
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
RESIDENT OF CHELUVADI ONI
OPPOSITE TO HESCOM
BANDIWAD BASE
HUBLI-580 020
12. SRINIVAS T
S/O THIPPESWAMY K
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
RESIDENT OF HULIGERE
MADALUR POST, SIRA TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT, PIN-572 137
13. SHEKARA S
S/O SIDDAMALLAIAH
MAJOR, RESIDENT OF KATTE
MALAVADI VILLAGE
KATTE MALAVADI POST
HUNSURU TALUK, MYSURU DISTRICT
PIN-571 134

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI RAHAMATHULLA KOTHWAL, ADVOCATE;
SRI M.B.NARGUND, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI MUZAMIL MUSHTAQ SHAH ADVOCATE FOR
PETITIONERS NO.5, 7, 8, 11 & 12;
PETITIONERS NO.2 & 10 ARE DELETED VIDE
ORDER DATED 16.10.17;
PETITIONER NO.13 IS IMPLADED AS PER
COURT ORDER DATED:16.10.2017.)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
CHIEF SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA, VIDHANA VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001
2. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL
& ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS (DPAR SERVICES)
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BENGALURU-560 001
3. KARNATAKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
UDYOGA SOUDHA, PARK HOUSE
BENGALURU-560 001
4. THE DIRECTOR
DIRECTORATE OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION
9TH & 10TH FLOORS
VISVESHWARAIAH TOWER
DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001
5. GOWRAV KUMAR SHETTY
PATHI KRIPA, KARKEE, POST GULVADY
KUNDAPUR TALUK, KUNDAPUR
UDUPI-576 283, UDUPI DISTRICT
KARNATAKA
6. VANDANA BHAT S.A
NO.13/1, RANGARAO
PARALLEL ROAD, SHANKARPURAM
BASAVANAGUDI
BANGALORE-560 004
7. HARISH G.K
GUNJEVU VILLAGE
SINGAPURA POST, HOLENARASIPURA TALUK
HASSAN DISTRICT, HOLENARASIPURA
HASSAN-573 211

8. JAGADEESH GANGANAVAR
C/O N.SHIVANNA (DSS)
VINOBA COLONY, CHINTAMANI
CHIKKABALLAPUR-564 125
9. SURAJ A.R
C/O SHOBHA RAJEEV
SB COTTAGE NO.88
BEHIND GOVT. ENGG COLLEGE
MADAPATNA VILLAGE
KUSHALNAGAR POST
KODAGU DISTRICT-572 234
10. DEVARAJA B
S/O BHADRA NAIK
ANUPAMA NILAYA
WARD NO.7/775, BASAVESHWARA EXTENSION
KOTTUR POST, KUDLIGI TALUK
BELLARY-583 134
11. NITHIN CHAKKI
1694, 15TH MAIN, 30TH CROSS
BANASHANKARI 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE-560 070
12. KANTHARAJA K.J
S/O JAVARAI AH
AT POST-KEREGODU HOBLI
HALLIMYSUR, HOLENARASIPUR
HASSAN-573 211
13. ANURADHA VASTRAD
W/O MAJ S.S HIREMATH, KAS
C/O SHIVAYYA MATH
MAKHANAPUR POST
BIJAPUR-560 096
14. KEERTHANA H.S
NO.5/14, 2ND A MAIN, 5TH CROSS
2ND BLOCK, NANDINI LAYOUT
BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE-560 096

15. SRI SHEKAR G.D
GAMANAHALLY VILLAGE AND POST
SUGAR TOWN, MANDYA
SRIRANGAPATNA
MANDYA-571 402
16. NAGESH D.L
BHEEMAGANAN PATH
MARASANA PATH (POST)
SRINIVASAPUR TALUK
KOLAR-563 135
17. JAMBAGI RENUKA PRASAD DILIP
S/O DILIP JAMBAGI
AT/POST MUNAVALHH
SAVADATTI
BELGAUM-591 117
18. KIRAN S
DOOR NO.156/6, 2ND CROSS
BYRASANDRA MAIN ROAD
JAYANAGAR 1ST BLOCK
BANGALORE EAST
BANGALORE-560 011
19. PRABHAVATI FAKIRPUR
UDAYKUMAR C FAKIRPUR
AT POST ASANGI, JAMAKHANDI
BAGALKOT-587 311
20. MUKUNDASWAMY R.G
S/O M.GANGALAKSHMAIAH
#132, PAVANASUTA NILAYA
RAMADEVANAHALLI
KANNAMANGALA POST
MADHRE (HOBLI), DODDABALLAPURA
BANGALORE RURAL—561 203
21. HASAN SAHEB TAHSILDAR
AT SHAHABANDAR, ISLATHUR POST
HUKKERI, BELGAUM-591 243

22. ARCHANA C
#504, III STAGE, IV BLOCK
10TH 'A' MAIN, WOC ROAD
BASAVESHWARANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 079
23. SUPRIYA BANAGAR B
HOUSE NO.750, 3RD WARD
NEAR PRIYADARSHINI
LADIES HOSTEL, KUDLIGI
BELLARY-583 134
24. AIYAPPA M.A
440, 1ST B CROSS, 7TH BLOCK
KORAMANGALA, BANGALORE SOUTH
BANGALORE URBAN-560 095
25. MANJUNATHA H.S
S/O SIDDAPPA GOWDA H.C
HOSUR VILLAGE, HALMUTHUR POST
KOPPA TALUK, CHICKMAGALUR
DISTRICT-577 126
26. RASHMI RAMESH DODDAMANE
156/6, 2ND CROSS, BYARASANDRA MAIN ROAD
JAYANAGAR, BANGALORE-560 011
27. MOHAN R
S/O RADHAMMA M.A
S/O RAMAKRISHNA REDDY R.S (LATE)
RAGUTTAHALLI VILLAGE & POST
BATLAHALLI, S.O.CHINTAMANI
CHIKBALLAPUR DISTRICT
28. BHAVANA BHAT S.A
NO.13/1, RANGARAO PARALLEL ROAD
SHANKARPURAM, BASAVANAGUDI
BANGALORE SOUTH
29. SHREESHAIL BIDARKUNDI
SHREE CHOWDESHWARI
TEMPLE STREET, WARD NO.149
VARTHUR, BENGALURU-560 087

30. BHAGYA T.N
D/O NINGAPPA T.E
OLD LINGADAHALLI ROAD
MARGADA CAMP, BIRUR, KADUR
CHIKMAGALUR-577 116
31. HEMANTH KUMAR T.E
S/O ESWARA T.R
SHRI MALATESHA NILAYA
VIDYA NAGAR, BEHIND SRI
VENKATESWARA TEMPLE
KADUR, KARNATAKA
CHIKMAGALUR- 577 548
32. G.R.NATARAJA
GANJIGERE POST
BOOKANAKERE HOBLI
K.R.PETE, MANDYA-571 421
33. SATISHA
S/O SHESHAYYA SHEREGAR
BATWADI HOUSE, CUSTOM ROAD
PADUVARY BYNDOOR
KUNDAPURA, UDUPI-576 214
34. NARASIMHAMURTHY
ASST. MASTER, GOVT. PU COLLEGE
DEVALAPURA, HOSKOTE TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT-560 067
35. NAVEEN M.N
S/O NANJUNDA SWAMY M
MELLAHALLI VILLAGE
HONNUR (P), YELANDUR TALUK
CHATHARAJANAGAR
CHAMARAJANAGAR-571 142
36. PARASHURAM PATTAR
S/O PARASHURAM SADASHIV PATTAR
A/P. J.P.COLONY, HARUGERI
RAIBAG TALUK, BELGAUM DISTRICT
BELGAUM-591 220

37. SUSHMA N
NO.655, 13TH CROSS, 27TH MAIN
H.S.R. LAYOUT, SECTOR-I
BANGALORE—560 102
38. K.P.SUBBAIAH
POST BOX NO.27, KUMTOOR VILLAGE
SRIMANGALA POST
VIRAJPET TALUK
SOUTH, COORG—571 217
39. K.ARIF HAFEEZ
1ST CROSS, INDIRA NAGAR
H.A.L. 2ND STAGE, BANGALORE CITY
KARNATAKA
BANGALORE-560 008
40. SHOBA A
NO. # 16, 9TH MAIN, 4TH CROSS
NANJAPPA REDDY LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 043
41. MOHAN KUMAR H.R
J.S.S. SHABHA SHAVAN
KOLLEGAL ROAD, T.NARASIPURA
MYSORE-571 124
42. VIJAYKUMAR S
150, 2ND MAIN, A1 BLOCK
3RD STAGE, VIJAYANAGAR
MYSORE-570 017
43. PUSHPALATHA G
NO.4207/I, 1ST FLOOR
10TH CROSS, 21ST MAIN ROAD
SUBRAMANYANAGAR
RAJAJINAGAR 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE-560 021
44. MISHAL QUEENI DCOSTA
4-27, NEERUDE HOUSE
NEERUDE POST, MANGALORE
DAKSHINA KANNADA-574 144

45. SIDDAPPA ANNIGERI
71, VASANT HOSTEL
ION PUSA CAMPUS
NEW DELHI-110 012
46. SANATH KUMAR G.N
GUJJANAHALLY, MUDIANOOR POST
MULABAGAL, KOLAR-563 127
47. SARITHA RAO
GOVINDARAJ NAGAR
BANGALORE—560 040
48. LATHA T
D/O KANIBASAPPA T
UTTANGI POST, HUVINAHADAGALI TALUK
BELLARY DISTRICT
BELLARY-583 219
49. SUSHMA N
NO.101, 1ST MAIN
BUDIGERE ROAD, PRASHANT NAGAR
DEVANAHALLI
BENGALURU-562 110
50. MAHABALESHARA U
S/O BASAVARAJ U
HOUSE NO.333, 1ST MAIN CROSS
BASAVESHWARA BADAVANE
HOSPET TALUK
BELLARY DISTRICT-583 201
51. MADHUCHANDRA B.R
BENDARAVADI VILLAGE
PUTTANAPURA POST
GUNDLUPET TALUK
CHAMARAJANAGARA DISTRICT-571 111
52. SHAILASHREE G. KOPPAL
D/O GUNDAPPA M. KOPPAL
AT POST YANKANCHI, SINDAGI
BIJAPUR-586 128

53. ABID GADYAL
CHAUDHARY GALLI POST
RABKAVI TALUK, JAMAKHANDI
BAGALKOT DISTRICT-587 314
54. THYAGARAJA D
S/O DURUGAPPA
HIRIYUR POST
HOLALKERE
CHITRADURGA-577 523
55. KARUNAKARA
S/O SHANTHAIAH
HOSPETE VILLAGE
BELGODU POST, SAKLESHPUR TALUK
HASSAN DISTRICT-573 124
56. SAMEENA SEGADI
C/O D.K.KAMATE NAMAZ MAL
SANKESHWAR-591 313
57. MRUTHYUNJAYA MATHAD
DCSE.BUILDING
DESHPANDE FOUNDATION
BVB ENGINEERING COLLEGE
CAMPUS-HUBLI
DHARWAD-580 031
58. SANTHOSH KUMAR
NO.126, ANEKAL ROAD
CHANDAPURA CIRCLE
ANEKAL, BANGALORE-560 081
59. K.ANJUM HAFEEZ
1ST CROSS, INDIRA NAGAR
HAL 2ND STAGE, BANGALORE
KARNATAKA
BANGALORE CITY-560 008
60. SATISH B PATIL
GRAM PANCHAYATH
GORAVANKOL TALUK
SAVATLATTI, BELGAUM-591 116

61. GANGAMMA CHANDRASHEKAR ULLATTI
DR.NATARAJ K.M, 1093/20
TARALUBALU EXTENSION
VIDYANAGAR
DAVANGERE-577 005
62. VIJAYENDRA R
411, 7TH MAIN, 2ND BLOCK
80 FEET ROAD, HRBR LAYOUT
KALYAN NAGAR, BANGALORE EAST
BANGALORE URBAN-560 043
63. KARUNAKAR K.H
C/O L.CHANDRAN
NO.28, HARISH NILAYA
1ST CROSS, RAGHAVAN NAGAR
NEW TIMBER YARD LAYOUT
KARNATAKA STATE
BANGALORE
64. GOVINDARAJU K.N
KALLESOMANAHALLY VILLAGE
BAURU HOBLI
CHANNARAYAPATNA TALUK
HASSAN DISTRICT-573 111
65. HARISH Y.N
NO.376, 8TH MAIN, 6TH CROSS
MICO LAYOUT, BTM 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE-560 076
66. K.AKSHATA
DOOR NO.20
OPPOSITE TO GANDHINAGAR PARK
MOKHA ROAD, GANDHINAGAR
BELLARY-583 103
67. SANTOSH R
MIG II, 114 SHIVAM SADAN
ADARSH NAGAR, BIJAPUR-586 101
68. REENA SUVARNA N
NO.25,'GAYATHRI NILAYA'

11TH CROSS, 1ST MAIN, BCC
HSBC LAYOUT, CHANDRA LAYOUT
BANGALORE—560 040

69. HANAMAT SHIRAHATTI
A/P CHIKKAPADASALAGI
JAMKHANDI, BAGALKOT—587 301
70. JYOTHI A
VRUSHABHAVATHIPURA VILLAGE
ITTAMADU POST, BIDADI HOBLI
RAMANAGARA—562 109
71. NIKHITA M. CHINNASWAMY
B-12, U A S QUARTERS
OPP. VETERINARY COLLEGE
HEBBAL, BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE—560 024
72. NOORAIN K. SHARIEF
D/O MOHAMAD KAMAL SHARIEF
HILALS AGRO INDUSTRIES
H.N.PURA ROAD
HASSAN—573 201
73. RAJU K
C/O KADASIDDAPPA DODDA KEN
SHIKARIPURA
SHIMOGA—577 427
74. CHANDAN KUMAR N
3841, 1ST CROSS, LOKHARANJAN
MAHAL ROAD, ITTIGEGUD
MYSURU—570 010
75. J.HEMANTH SHARAN
NO.2C-706, 2ND A CROSS
NEAR OM SHAKTI TEMPLE
KALYAN NAGAR, 1ST BLOCK
HRBR LAYOUT, BANASWADI
BANGALORE—560 043
76. C.K.ROHINI
C/O R.S.VENUGOPAL IYER

3RD FLOOR-I, NO.4-74/1/31
SRI VELTHATHRE PLAZA
PADMAVATHI PURA
TIRUPATI, CHITTOOR—517 503

77. PRIYADARSHINI SANIKOP
D/O ISHWAR SANIKOP
MALLIKARJUNA NILAYA
RAMANAGAR 2ND MAIN
NEAR NTTF, DHARWAD
DHARWAD—580 001
78. GOVARDHAN GOPAL
NO.1553, 13TH MAIN
12TH CROSS, 2ND STAGE
B.T.M.LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 076
79. GOURAV K.C
DOOR NO.2, 6TH MAIN
1ST STAGE, BINNY LAYOUT
VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE—560 040
80. MANJUNATHA R.G
S/O GOWDAIAH
RAMEGOWDARA PALYA
BUDDIGERE POST
KUNIGAL TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT—572 130
81. SUMEETH A.R
C/O SANDHYA DIWAKAR
NO.3, SRI SKANDA, I FLOOR
ANANDA LAYOUT, DIBARI PALYA
R.V. ENGINEERING COLLEGE POST
MYSURU—560 059
82. MANJUNATHA T.R
NO.693, THIRUPALYA VILLAGE
BOMMASANDRA POST, ANEKAL TALUK
BANGALORE DISTRICT

83. MAHENDRA A.H
S/O HOLEYAPPA A
JEENAHALLI POST
HONNALI TALUK
DAVANGERE-577 223
84. RAVIKUMAR K.Y
C/O S.SANGAMESHWARAN
CFTRI LAYOUT, 1ST MAIN
3RD CROSS, BOGADI 2ND STAGE
MYSURU-570 026
85. RAGHU N
S/O NAGAPPA
ASAHDI POST, KADUR TALUK
CHIKKAMAGALURU-577 550
86. MODALAPPA P.S
S/O PRABHUSHETTY SOMANNA
AT POST SHIVANI, BHALKI
BIDAR-585 411
87. SHIVARAJ K. KATAKBHAVI
S/O K.N.KATAKBHAVI
GAURISHANKAR NILAYA
SHANKAR NAGAR, ATHANI
BELGAUM—591 304
88. RAMYA C.R
D/O RAJASHEKHARAI AH S SHARANYA
6TH CROSS, CHANNABASAVESHWARA NAGAR
NEAR UPPARA HALLI WATER TANK
KARNATAKA, TUMKUR-572 102
89. YASHAVANTH KUMAR S.B
S/O S.K.BOMMARAYA SWAMY
A.K.STREET, SALIGRAMA
K.R.NAGARA, MYSURU-571 604
90. SANTOSH CHAVAN
AT POST ATHARAGA
LT. NO.1, INDI TALUK
BIJAPUR DISTRICT-586 112

91. RAVI
DOOR NO.275/276, LIG 1
GROUP-I, KHB COLONY, HOOTAGAILY
MYSORE DISTRICT-570 018
92. SNEHA RAJ N
#156, HPO & RMS COLONY
NEAR R.T.O. (EAST), SHAKTHI NAGAR
MYSURU-570 019
93. MOHAMMED MANSOOR M.R
MR.VILLA, SATHNOOR ROAD CROSS
OPPOSITE KSRTC BUS DEPOT
CHANNAPATNA TOWN
RAMANAGARA-562 160
94. UMARANI S
NO.13, 19TH CROSS
PARVATHI NILAYA, BHUVANESHWARI NAGAR
HEBBAL (DASARAHALLI) MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE EAST
BANGALORE-560 024
95. PADMASHREE GUNJIKAR
C/O T.VENKATASWAMY
1395/44B, SAPTAGIRI NILAYA
2ND CROSS, KEERTHI LAYOUT
ST.THOMAS TOWN, KAMMANAHALLI
BANGALORE-560 084
96. B.ASHWINI
#01, 18TH A CROSS, BANDAPPA GARDEN
MUTHYALANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 054
97. SRINIVAS GOWDA V
NO.61, 3RD CROSS
MRS LAYOUT, SUNKADAKATTE
BANGALORE-560 091
98. MANJUNATH HEGDE
#549, 14TH CROSS, SRIRAMPURA
2ND STAGE, MYSORE-570 023

99. ANITHA K.M
D/O KRISHNAMURTHY H
EX SERVICE MAN, KOTE AJJAMPURA
TARIKERE TALUK
CHIKAMAGALUR DISTRICT-577 547
100. PAKEERAPPA METI
P.V.MET, AT HANARNASAGAR
CHUNCHANUR
RAMDURG, BELGAUM-591 114
101. AMULYA B RAJ
D/O BASAVARAJU A.R
#610, SRI SHIVA SAI NILAYA
2ND MAIN, 4TH CROSS
GAVIPURAM LAYOUT, WARD NO.129
BANGALORE-560 056
102. LALITHABAI L
W/O CHANDRASHETTY B.D
TEACHER, BILEKALAHALLY
UDDEBORANAHALLI POST
CHIKMAGALUR DISTRICT-577 168
103. SUSHMA K
MARNGERE VILLAGE
BIDRAHALLY POST, MADDUR
MANDYA-571 422
104. RAVI N
TEACHER GOVT. PRIMARY SCHOOL
ARAVATTIGEPURA, BESTAMANAHALLY POST
ANEKAL, BANGALORE-562 106
105. AVINASH C
#11, SRINIDHI NILAYA
2ND CROSS, 3RD MAIN
KALYAN NAGAR, NAGARABHAVI 1ST STAGE
BANGALORE-560 071
106. AJJIAH G.R
S/O RUDRESHAPPA G. TANIGERE
CHANNAGIRI TALUK
DAVANGERE-577 552

107. HAMPANNA S SAJJAN
S/O SANGANNA R SAJJAN
AT POST KOLLUR
CHITTAPUR TALUK
GULBARGA DISTRICT-585 218
108. SUNITHA A.S
D/O SRINIVASA
C/O SHESHACHALA
CONTRACTOR ARYABHATA ROAD
DASARAKOPPALU, HASSAN-573 201
109. RAMESH G.V
#439/A, 1ST FLOOR
2ND MAIN, 2ND CROSS
MATHIKERE, BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE-560 054
110. VIJAYAKUMAR B AJUR
C/O B.M.AUR
BASAVESHWAR NIVAS
NEHARU NAGAR, GYANG BOUDY
BIJAPUR-586 101
111. BHARAT HEGDE
2952, 13TH 'B' MAIN ROAD, ATTIGUPPE
HAMPI NAGAR (RPC LAYOUT)
VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE URBAN-560 040
112. SHANTHAMALLESH R
S/O RAJASHEKARA MURTHY M
'KANASU', OPP: RMC MARKET
NANJANGUD ROAD, T.NARASIPURA
MYSORE-571 124
113. ABHISHEK HEGDE
#389/H, 9TH 'F' MAIN ROAD
VIJAYANAGARA
BANGALORE-560 040

114. SANJEEVA JUNNUR
AT POST KOPPA (5K)
BILAGI TALUK
BAGALKOT DISTRICT
115. SHADAKSHARIAH H
C/O #93, KADAMBA
3RD MAIN, 4TH CROSS, 2ND STAGE
SATYANARAYANA LAYOUT
MAHALAKSHMIPURA
BANGALORE-560 086
116. MANJUNATH HARTI
C/O DR.D.L.SAVITHARAMAMA
PROFESSOR AND HEAD OF DEPT. OF GENETICS
AND PLANT BREEDING, UAS, GKVK
BANGALORE URBAN-560 065
117. LOKESHAMURTHY S.M
S/O MANJEGOWDA M
SOREKAYIPYRA SABBANAHALLI POST
H HIRISAVE HOBLI
CHANNARAYAPATTANA TALUK
HASSAN DISTRICT-573 124
118. HARSHA KUMAR K
NO.MIG 79/9, 6TH CROSS
2ND STAGE, KHB COLONY
BASAVESHWARNAGAR
BANGALORE NORTH
119. RAVIKUMAR HUKKERI
S/O R.G.HUKKERI
AT POST KANKANAWADI
RAIBAG, BELGAUM-591 222
120. RAVI A.N
S/O NARASASHETTY
C/O GOVINDEGOWDA
#409, DAVANE BEEDI
H.D.KOTE ROAD, HUNSUR TOWN
MYSORE DISTRICT-571 105

121. RAJAKUMAR
C/O MAHESH KARUR
SHAMANNA BUILDING
#282/4, 3RD CROSS
7TH MAIN, PEENYA I STAGE
BANGALORE-560 058
122. BASAVARAJ AINAPUR
AT POST KURAGOD
JAMKHANDI TALUK
BAGALKOT-586 126
123. VEERANNA
SANTOSH COLONY
GULBARGA—585 102
124. SHASHIDHARA H
S/O HANUMANTHAPPA KANGUVALLI
HOSADURGA POST
CHITRADURGA—577 515
125. KOUSER RESHMA G
#297/C, H.P.GALLI, CHOWKIPETE
DAVANAGERE-577 001
126. SANTOSH BIRADARPATIL
C/O GIRISH N. GOUDAR
#48/3, 8TH MAIN, 13TH CROSS
MALLESHWARAM
BANGALORE—560 003
127. NANDINI PATIL
D/O SHRI J.T.PATIL
C/O DR.R.T.PATIL
SHANTI EXTENSION AREA
BAGALKOT-587 101
128. NAVEENPRASAD B. KATTIMANI
C/O PARAMESHWARA B. KATTIMANI
BASAVASHREE NILAYA
OPP. BHAKTHI BHANDAR HIGH SCHOOL
UDAYA NAGAR, HAVERI-581 110

129. SHAILAJA N
GOVT. PU COLLEGE, I.D.HALLI
MADHUGIRI TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 132
130. KIRAN KUMAR K.K
S/O KARIYAPPA
KATTEMALALAVADI VILLAGE AND POST
HUNSUR TALUK, MYSORE DISTRICT-571 134
131. KAIPASHREE C.R
#28, RAMA MANDIRA ROAD
BELAGOLA, S.R. PATNA
MANDYA-571 606
132. DUNDAPPA TURADI
#496, 10TH MAIN
M.C.LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040
133. GEETHA SHANKAR S
#29/A, 4TH CROSS, 2ND MAIN
BAPUJINAGAR, MYSORE ROAD
BANGALORE-560 026
134. YUVARAJ HANAGANDI
S/O MALLAPPA HANAGANDI
NEAR OLD POST OFFICE
SOMAWAR PETH, BAHAHATTI
JAMKHANDI, BAGALKOT-587 311
135. NINGAPPA S. MASALI
S/O SURESH B. MASALI
NAGATHAN POST
BIJAPUR DISTRICT-586 112
136. LALITHA K
D/O KRISHNAPPA C
CASHIER SBM YELDUR BRANCH
YELDUR, SRINIVASAPURA TALUK
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 138

137. BHAGYASHREE JAHAGIRDAR
SRI CHENNAKESHA
MORE PLOTS, PLOT NO.5/1
MICHIGAN COMPOUND
SAPTAPUR, DHARWAD-580 007
138. POORNIMA N
W/O NARAYANA MURTHY
DOOR NO.8/15, CK NAGAI AH STREET
KOLLEGAL, CHAMARAJANAGAR-571 440
139. SUNITA B. CHIMMANAKATTI
D/O B.B.CHIMMANAKATTI
CHALUKYA NAGAR, BADAMI
BAGALKOT-587 201
140. HULLUMANI THIMMANNA
S/O HULLUMANI GOVINDAPPA
UJJINI AT POST, KUDLIGI
BELLARY DISTRICT-583 136
141. VEENA M.S
D/O SHIVANNAGOWDA
MURUKANAHALLI VILLAGE & POST
SEELANERE HOBLI, K.R.PETE
MANDYA-571 426
142. KIRAN G
SRI VINAYAKA EXTENSION
K.R.PURAM, BANGALORE EAST
BANGALORE-560 036
143. MAHIBOOBEE
D/O ABDULSAB ARKERA
HOUSE NO.4/3, Q.R.COLONY
HUTTI GOLD MINES
HUTTI POST, LINGASUGUR TALUK
RAICHUR-584 115
144. MYTHRI H.P.S.
W/O DR.SURYANARAYANA V POOJAR
NO.147, NEERAJA NILAYAM

II MAIN, SARVABOUMA NAGAR
CHIKKALLASANDRA
BENGALURU-560 061

145. MOHAMMED SAYED PATEL
C/O M.I.PATEL
NEAR GANESH TEMPLE
CHANDAPUR POST, CHINCHOLI
GULBARGA-585 305
146. AMBRESH M. PATIL
C/O AMBANNAJAMADAR
H.NO.11-366/15, C GANGA NAGAR
BRAHMAPUR, GULBARGA-585 305
147. SUMALATHA S.P
D/O SHANKARAGOWDA G. BEVINAHALLI
HARIHARA TALUK
DAVANGERE-577 601
148. HONNAIAH O.K
HEGDE POST
SRIRAMPURA HOBLI, HOSADURGA
CHITRADURGA-577 542
149. NARAYANA S
NO.207, 10TH CROSS, 1ST STAGE
5TH MAIN ROAD, BASAVESHWARANAGARA
BANGALORE URBAN-560 079
150. DHANARAJ B
S/O BHEEMA NAIK
NELAHONNE THANDA
KUMBALURU POST, HONNALI
DAVANGERE-577 219
151. BINDU G
NO.88, SOLADEVANAHALLI
CHIKKABANAVARA POST
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK
BENGALURU URBAN-560 090

152. HEMAVATHI R
#70/2, FLAT NO.008
SLV ENCLAVE, ASHWATHNAGAR
THANISANDRA, BANGALORE-560 045
153. BALARAM LAMANI
C/O RAMESH RATHOD
DEVENDRA HOTEL
NH-13, SINDAGI ROAD
BIJAPUR, BIJAPUR-586 101
154. SANDEEP NAYAKA G.S
S/O SATHYANARAYANA SWAMY NAYAK
AGSNG NAYAK COMPLEX
BEHIND BUS STAND
MOLAKALMURU POST
CHITRADURGA-577 535
155. MAMATHA L
NO.8, 1A MAIN, SANJEEVININAGAR
OPP. SRI SEETHA RAMA KALYANA MANTAPA
MOODALAPALYA, NAGARABHAVI MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE-560 072
156. NAGAMANI M
PANCHAYATH DEVELOPMENT
OFFICER, GRAM PANCHAYATH
DASTIKOPPA, BAILHONGAL TALUK
BELGAUM DISTRICT-591 153
157. APOORVA C. ANANTHARAMU
#84/A, 1ST MAIN, 10TH 'A' CROSS
MAHALAKSHMIPURAM 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE-560 086
158. AJIT KUMAR G.A
S-272, 13TH MAIN, 10TH 'A' CROSS
MAHALAKSHMIPURAM 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE-560 091
159. PUTTEGOWDA
KONDAPURA, KODAMBALLI POST
CHANNAPATNA
RAMANAGARA-571 501

160. SHIVANAND BEVOOR
#6, ULLAL MAIN ROAD
5TH RIGHT CROSS, GNANA JYOTI NAGAR
NEXT TO RELIANCE FRESH
BANGALORE- 560 056
161. B.MAHESH KUMAR HOLLA
GURUKULA COMPOUND
BEHIND VIJAYA CLINIC VPO
KAIKAMBA, KINNIKAMBLA
MANGALORE TALUK
DAKSHINA KANNADA-574 151
162. PARAMESH KUMAR V
NO.6/36, 2ND CROSS, HENNUR MAIN ROAD
JANGARAJAPUR, BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE-560 084
163. ANAND KUMAR
PLOT NO.626, SEC. NO.05
SHREE NAGAR
BELGAUM-590 016
164. SHIVANAND N. MADARAKHANDI
S/O NANDABASAPPA
AT/POST UKKALI
B.BAGEWADI TALUK
BIJAPUR DISTRICT-586 152
165. VITTAL CHANDARAGI
NO.23, KANAKA NIVASA
13TH F CROSS, AGRAHARA
BANGALORE-560 079
166. SURESH ADIGA K
FLAT NO.3, RAMAKRISHNA APTS
SHIVBAGH KADRI, MANGALORE
DAKSHINA KANNADA-575 002
167. SANTOSH KAMAGOUDA
POSTAL ASSISTANT
AT POST: KABBUR
CHIKKODI TALUK
BELGAUM DISTRICT-591 201

168. NAVEEN KUMAR V.S
SRI AMMAJI NILAYA, GOKULA BADAVANE
NEAR TALUK OFFICE, KORATAGERE TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 129
169. DATTATREYA J.G
JAGANNATH RAO S
GADA AREA OF DR.RAJSHEKAR
KORWAR, NEAR NEHRU CHOWK
CHITGUPPA, HUMNABAD
BIDAR-585 412
170. SHREYAS G.S
ASHRESHA NILAYA
NEAR HASSAN GAS OFFICE
KARIGOWDA COLONY
B.M.ROAD, HASSAN-573 201
171. VASUDEV SWAMY
S/O V.P.SWAMY
#1217, NH-13, NEAR J.B.HOSPITAL
BASAVANAGAR, ILKAL-587 125
HUNGUND
172. SHARATH KUMAR D.P
S/O PRAKASH REDDY G.Y
BHARAMASAMUDRA POST
JAGALUR TALUK
DAVANGERE DISTRICT- 577 529
173. SREENIVASAIAH M
#24, 1ST MAIN ROAD, 2ND CROSS
S.V.G.NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 672
174. VARADARAJU N.S
S/O SIDDABASAVAIAH
VIJAYANAGARA, HULIYAR
TIPTUR, C.N.HALLI
TUMKUR-572 218
175. BHARATRAJ K.N
NO.3, SHARAVATHI, 8TH BLOCK

ADUGODI POLICE QUARTERS
ADUGODI, BANGALORE-560 030

176. GANGAPPA M
S/O MUNIYAPPA
KUTHANDAHALLI VILLAGE
DEVARAMOLLUR POST
SHIDLAGHATTA TALUK
CHIKKABALLAPUR DISTRICT-562 105
177. YAMANAPPA SOMANAKATTI
AT-POST NAGARAJ
BILGI TALUK
BAGALKOTE DISTRICT-587 116
178. BASWANAPPA KAISHETTY
S/O BHEEMARAYA KAISHETTY
BAGALUR POST, SINDAGI
BIJAPUR-585 167
179. NARASAPPA TAHASILDAR
S/O NAGAPPA TAHASILDAR
AT POST SALGUNDA
SINDHANUR TALUK
RAICHUR-584 167
180. MALLAPPA
S/O KASHAPPA HADIMANI
AT POST YERAGOL
YADGIR TALUK AND DISTRICT
YADGIR-585 218
181. ADARSH G
S/O S.GANGADARAIHAH
"GANGA NILAYA", 3RD MAIN
BASAVESHWARA EXTENSION
KYATHASANDRA, TUMKUR-572 104
182. RAMYA T
TAVAKADAHALLI
BIJAVARA POST, MADUGIRI
TUMKUR- 572 102

183. NAGAMANI V
C/O VEENA V
SOUNDARYA BEAUTY PARLOUR
SM.MALLIK BUILDING
NEAR RAMEGOWDA OFFICE
HOSUR ROAD, MALUR
KOLAR-563 101
184. PRABHA B.S
D/O LATE B SANGARAJ URS
MANCHADEVANAHALLI
BYLAKUPPE POST
PERIYAPATNA TALUK
MYSORE DISTRICT-571 104
185. ASHOK TELI
S/O GURALINGA S.TELI
ADVOCATE, PLOT NO.138
KAYAKA NILAYA, MAKA LAYOUT
GULBARGA-585 102
186. BHYRAPPA P.V
PADVANAHALLI VILLAGE
D.N.DODDI POST, MALUR TALUK
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 130
187. PRATHIBHA R
D/O RAMACHANDRAPPA
H.R.ENGINEER, K.E.B. LAYOUT
SAPTHAGIRI EXTENSION
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 107
188. DR.ROHINI V.J
#4667, OPPOSITE VIJAYA BANK
GURUKRUPA NILAYA, NELAMANGALA
BANGALORE DISTRICT-562 123
189. SRINIVASA K.R
S/O RAMANNA GOWDA
KUPPE VILLAGE, HALAGERE POST
AMRUTUR HOBLI, KUNIGAL TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 111

190. SHRUTHI B.R
D/O B.J.RAVINDRA
NO.876/8A, 1ST MAIN
1ST CROSS, LAKSHMIPURA
MYSORE-570 004
191. PRIYANKA B.N
DOOR NO.315/51, 37TH B CROSS
28TH MAIN, 9TH BLOCK, JAYANAGAR
BANGALORE SOUTH
BANGALORE URBAN-560 069
192. SOMASHEKHAR K.S
S/O LATE SRINIVASA V
4TH CROSS, KOLAR DISTRICT-563 101
193. SHRUTHI D.C
135, MATHRU NILAYA, 15TH CROSS
NAGESHWARA LAYOUT, NANJANGUD
MYSORE DIST-571 301
194. AMARESH
S/O GUNDAPPA KUMBAR ONI
AT JALAHALLI POST
JALAHALLI TALUK, DEVADURGA
RAICHUR DISTRICT-584 116
195. BHARATH H.J
#27, 1ST MAIN ROAD
3RD STAGE, 4TH BLOCK
BASAVESHWARANAGAR
BANGALORE NORTH-560 079
196. PRADEEPA R
51, VENKATESHWARA NILAYA
34/1, ATTIGUPPE, 2ND MAIN
VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE SOUTH-560 040
197. RESHMA K.S
#233/H, 4TH MAIN
NETHAJI NAGAR
MYSORE-570 010

198. SHIVAKUMARA R.C
P.RAMPURA, THUNGANI POST
KANAKAPURA
RAMANAGARA-562 117
199. RUKIYABEGUM
D/O LATE KHALEEI
183, (HK) 4TH CROSS
SIDHARTHA NAGARA POST
VIDYANAGAR, MYSORE-570 011
200. MANJUNATHA J
MURUDAGALLI, TALUK POST
JAYAPURA HOBLI
MAHADEV SANAMURI AT POST
HALYAL TALUK, ATHANI
BELGAUM-591 301
201. MAHADEV SANAMURI
AT POST HALYAL TALUK
ATHANI, BELGAUM DIST-591 304
202. SOMASHEKARA V
S/O VENKATARANAPPA
DODDARALAGERE VILLAGE
BENDIGANAHALLI POST
HOSAKOTE TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT-562 129
203. BHIMAPPA PARAGOND AJOUR
C/O B.B.AWATI
17, PARISARA HEALTH LAYOUT
SHRIGANDHADA KAVALU
BANGALORE NORTH-560 091
204. RAJU MAVARAKAR
AT POST MORAB, RAIBAG
BELGAUM DIST-591 317
205. SUNDARESHA
S/O VENKATADASAIAH
#47, DEVAGALLI, DHANAGALLI POST

JAYAPURA HOBLI
MYSORE DISTRICT-570 008

206. SUDHEENDRA O.N
S/O NARAYANASWAMY
GANGAPURA, THAVARAKERE POST
NANDAGUDI HOBLI, HOSAKOTE
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT-562 122
207. MANGALA MADAR
VARADAAN BUILDING, MIG-I/8A
CHAITANYANAGAR
DHARWAD-580 001
208. NEELABAI LAMANI
D/O KRISHNAPPA LAMANI
T.S.S. ROAD, NEW MARKET YARD
SIRSI, UTTARA KANNADA
DISTRICT-581 402
209. ANNAPURNA NAGAPPA MUDUKAMMANAVAR
VIDYANAGAR, B BLOCK, 4TH MAIN
3RD CROSS, HARIHAR TALUK
DAVANGERE DISTRICT-577 601
210. VENKATESHAPPA S
HOLLAMBALLI VILLAGE
SHAPUR POST, KOLAR TALUK
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 104
211. FERROJ PASHA SOMANAKATTI
#10, HANUMAPURA (V & P)
RANEBENNUR TALUK
HAVERI-581 115
212. GEETHA V
#117, C/O G.KRISHNAPPA (DRIVER)
KURUBARPET, MULBAGAL TALUK
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 131
213. NANDINI R.B
G.B.N.ROAD
OPP. BALAJI SARNIL
MADHUGIRI
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 132

214. MAMATHA DEVI G.S
NO.78, 2ND MAIN, H.COLONY
INDIRANAGAR 1ST STAGE
BANGALORE-560 038
215. KEMPA HONNAIAH
NO.402, 3RD CROSS
4TH MAIN, AHIMSA MARGA
SIDDHARTHA NAGAR
MYSORE-570 011
216. SHIVASHARANAPPA PATIL
C/O SHRI M.T.KUMBAR 1923
KALYAN NAGAR, BEHIND PWD OFFICE
SINDAGI POST, BIJAPUR-586 128
217. SRINIVASA
VILLAGE: PATEMACI GOWDANAHALLI
POST, ARKALGUD TALUK
HASSAN-573 102
218. DODDAPPA HUGAR
AT POST YALAWAR
BASAVANABAGEWADI TALUK
KARNATAKA, BIJAPUR-586 203
219. ANANDA KUMARA G
K.T.HALLY VILLAGE
PAVAGADA, TUMKUR-572 116
220. MALLANNA
S/O SIDRAMAPPA
YALAGOD VILLAGE & POST
KEMBHAVI TALUK, SHORAPUR
YADGIR-585 216
221. SOMALING KUMBAR
S/O BHEEMANNA KUMBAR
HORTI POST, INDI TALUK
BIJAPUR DISTRICT-586 117

222. DR.SANJEEV KUMAR
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
DEPT. OF ANATOMY, MANDYA INSTITUTE
OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
MANDYA-571 401
223. SHAHABUDDIN KHAN
NO.27, 2ND FLOOR, 2ND CROSS
M.D. BLOCK, MALLESHWARAM
BANGALORE URBAN-560 003
224. SHARANAPPA RAJASHEKAR HALIMANI
C/O M.S.PATH, KASABA
NAIANTWAD POST, MUDDEBIHAL TALUK
BIJAPUR DISTRICT-577 001
225. HARSHAVARDHAN S.L
S/O LAKSHNIAIAH G. HARSHITHA
GOWN KALUVE, VIJAYAPURA
CHICKMAGALUR-577 101
226. VIVEK B.K
NO.119, 2ND A MAIN
10TH BLOCK, BANGALORE SOUTH
BANGALORE-560 072
227. VENUGOPAL M.P
DOOR NO.21, REVENUE QUARTERS
NEAR TALUK OFFICE, PERIYAPATNA
MYSORE-571 107
228. CHAITRA V
INCHARA, NO.2, 2ND MAIN
HONGASANDRA
BEGUR MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE-560 068
229. SUMA H.S
D/O.SADASHIVA SETTY
RETD. TEACHER, VENKATAPURA
AT POST PAVAGADA
TUMKUR DISTRICT-561 202

230. SHANKAR GOUDI
S/O MALLAPPA BALAPPA GOUDI
ARANYASIDDESHWAR THOTA
A/P DURADUNDI, GOKAK
BELGAUM-591 310
231. MANJULA A
D/O ASWATHA NARAYANA M. KODI
KANNUR VILLAGE, ARAHALLY POST
KOLAR TALUK & DISTRICT-563 101
232. YAMUNA K.N
#13, RAMDEV BHAVAN, 4TH CROSS
4TH MAIN, GANGANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 032
233. SHREESHAIL SOMANAKATTI
AT/POST NAGARAL, BILAGI TALUK
BAGALKOT DISTRICT-587 116
234. SANTOSH KUMAR G
#19, 19TH B.EXTN, BANNIMANTAP
S.S.NAGAR, MYSORE-570 015
235. SAVITHA M
W/O K.S.MAHADEV
#306, 7TH MAIN, 9TH CROSS
T.K.LAYOUT, SARASWATHIPURAM
4TH STAGE, MYSORE-570 009
236. GOVINDA RAJU V
C/O S.C.MANJUNATH
NO.224, 2ND STAGE, LIC COLONY
SHRIRAMPURA, MYSORE TOWN
MYSORE-570 023
237. THEJAVATHI K
W/O MANJUNATH N
C/O JENNI FRANKLIR
W/O LATE FRANKLIN PETER
NEAR VEERABADRA SWAMY TEMPLE
VEERA SAGARA, MELEKOTE ROAD
TUMKUR-572 102

238. TABASSUM M.A
FLAT NO.103, FIRST FLOOR
VICTORY ASHOKA ENCLAVE
NO.12, NETAJI ROAD, FRAZER TOWN
BANGALORE-560 005
239. UMESH HADAPAD
13-3 POLICE OFFICERS QUARTERS
JALAHALLI POLICE STATION
BANGALORE-560 013
240. PRADEEP KUMAR H.S
S/O SATYANARAYANA
TIMBER MERCHANT
KARIGOWDA COLONY
B.M.ROAD, HASSAN-573 201
241. MALLAPPA S. RAHUTANNAVAR
VETERINARY OFFICER
VETERINARY DISPENSARY
YALLUR, BELGAUM-590 005
242. BALUCHANDRA D.K
LAKSHMI NARAYANA NILAYA
3RD STAGE, 2ND CROSS
HEMAVATHI NAGAR
HASSAN-573 201
243. MANOJ KUMAR S.H
S/O HONNAPPA C
YELUKOTINILAYA, O.T.ROAD
SHIMOGA—577 202
244. ANITHA K
#58, 8TH E CROSS, 14TH F MAIN
RPC LAYOUT, ATTIGUPPE
VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040
245. ANUPAMA K. MAGANUR
MF 38/7, MIG BLOCK, 2ND PATHWAY
PWD QUARTERS, NANDINI LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 096

246. RAGHUNATHA GOWDA M.S
S/O M.V.SRINIVASA GOWDA
MANDIKAL VILLAGE, KOLADEVU POST
MULBAGAL TALUK, KARNATAKA
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 131
247. RAKSHITHA K MURTHY
301, 5TH MAIN, 4TH CROSS
HAL 2ND STAGE, INDIRANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 038
248. SHASHI K.R
KOLIHALLI HIREHALLI POST
TUMKUR TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 168
249. TEJASWINI G.S
D/O MR.SHIVA RAME GOWDA K.H
S-4, JITIN CHAITANYA APARTMENTS
3RD CROSS, WILSON GARDEN
BANGALORE - 560027
250. BAHUBALI HANJE
AT POST: ALAGAWADI
RAIBAG TALUK
BELGAUM DISTRICT-591 317
251. THEJASWINI D.S
C/O DR.SHIVARAJ
NO.24, VISHWAKALA, 4TH MAIN
RAM MOHAN PURAM
NEAR DEVAIAH PARK
BANGALORE-560 021
252. RAMANAGOUDA PATIL
S/O BALANAGOUDA PATIL
NEAR MUDDEBIHAL TALUK
BIJAPUR DISTRICT-586 212
253. HARISH KUMAR B.V
S/O VENKATAPPA
BOMMANAHALLI VILLAGE
SIDLAGHATTA TALUK

DEVARA MALLURU POST
CHIKKABALLAPURA DISTRICT
CHIKKABALLAPURA-562 105

254. SHANKARANAND BANASHANKARI
AT POST, ALAGAWADI
RAIBAG TALUK
BELGAUM DISTRICT-591 317
255. RAVIKUMAR T.S
S/O T.SADASHIVA
RETD. HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER
HIREMATH COLONY
BAPUJI NAGAR, 2ND WARD
KUDLIGI POST
BELLARY-583 135
256. NALINI H.G
W/O PUTTARANGAIAH M.C
MYLANAHALLI, UDUKUNTE POST
SOLUR HOBLI, MAGADI TALUK
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 127
257. SRIDHARA L.C
S/O CHANDRAGIRI NAIK
MACHENAHALLI POST
MACHENAHALLI TANDYA
LAKYA HOBLI
CHICKMAGALORE-577 146
258. ZABIULLA K
S/O MOHAMMED FAZLULLA
AT POST, BELLUDI, HARIHAR
DAVANAGERE-586 214
259. SAVITA INAMDAR
D/O R.Y.INAMDAR
RTD. POST MASTER
RAJAPUR GALLY
TALIKOTE, MUDDEBIHAL
BIJAPUR-586 214
260. MAHADEV KUMAR
AT/POST KOUJALGI
GOKAK, BELGAUM-591 227

261. SAJJANAR PRAKASH
S/O VIRUPAXAPPA SAJJANAR
AT/POST BARDUR, MUNDARGI
GADAG-582 118
262. KANAKAPPA WADDAR
AT POST KALAKERI
SINDAGI TALUK
BIJAPUR DISTRICT-586 118
263. SANDEEP S.P
#1028, 25TH MAIN, 39TH CROSS
JAYANAGAR, 4TH BLOCK
BANGALORE-560 041
264. DR.SUDHAKAR V
S/O VISHWANATH R
NO.5064, RAJENDRA LAYOUT
DESIHALLI POST, BANGARPET
KOLAR-563 114
265. VINAY KUMAR G.B
ROOMANAGAR HOSPITAL
BHOGADI, MYSORE-570 026
266. MOHAN KUMAR S
#104-ED, 16TH MAIN
INDUSTRIES & COMMERCE LAYOUT
VIJAYANAGAR, BANGALORE-560 040
267. CHIDANANDASWAMY
C/O S.S.SHUSNURMATH
HOUSE NO.203, PARANJYOTHI
NEAR GOVT. SCHOOL, HALIYAL ROAD
DHARWAD-580 001
268. CHIDAMBARA P.M
NESARA NILAYA, JAIL ROAD
15TH CROSS, NAGESHWARAN LAYOUT
NANJANGUDU, MYSORE-571 301

269. MANOJ KUMAR MED
BHAA SHRI NILAYA
TALUK PARK ROAD, VIJAYAPURA
CHIKMAGALUR-577 101
270. MAHESH KUMAR R. MASHETTY
C/O SHIVA KUMAR
J.EH.NO.810-28
AKKAMAHADEVI COLONY
NEAR RANGAMANDIR
BIDAR-585 401
271. MALLAYYA S
C/O DEEPA KADAPATI
H.NO.1, DEVI NAGAR, VIDYANAGAR
POST-HUBLI, DHARWAD-580 031
272. MAHADEVASWAMY T.P
DOOR NO.355, KALIDASA ROAD
VIVEKANANDA NAGAR
T.NARASIPURA TOWN
MYSORE-571 124
273. MUSI HONNURAPPA
S/O MUSI YAMUNAPPA
AT POST BALLAPUTA
CHIKARAJANUR POST
BELLARY-583 129
274. RAJANI K.S
411, KARSIDDESHWARA NILAYA
RING ROAD, NIJALINGAPPA LAYOUT
DAVANGERE-577 004
275. K.VAISHNAVI
#16, GANESHA TEMPLE ROAD
19TH MAIN, 50 FEET CROSS ROAD
GIRINAGAR, BANGALORE SOUTH-560 085
276. MOHAMMED NAEEM MOMIN
S/O ABDUL RAZAK MOMIN
NEAR OLD AFIJUMAN HIGH SCHOOL
KILLA GALLI, BAGALKOT-587 101

277. SHILPA D
#3C, DEVASHILPA, 14TH CROSS
1ST B. MAIN, IAS OFFICERS COLONY
HSR LAYOUT, 6TH SECTOR
BENGALURU URBAN-560 102
278. DIVYA RANJINI K.N
NO.408, A & B BLOCK
KUVEMPUNAGAR
MYSORE-570 023
279. PREETI C.S
H.NO.153, 2ND CROSS
3RD MAIN, D BLOCK
GOPALA GOWDA EXTENSION
SHIVMOGA-577 203
280. BASAVARAJU B
BARADANAPURA VILLAGE
JAYAPURA HOBLI
MYSORE TALUK AND DIST-570 008
281. PRAVEEN M
S/O MANJANNA PARVATHAYYANA PALYA
SONDEKOPPA POST, DASANPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK-562 130
282. MANJULA R
W/O MANOHARA
1302, II CROSS, II STAGE
SRIRAMPURA, MYSORE-570 023
283. GANGADHARA B.V
NO.138, BHAKTHARHALLI
SHIDLAGHATTA
CHIKKABALLAPURA-562 102
284. NETHRAVATHI C.M
W/O PRABHAKAR G.M
#5450/AS, 1ST FLOOR
SHIVA KRUPA, (NEAR VIVEKANANDA
RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL)
BARIASHANKARI LAYOUT

VIDYA NAGAR
DAVANGERE—577 005

285. MANJULA T.M
C/O S.G.ODANAVAR PETBAN ODANAVAR ONI
AT POST LAXMESHWAR, SHIRAHATTI TALUK
GADAG DISTRICT-582 116
286. MANIK RAJ S
S/O SIDRAMAPPA S
H.NO.MIG 7, II PHASE
ADARSH NAGAR, RING ROAD
GULBARGA-585 105
287. NANDISHA S.B
S/O BOREGOWDA
SIDDARAMANAHUNDI
YADAKOLA POST
MYSORE DISTRICT—570 010
288. MANJAPPA G.R
S/O RANGAPPA G.M
GOLLARAHALLI, BELLIGANUDU POST
CHANNAGIRI TALUK
DAVANGERE DISTRICT-577 552
289. KARTHIK DARSHAN
NO.1882, 6TH CROSS, 20TH MAIN
J.P.NAGAR, 1ST PHASE
BANGALORE-560 078
290. HARIPRASADA T.V
S/O VENKATAPPA
GALIHALLY, HOSAKERE POST
MADHUGIRI TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 132
291. LAKSHMI P
W/O CHANDRA SHEKAR H.M
C/O SHANTHIKRUPA, D.NO. X-80/1
MAHADESHWARA BLOCK
SOMWARPET, KODAGU -571 236

292. ANANDA M.R
MELAVARIGE POST
SAGAR, SHIMOGA-577 401
293. CHETHAN KUMAR M.S
#61, SIRSI ROAD, CHAMARAJPET
BANGALORE URBAN-560 008
294. VARSHA
H.NO.227, OPP.NIJALINGAPPA DENTAL
COLLEGE, BANASHANKARI COLONY
JAYANAGAR, BANGALORE-560 038
295. HANAMANT TAKKANNAVAR
RAIBAG RAILWAY STATION
NAGRAL, BELGAUM-591 317
296. NAYANA
S.K.S.T. GIRLS JUNIOR COLLEGE
PERIYAPATNA TOWN
MYSORE-571 107
297. JAVED ALI RAJASAB JAMADAR
C/O KOHINOOR BEKARY
HARUGERI, RAIBAG TALUK
BELGAUM DISTRICT-591 220
298. VIDYA RANI Y.V
C/O MURALI MOHAN P.N
GRAMA PANCHAYATH SECRETARY
YELDUR VILLAGE & POST
SRINIVASAPUR TALUK
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 138
299. RAJESHWARI B
FLAT NO.006, BUILDING-5
SHANTI PARK, 9TH BLOCK
JAYANAGAR, BANGALORE-560 065
300. SHARANAVVA
S.D.KARI, AT-MADANAL
YARAGEN POST, KUSHTAGI TALUK
KOPPAL DISTRICT-583 182

301. SHARANAPPA GUGIHAL
SHARANAPPA MALLAPPA GUGIHAL
AT POST KUDGI
BASAVANA BAGEWADI
BIJAPUR-586 121
302. C.S.MANO HAR RAO
NO.67-0, SREE NIVASA, 11TH MAIN ROAD
VITTALNAGAR-AT POST
BANGALORE-560 018
303. SADANANDA K.C
S/O CHANDREGOWDA
K.R.KODTHALLY, ADAGUR POST
BELUR, HASSAN-573 121
304. VASANT BHAGWAT
H.NO.05, KRISHNA BLOCK
POLICE OFFICER'S QUARTERS
R/K HEGDE NAGAR
SHIVARAMKARANTH NAGAR POST
BANGALORE EAST
BANGALORE URBAN DIST-560 077
305. KALLAPPA BHANGIGOUDAR
NO.03, SHIMSHA BLOCK
POLICE OFFICERS QUARTERS
CAR NORTH, R.K.HEGDE NAGAR
SHIVARAMA KARANTH NAGAR POST
BANGALORE-560 099
306. VASANT BANDAGAR
C/O RAMESH TARALAGATTI
IBRAHIMPUR WARD NO.21
MANAGOLI ROAD
BIJAPUR-586 109
307. RAVISHANKAR P
922, 3RD MAIN, 12TH CROSS
M.S.LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040

308. JAYAPPA
#413, MAHAVEER CORNET
KENGARI SATELLITE TOWN
BANGALORE SOUTH
BANGALORE URBAN-560 060
309. VISMAYEE V.T
NO.115, 'A' 1ST MAIN
4TH CROSS, HANUMAN HILLS LAYOUT
AREHALLI, BANGALORE-560 061
310. MANUKUMARA H.M
S/O MANJAPPA H.T
184, WARD 12, GANDHI CIRCLE
CHANNARAYAPATNA
HASSAN-573 116
311. PRAKHAR PANDEY
S/O R.N.PANDEY
I.I.H.R. COLONY
HESARAGHATTA LAKE
BANGALORE-560 089
312. RAVIKUMAR J.D
S/O DURGE GOWDA
27, JAMPALEGOWDANADODDI VILLAGE
THUNGANI POST, KASABA HOBLI
KANAKAPURA TALUK
RAMANAGARA-562 117
313. MANJUNATHA A.S
NO.45, AGASARAHALLI
MALAGONDANAHALLI POST
CHIKKANAYAKANAHALLI TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 214
314. ANAND KESARGOPPA
AT/POST:MUGALKHOD
MUDHOL, BAGALKOT-587 113
315. SHANKARAPPA PATIL
HULAGUR ROAD, SHIGGAON
HAVERI DISTRICT-581 205

316. SUBHASH B
GOVERNMENT HIGHER PRIMARY SCHOOL
GAJANURU POST, SHIVAMOGGA TALUK
SHIVAMOGGA DIST-577 202
317. VIDHYA M. KALE
NO.72, U.V.BHAT JEWELLERS
27TH CROSS, 8TH C MAIN
4TH BLOCK, JAYANAGAR
BENGALURU-560 011
318. VANI M
W/O MANJUNATH T.R
NO.693, RAMACHANDRA REDDY
BUILDING, THIRUPAIYA
BOMMASANDRA POST, ANEKAL TALUK
BANGALORE-560 099
319. SUDHAMBIKA R
#5, GEETANJALI FLORA
GUNDAPPA REDDY LAYOUT
CHOLANAGAR, 4TH MAIN
R.T.NAGAR POST
BANGALORE-560 032
320. GEETHA D.M.
NO.12, 23RD CROSS, 1ST MAIN
MARUTHI NAGAR, VENKATALA
BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE-560 064
321. GOPAL RATHOD
S/O RUKMANNA RATHOD
AT.BORABANDA, BUDOOR POST
YADGIR TALUK & DISTRICT-585 214
322. NAGARATHNA S.L
W/O B.S.LOKESH
S/O SHEKARAPPA
BETTADAHALLI, TARIKERE
CHIKMANGALUR-577 428

323. JAYANNA
NO.34, KRISHNAPURA
PIRIYAPATNA TOWN
MYSORE DISTRICT-571 107
324. AYESHA KHANUM
#1052, NEW MASJID MOHALLA
MAGADI TOWN
RAMANAGARA—562 120
325. LAXMI ASHTAGI
HOME NO.449, AT: KALKHAMB
MUCHANDI POST
BELGAUM—590 010
326. NAGARAJU H
8-1294, 5TH CROSS
BHARATHNAGAR 2ND STAGE
MAGACH MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE URBAN—560 091
327. MANJUNATHA REDDY D.L
61, 4TH CROSS, KODIHALLI
BANGALORE-560 008
328. BASAVANNA A.G
S/O A.S.GURULINGAPPA ARAKALAVADI
V & P CHAMARAJANAGARA
CHAMARAJANAGARA DIST
329. SHIVANAND KUMBAR
POST RABKAVI KUMBAR LANE
JAMAKHANDI, BAGALKOT DIST-587 314
330. PADMAVATHY M.A
W/O DRUVAKUMAR C.S
#256, ASHA, 16TH CROSS
RAILWAY LAYOUT
VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE
MYSORE-570 016
331. ADARSHA D.B
S/O BASAVARAJAPPA D.J

MELLEKATTE, DAVANGERE TALUK
DAVANGERE DISTRICT-577 512

332. RAGHUNANDAN
NO.12, 3RD 'O' CROSS, 2ND BLOCK
3RD STAGE, 1ST MAIN
BASAVESHWARANAGAR
BANGALORE NORTH
BANGALORE-560 079
333. SHASHIKALA S
W/O PRASANNAKUMARA C
NEAR AMRUTESHWARA HIGH SCHOOL
NERALAKERE, TARIKERE
CHICKMAGALUR-577 228
334. SHRIDHARA PATTAR
SHRIDHARA PARAPPA PATTAR
LAXMI NAGAR, MUDALGI TALUK
GOKAK, BELGAUM DISTRICT-591 312
335. CHAITHRA K
#12, 12TH 'E' MAIN ROAD
SRINIVASA NILAYA, BANDAPPA GARDEN
MUTHYALANAGAR, BANGALORE-560 054
336. YAMANAPPA
S/O MALLAPPA
AT POST CHITTAPUR
LINGASUGUR TALUK
RAICHUR DISTRICT-584 127
337. RUBINA KHAN
#124 1ST FLOOR, 2ND CROSS
18TH MAIN, 5TH BLOCK
KORAMANGALA
BANGALORE SOUTH
BANGALORE-560 034
338. SUVARNA WALIKAR
PLOT NO.4, JOSHI LAYOUT
VENKATESH COLONY

BARAKOTRI ROAD
DHARWAD—580 001

339. NIJALINGAPPA BASAVARAJ TOTAD
S/O BASAVARAJ TOTAD
AT:AKKIGUND, GOJANUR POST
SHIRAHATTI TALUK
GADAG—582 116
340. VISHWANATH REDDY
#04, KAVERI BLOCK
KSRP POLICE QUARTERS
ELECTRONIC CITY POST
BANGALORE CITY—550 100
341. PRATHIK G. HEGDE
NO.423, 4TH BLOCK
3RD CROSS, BRINDAVAN NAGAR
HBR LAYOUT, BANGALORE—560 043
342. SHILPA A.E
#31, 3RD FLOOR, S.H.I.G T-2
SHANTHINIKETHAN A BLOCK
OPP. SHIVAMANDIRA TEMPLE
5TH PHASE, YELAHANKA NEW TOWN
BANGALORE—560 106
343. CHANDRASHEKHAR GALI
S/O LATE SHAMBANNA GALI
AT/POST—ARALESHWAR
HANGAL, HAVERI—581 104
344. NAZEER AHMED KANAVALLI
MARUTHI NAGAR, 1ST MAIN
NEAR CHOLAMARADI
RANEBENNUR, HAVERI-581 115
345. MANJUNATHA D.J
S/O JAYAPPA S
DOOR NO.765/1, 12TH CROSS
K.T.J. NAGARA
DAVANGERE—577 002

346. VASUNDHARA R
DOOR NO.92, 5TH MAIN
S.J.H. ROAD, VIDYARANYAPURAM
MYSORE-570 008
347. CHANDRASHEKHAR
S/O BASANNA KUMBAR BANKADA MANI
AT POST KASABA, LINGASUGUR
RAICHUR-584 122
348. MANJUNATH
C/O VEERABADRAYYA KIRANI STORE
#131, BASAVA NILAYA
AT: HASAMAKAL, GUDADUR POST
SINDHANUR, RAICHUR-584 124
349. ASHOK KUMAR RATHOD
C/O SRI D.L.CHAVAN
BANJARA CROSS, BANJARA NAGAR
SOLAPUR ROAD, BIJAPUR-586 103
350. BASETTAPPA D.M
S/O MUGAPPA D
HARAKABHAVI POST
KUDLIGI TALUK
BELLARY DISTRICT-583 126
351. SHYLAJA
D/O NARASIMHA NAYAK
PANCHAMUKHI GANDHAL POST
RAICHUR-584 140
352. GANAPATI SHASTRI
AT-GUI ANAKKI, KEKKAR POST
HONNAVAR, UTTARA KANNADA-581 338
353. SEKHARAPPA V
S/O VENKATAPPA
TALIKATTE AT POST
HOLALKERE TALUK
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT-577 539

354. POORNIMA N
D/O NAGARAJU T
#478/4, TELEPHONE EXCHANGE ROAD
YELAWALA, MYSORE-571 130
355. RADHAMANI V.B
D/O BOREGOWDA
JATAKAGATE HOME
VADERAPURA VILLAGE
ANCHE CHITTANAHALLI POST
KASABA HOBLI, NAGAMANGALA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT
356. PRATHIBHA R
C/O HARISH
NEW FRIENDS STITCH WEAR
NEAR BHARATH GAS, OFFICE NO.19
1 MAIN ROAD, KAMALANAGAR
BANGALORE URBAN—560 079
357. NEELAGANGA
PLOT NO.3, SAI LAYOUT
SHAKTI NAGAR
GULBARGA—585 103
358. GAYATHRI C.H
D/O RAMANA POOJARY
JANATHA COMPOUND
VITLA, KASABA, BANTWALA TALUK
DAKSHINA KANNADA DISTRICT
359. NARASIMHA MURTHY D.K
115, KEMPAIAH DANDINASHIVARA
TURUVEKERE TALUK
TUMKUR—572 212
360. R.PRASAD, S.I
PLOT NO.153, 1ST MAIN, 2ND STAGE
3RD CROSS, OPPOSITE HANUMAN TEMPLE
HANUMAN NAGAR, BELGAUM-590 001
361. HARISH T
C/O S.N.SANGAMESWARAN
#130, CFTRI LAYOUT

1ST MAIN, 3RD CROSS
BHO GADI 2ND STAGE
MYSORE-570 026

362. G.S.SRIVIDYA
21/6/117, TEACHERS COLONY
HINDUPUR, ANANTAPUR-515 201 (A.P)
363. KISHAN KALAL
C/O MAHARSHA J.M
HOUSE NO.5/41, 2ND FLOOR
SAMEERA KRUPA, 1ST MAIN
1ST STAGE, K.H.B.COLONY
BASAVESHWAR NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 079
364. MANJUNATH H.S
S/O SHIVALINGEGOWDA HODIKEGHATTA
BENAKANAKARE POST
TURUVEKERE TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572 227
365. SHARANAPPA T
AT POST JAKKERAMADU TAZIDA
LINGASUGUR TALUK
RAICHUR DISTRICT-584 125
366. SHRUTHI M
D/O MAHANTESH B
70/D, AIWAN-E-SHAHI OFFICERS
QUARTERS, GULBARGA-585 102 ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI ADITYA SONDHI, ADDL. ADVOCATE GENERAL
FOR MS.PRATHIMA HONNAPURA, AGA FOR R1,
2 & 4;
SRI P.S.RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI REUBEN JACOB, ADVOCATE FOR R3;
SRI BELAPU LAKSHMINARAYANA ACHARYA &
SRI SHAHUL HAMEED, ADVOCATES FOR R5 TO 9,
11 TO 14, 17 TO 19, 21, 22, 26 TO 31, 34 TO 36,
38, 40 TO 43, 48, 49, 52, 54 TO 59, 60, 61, 63,
64, 66, 67 TO 69, 71 TO 90, 92 TO 96, 97, 99,
100, 102, 103 TO 105, 107 TO 111, 113 TO 119,

121 TO 129, 130 TO 133 & 135, 137 TO 140,
145 TO 149, 151 TO 159, 160 TO 162, 164, 165,
167, 168, 169 TO 171, 173, 175, 176, 178, 180,
181, 183, 184, 188 TO 190, 192, 194 TO 197,
199, 201, 203, 204, 207 TO 211, 214, 216 TO
218, 220, 224 TO 227, 229 TO 232, 235, 237, 239
TO 243, 245, 248 TO 253, 255, 257, 258, 260 TO
262, 264, 266, 267, 271, 273, 274, 275, 278 TO
282, 284, 287, 288 TO 293, 296 TO 301, 303
TO 315, 317, 320 TO 329, 331, 333, 334 TO 341,
343, 345, 346, 348, 351 TO 353, 358, 359, 361
TO 366;
SRI PARVAIAH, ADVOCATE FOR R13, 15, 20, 33,
37, 46, 47, 51, 70, 76, 82, 119, 177, 141, 179,
187, 188, 193, 200, 206, 220, 233, 280, 318, 339,
342, 344, 355, 356, 357;
SRI SAJAN POOVAYYA, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
MS.SANJANTHI SAJAN POOVAYYA FOR
M/S.POOVAYYA & CO., FOR R8, 10, 18, 20 21,
30, 31, 34, 54, 57, 58, 61, 69, 70, 73, 74, 76, 84,
87, 90, 94, 99, 100, 168, 169, 179, 187, 188,
206, 210, 243, 250, 251, 253, 257, 260, 274, 278,
279, 283, 284, 289, 335, 340, 353, 355, 361;
MS.MONICA PATIL & SRI JOSEPH ANTHONY
ADVOCATES FOR M/S JSM LAW PARTNERS FOR
R45, 80, 101, 136, 182, 185, 213, 236, 244, 259,
294, 316, 330;
SRI B.M.ARUN, ADVOCATE FOR R23;
SRI D.K.SHIVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R50;
SRI UDAYA HOLLA, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI RAGHAVENDRA G. GAYATHRI
ADVOCATE FOR R144;
SRI K.G.RAGHAVAN, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI P.N.RAJESHWARA, ADVOCATE FOR R163;
SRI M.V.ADITHE, ADVOCATE FOR
M/s.A.H.LEGAL CONSULTANT FOR R354;
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R25, 44, 172, 191, 223,
246, 276 IS COMPLETE VIDE ORDER DATED
04.09.2017;
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R16, 39, 142, 332 IS
HELD SUFFICIENT VIDE ORDER DATED
04.09.17;
RESPONDENTS 24, 32, 53, 62, 65, 91, 97, 98, 106,

112, 120, 134, 150, 166, 174, 186, 198, 202, 205,
 212, 215, 219, 221, 222, 234, 238, 247, 254, 256,
 263, 265, 268, 269, 270, 272, 277, 285, 286, 295,
 302, 319, 347, 349, 350, 360 ARE SERVED BUT
 UNREPRESENTED;
 RESPONDENTS 143 & 228 - UNSERVED;

SRI SAJAN POOVAYYA, SENIOR ADVOCATE
 ACCEPTS NOTICE FOR RESPONDENTS NO.5 TO 366
 VIDE COURT ORDER DATED 09.08.2017.

SRI VIKRAM PHADKE, ADVOCATE FOR APPLICANT
 ON I.A. NO.16/17)

THESE WRIT PETITIONS ARE FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO GRANT
 LEAVE TO FILE WRIT PETITIONS AND QUASH THE ORDER DATED
 19.10.2016 PASSED BY KARNATAKA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
 BENGALURU IN APPLICATIONS NUMBER 6268/2014 TO
 6395/2014, 6432/2014 TO 6444/2014, 6446/2014 TO
 6459/2014, 6597/2014, 6598/2014, 7464/2014, 7941/2014 TO
 7946/2014, 7950/2014 TO 7966/2014, 7967/2014, 7968/2014,
 7969/2014, 9112/2014 TO 9126/2014, 9592/2014 TO 9610/2014
 AND 8298/2015 AT ANNEX-M, ETC.

IN WRIT PETITION NO.11342/2017

BETWEEN:

DR.MYTHRI H.P.S
 W/O DR.SOORYANARAYAN V. PUJAR
 AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
 #147, NEERAJA NILAYAM
 2ND MAIN, SARVABHOUMA NAGAR
 CHIKKALLASANDRA
 BANGALORE-560 061 ...PETITIONER

(BY SRI UDAYA HOLLA, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
 SRI RAGHAVENDRA G. GAYATRI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
 REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
 DPAR, VIDHANA SOUDHA
 BANGALORE-560 001

2. THE KARNATAKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
 'PARK HOUSE', UDYOG SOUDHA
 BANGALORE-560 001
 3. SUPRIYA BANAGAR B
 MAJOR, HOUSE NO.750
 3RD WARD, NEAR PRIYADARSHINI
 LADIES HOTEL, KUDLIGI
 BELLARY-583 134
 4. DR.MANGALA SRIDHAR
 W/O SRIDHAR NARAYANI
 AGED 43 YEARS, THEN KPSC MEMBER
 R/AT NO.1914, 18TH A MAIN
 SRILAKSHMIVENKATEWARA NILAYA
 5TH CROSS, 2ND STAGE, J.P.NAGAR
 BANGALORE-560 078
- ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI ADITYA SONDHI, ADDL. ADVOCATE GENERAL
 FOR MS.PRATHIMA HONNAPURA, AGA FOR R1;
 SRI P.S.RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
 SRI REUBEN JACOB, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
 SRI B.M.SHYAM PRASAD, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
 SRI I.S.PRAMOD CHANDRA, ADVOCATE FOR R4;
 SRI B.MAHESHA, ADVOCATE FOR C/R3;
 SRI B.M.ARUN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER OF THE HON'BLE TRIBUNAL IN APPLICATION NO.7941/2014 PASSED ON 19.10.2016 VIDE ANNEX-A IN SO FAR AS ISSUING DIRECTION TO THE R-1 TO APPOINT R-3 TO THE POST OF ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER [REVENUE] AND DIRECT THE R-1 TO CONSIDER CASE OF THE PETITIONER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE POST OF ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER [REVENUE] IN SO FAR AS THE PETITIONER IS CONCERNED.

THESE WRIT PETITIONS, HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON 15.11.2017, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF ORDERS, THIS DAY,
P.S.DINESh KUMAR J., PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:-

ORDER

1. The batch of these writ petitions involve appointment of Group 'A' and Group 'B' Probationary Officers under the Karnataka Recruitment of Gazetted Probationers (Appointment by Competitive Examinations) Rules, 1997.

2. Writ Petitions No.13617-13627 & 14529/2017 are filed in public interest and Writ Petition No.11342/2017 is filed in private interest with a prayer *inter alia* to quash the common order dated 19.10.2016 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore ('Administrative Tribunal' for short), in Applications No.6268/2014 to 6395/2014 c/w 6432/2014 to 6444/2014, 6446/2014 to 6459/2014, 6597/2014 & 6598/2014, 7464/2014, 7941/2014 to 7946/2014, 7950/2014 to 7966/2014, 7967/2014, 7968/2014, 7969/2014, 9112/2014 to 9126/2014, 9592/2014 to 9610/2014 and 8298/2015, whereby the Administrative Tribunal has directed the State Government to issue appointment orders to the applicants therein.

FACTS OF THE CASE:

3. The genesis of these cases dates back to issuance of notifications by the State Government on 29.3.2011, 25.4.2011, 4.10.2011 and 19.10.2011 to hold examination for the posts of Group-A and Group-B Officers as per the Karnataka Recruitment of Gazetted Probationers (Appointment by Competitive Examinations) Rules, 1997 ['1997 Rules' for short]. Pursuant thereto, the Karnataka Public Service Commission ('KPSC' for short) by notification dated 3.11.2011 invited applications for 352 posts. Subsequently, the number of posts were modified to 362 by the State Government vide communications dated 9.2.2012. Accordingly, amended notification was issued by the KPSC. Preliminary written examinations were conducted on 22.4.2012 and written (main) examinations were conducted between 15.12.2012 and 6.1.2013. The personality tests were conducted between 1.4.2013 and 27.5.2013.

4. On 24.5.2013, Dr. HPS Mythri, one of the candidates submitted a representation to the learned Advocate General

for Karnataka, alleging mal-practices in the selection process, stating *inter alia* that she had secured 1009 marks out of 1800 in the written examination, but she was awarded only 75 marks in viva-voce, whereas, a candidate in the same category, Supriya Banagar, who was her immediate competitor had secured only 937.5 marks in the written examination, but she was awarded 150 marks in viva-voce.

5. On 28.5.2013, Dr. Mythri, submitted another representation to the learned Advocate General stating that:

- on 20.3.2013, she received a call from a Cell Phone No.99455 85567; the caller introduced herself as Dr. Mangala Sridhar, Member, KPSC, and asked Dr.Mythri to meet her, in her chambers;
- she received another call from the very same No.99455 85567 on 22.3.2013, with a similar request;
- when she met Dr. Mangala Sridhar, Member, KPSC, she was asked to discuss with her PA (Personal Assistant) Ashok Kumar;
- Ashok Kumar told her that the post of Assistant Commissioner (Revenue) were being offered at

Rs.1 Crore for general merit candidates. Dr.Mythri, being a candidate belonging to Scheduled Tribe Category, was being offered the same at Rs.75 Lakhs;

- on 26.3.2013, she received two calls from Ashok Kumar, from Cell Phone No. 97390 08228. However, she declined to accept his demand to pay illegal gratification; and
- on 6.5.2013, she again received a call from Ashok Kumar, from Cell Phone No.81476 07549, informing that she had lost her chance to get the post of Assistant Commissioner, but she could still negotiate for the post of an Executive Officer.

With aforesaid allegations, she requested the learned Advocate General to look into the matter.

6. On 4.6.2013, the learned Advocate General gave his opinion as follows:

"It is well-settled that calling for an interview or even a selection by the Public Service Commission would not confer any vested right upon the candidate to be appointed. If the Government wants to disapprove or reject the list submitted by the Commission, it is empowered to do so. But such rejection should be done within a reasonable time on receipt of the List and for reasons to be recorded. Government cannot accept a part of the List and reject the rest. The Government may reject the entire Select List when it is satisfied after due enquiry that the selection has been

vitiated either on account of violation of a fundamental procedural requirement or is vitiated by corruption, favoritism or nepotism.

- a) *In the light of the serious allegation of rampant corruption, the Government will have to carefully examine the allegations made and hold an enquiry to verify the truth of all these allegations. It should be remembered that these are only allegations and not proof of any omission or commission. And it is not permissible for the Government to form an opinion on the basis of these allegations alone.*
- b) *However, as could be seen from the material now available with the government, a prima facie case has been made out to withhold the List and conduct a thorough enquiry/investigation into these allegations and ascertain whether the process of selection is so tainted so as to warrant the entire selection process to be cancelled. It has to be ensured that due to the misdeeds of some candidates, honest and meritorious candidates do not suffer. If the Government finds it impossible or improbable that the tainted cases cannot be separated from the non-tainted cases, the entire Selection List can be cancelled. All endeavours should be made to segregate the tainted from untainted candidates while scrutinizing the Selection List.*
- c) *In the light of this legal position, I advise the Government to initiate the following steps.*
 1. *Withhold the list of selected candidates,*
 2. *Direct a comprehensive inquiry/investigation into the allegations made against the entire process of selection including the conduct of written examinations and viva-voce through a credible investigating agency like the Central Bureau of Investigation.*
 3. *Decide on acceptance or non-acceptance of the List on the basis of the outcome of such investigation and keeping in mind the above stated legal principles."*

7. The State Government, through the Deputy Secretary, DPAR, lodged a complaint with Vidhana Soudha Police Station on 22.6.2013 alleging commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Prevention of Corruption Act and Sections 34, 120, 120-B, 418, 420 and 465 IPC, against 8 accused. In substance, it was alleged in the complaint that the selection process was vitiated and deserving candidates were not selected. An FIR was registered in Crime No.28/2013, wherein, Gonal Bheemappa, Chairman, KPSC, was arraigned as accused No.1 and another Member of KPSC, Mangala Sridhar, was arraigned as accused No.4. Three other officials working in KPSC, namely, Arunachalam, Sundar and Ashok Kumar, were arraigned as accused No.2, 3 and 5 respectively. Sudhir, working as Assistant Executive Engineer in Bengaluru Water Supply & Sewerage Board, Somnath, working as Executive Engineer in Bengaluru Development Authority and Rajashekar, an employee of Karnataka Government Secretariat were arraigned as accused No.6, 7 and 8 respectively.

8. On 27.6.2013, the State Government ordered an investigation and entrusted the matter to the Criminal Investigation Department (Special Units and Economic Offences) ['CID' for short], headed by the Director General of Police. The CID, submitted an interim report to the Government on 10.9.2013.

9. The State Government, after going through the Interim report, issued an order dated 15.10.2013 annulling evaluation of written examination as also the personality tests, and called upon the KPSC to re-do the exercise from the stage of evaluation of performance in the written examination (main).

10. The KPSC, vide their communication dated 19.12.2013, took a stand that the order dated 15.10.2013, passed by the State Government, was without jurisdiction and *non est*. It went ahead with the selection process and published a provisional select list on 5.3.2014. After considering the objections received, KPSC published their

Final Select List on 21.3.2014 and gazetted it on 22.3.2014. As per Rule 11(2) of the 1997 Rules, KPSC delivered the Final Select List to the Government on 26.3.2014. This marked the end of selection process by the KPSC.

11. In April 2014, Dr. Mythri, filed an application before the Administrative Tribunal, challenging the final select list and obtained an *ex-parte* interim order, which stood vacated on 2.7.2014, with an observation that any decision taken by the State Government with regard to the Final Select List shall be subject to the result of her pending application before the Administrative Tribunal.

12. The CID, on 12.5.2014, filed its charge sheet against accused No.1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 namely, Gonal Bheemappa, Arunachalam, Ashok Kumar, Sudeer @ Sridhar, Somanath @ Somesh Chickkamath and Rajashekhar respectively.

13. The State Government, by their order dated 14.8.2014, withdrew dated 9.3.2011, 25.4.2011,

4.10.2011, 19.10.2011 and 9.2.2012; and ordered for closure of recruitment process.

14. In the meanwhile, the State Government, appointed an Expert Committee headed by Shri P.C.Hota, IAS(Retd.), Former Chairman of Union Public Service Commission, to review the systems and procedures in the KPSC. The said Committee submitted its report on 20.8.2015, with its recommendations.

15. In 2014, successful candidates filed Applications No.6268-6395/2014 and connected cases before the Administrative Tribunal, *inter alia* with a prayer to quash the Government Order dated 14.8.2014 and to direct the State Government to issue appointment orders. State Government resisted those applications contending *inter alia* that in view of large scale irregularities such as manipulation in the process of recruitment, rampant corruption and nepotism by the Members of the KPSC and involvement of candidates as elucidated in the CID report dated 10.9.2013, the State Government had withdrawn the requisitions.

16. The Administrative Tribunal, after hearing, has passed impugned common order and quashed Government Order dated 14.8.2014 and directed the State Government to issue appointment orders to the applicants.

17. We have heard Shri Udaya Holla, Shri M.B.Nargund, learned Senior Counsel and Shri Rahamathulla Kothwal, learned Counsel for the petitioners and Shri Aditya Sondhi, learned Additional Advocate General for the State Government, Shri P.S.Rajagopal, learned Senior Counsel for KPSC, Shri K.G.Raghavan, Shri Sajan Poovayya, Shri B.M.Shyam Prasad, learned Senior Advocates, Shri B.L.Acharaya, Shri B.M.Arun, Shri I.S.Pramod Chandra, Shri N.G.Phadke and Shri Vikram Phadke, learned Counsel for respective parties.

18. The arguments advanced on behalf of the petitioners may be summarised as follows:

- (i) that, there was large scale irregularity, corruption and manipulation in the entire selection process;

- (ii) that, the State Government, on the advice of the learned Advocate General, directed an inquiry and investigation by the CID;
- (iii) that, CID's preliminary report, has revealed large scale corruption and involvement of Members of the Selection Committee;
- (iv) that, Dr. Mythri, did not succumb to the illegal offers, but, brought to the notice of the learned Advocate General, the state of affairs and sought redressal;
- (v) that, Dr. Mythri, also filed an application before the Administrative Tribunal in Application No.2661/2014 and the same is still pending adjudication. However, without adjudicating her application, the Administrative Tribunal has allowed the applications filed by a batch of successful candidates. Therefore, she had no other alternative but to challenge the order passed by the Administrative Tribunal before this Court;
- (vi) that, in view of Government Order dated 14.8.2014, the KPSC ought to have re-evaluated the answer scripts and held fresh viva voce. However, it did not comply with the said order, but went ahead with the selection process and notified

the list of selected candidates. Now, by the order impugned, directions have been given by the Administrative Tribunal to the State Government to issue appointment orders within a period of two months;

- (vii) that, the interim report dated 10.9.2013, submitted by the CID, clearly suggests that there was large scale corruption and manipulation, which rightly persuaded the State Government to annul the evaluation process;
- (viii) that, the Gazetted Probationer Officers hold executive power of the State and therefore, a candidate to be appointed for such post must not only be meritorious, but also a person of impeccable integrity. The CID report reveals that, the select list contains candidates who have indulged in serious mal-practices. Therefore, if the impugned order passed by the Administrative Tribunal is given effect to, the same shall result in appointing candidates selected for extraneous considerations;
- (ix) that, the State Government, accepted the CID report and resisted the applications filed by the

selected candidates before the Administrative Tribunal, and

- (x) that, the CID, after completion of investigation has filed the charge sheet (report under Section 173 of Cr.P.C.) before the jurisdictional Criminal Court.

19. With the above principal submissions, learned Counsel arguing in support of these writ petitions, contended that there is a strong element of public interest involved in these writ petitions and they are eminently maintainable. They prayed for quashing the impugned order passed by the Administrative Tribunal.

20. The arguments advanced by learned Senior Advocates S/Shri K.G.Raghavan, Sajan Poovayya, and B.M.Shyam Prasad, and Shri B.L.Acharya, learned Advocate, are summarised as follows:

- i) PIL is not maintainable in service matter;
- ii) High Court can examine only the order passed by the Administrative Tribunal and cannot expand the scope of writ petition;

- iii) Tainted candidates are not included in the charge sheet;
- iv) CID report could not have been submitted to the Government but ought to have been filed in the Court only;
- v) that, in the petitions filed by Smt.Renukambike and others, eight out of ten candidates did not qualify in the written test;
- vi) that, the writ petition filed by Dr. Mythri, is clearly in the nature of a private interest, inasmuch as, she has challenged appointment of third respondent (Supriya Banagar), and prayed for a direction to the State Government to consider her case for appointment to the post of Assistant Commissioner (Revenue);
- vii) that, Dr. Mythri, after participating in the selection process, submitted a complaint to the learned Advocate General on 25.4.2013 with bald allegations. Within next three days, she improved her case alleging that she was called to the chambers of a Member of the KPSC and offered the post,

on payment of illegal gratification. To substantiate her claim, she has quoted some telephone numbers. It is quite reasonable for anxious candidates to contact the concerned officials in the KPSC to know progress in the selection process. It is also arguable that, the officials may have returned a missed call from Dr. Mythri. Therefore, the entire case of Dr. Mythri is based on surmises and conjunctures;

- viii) that, Dr. Mythri, has admittedly, approached the Administrative Tribunal in Application No.2661/2014. Therefore, she had an option to either press for disposal of her application or seek review of the impugned order;
- ix) that, the State Administrative Tribunal is established as a substitute and appropriate forum for redressal of all service related matters. Therefore, a petition concerning a 'service matter' is not maintainable before the High Court. High Court is not a Court of Appeal to examine an order passed by the Administrative Tribunal;

- x) that, the Administrative Tribunal being the Judicial Tribunal of first instance, has gone into every aspect of the matter in detail and delivered a considered judgment. The State has accepted the said judgement. The High Court, exercising its jurisdiction under Article 226 or 227 of the Constitution of India, can only examine the decision making process by the Administrative Tribunal. The petitioners have not demonstrated any perversity either in appreciation of facts or any infraction of law calling for interference by this Court;
- xi) that, there is an urgent requirement of the Administrative Officers in the State;
- xii) that, there is no indictment against any selected candidate by the CID. Therefore, they cannot be denied of their appointments.

With the above submissions, the learned Counsel for the respondents prayed for dismissal of these writ petitions.

21. Shri Aditya Sondhi, learned Additional Advocate General for the State, submitted that, the opinion tendered

by the Advocate General was discussed in the Cabinet. With regard to the selection process, he submitted that, about 46 candidates were contacted by or on behalf of members/officials of the KPSC. To a pointed query, with regard to laying of report before the Legislature in compliance with Article 323(2) of the Constitution of India, he submitted that, the report was tabled during February, 2017. He also submitted that, the State Government is seeking sanction from the President of India to prosecute KPSC members.

22. We have carefully considered the submissions of the learned Counsel for the parties and perused the records as also the authorities cited by the learned Counsel in support of their respective contentions.

23. The principal defence urged before us, by the respondents, is that, public interest litigation is not maintainable in service matters.

24. In the conspectus of the facts recorded hereinabove, following questions arise for consideration of this Court:-

- (i) Whether these writ petitions are classifiable purely as 'service matters'?
- (ii) Whether an element of 'public interest' is involved in these matters?
- (iii) Whether any interference is called for?

25. Re-point No.(i):

Whether these writ petitions are classifiable purely as 'service matters'?

a) The gravamen of petitioners' case is, that there was large scale corruption and nepotism in the selection process in the KPSC and candidates have been selected for extraneous considerations. In the process, several meritorious and eligible candidates have lost their opportunities.

b) Applicants' prayer before the Administrative Tribunal, was, *inter alia*, to quash the Government Order dated 14.08.2014, withdrawing requisition and to direct the State Government to issue appointment orders. Therefore, the

subtle issue for consideration before the Administrative Tribunal was to examine, whether there was any flaw in the decision making process by the State Government, in passing order dated 14.08.2014. Indisputably, the said order was passed based on the CID report, which has indicted eight persons including the Chairman and a member of the public service commission. Thus, the issue involved in the applications before the Administrative Tribunal or before this Court in these writ petitions do not involve appointment of officers under normal circumstances. The grievance of the petitioners is that, entire selection process smacks of *malafides*. Although selection process culminates in appointment of officers, which according to the selected candidates is purely a service matter, the subtle and the real issue for consideration is the decision making process by the State Government while passing order dated 14.8.2014 withdrawing the requisitions given to the KPSC to conduct selection process.

c) We, therefore hold that, the issue in substance, either before the Administrative Tribunal or in these writ petitions are not '*stricto sensu*' classifiable, purely as service matter.

26. Re-point No.(ii):

Whether an element of public interest is involved in these matters?

a) Executive is one of the three limbs of the Constitution. Under the federal structure, the State, in their eminent domain are enjoined with solemn duty to administer the State policies. The Part-VI of the Constitution deals with the State. Under Article 153 of the Constitution, each State shall have a Governor, who shall head the State and exercise the executive power upon the advice of the Council of Ministers as provided under Article 163 of the Constitution. The business of the Government is conducted under Article 166 of the Constitution. The recruitment and conditions of service of persons serving under the Union or the State are governed by Article 309 of the Constitution. It is no more *res integra* that, Civil Servants are limbs of the executive. [See *Samsher Singh Vs. State of Punjab and*

Another (1974) 2 SCC 831]. Unarguably, the case on hand pertains to appointment of Civil Servants. Appointment of ineligible, inefficient persons with questionable integrity shall have a serious and cascading adverse impact on the business of the Government, which shall inevitably result in mal-functioning. This is anathema of rule of law.

b) Duties and responsibilities of bureaucracy and need to appoint sensitive, devoted and professionally competent officers, fell for consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of *Mehmood Alam Tariq and others Vs. State of Rajasthan and others* reported in (1988)3 SCC 241. The Supreme Court, speaking through Hon'ble Mr.Justice M.N.Venkatachaliah (as he then was), has held as follows:

"14. We may now examine the merits of the rival contentions. The modern state has moved far away from its concept as the 'Leviathan' with its traditional role symbolised by the two swords it wielded – one of war and the other of justice. The modern, pluralist, social welfare state with its ever-expanding social and economic roles as wide-ranging as that of an Economic Regulator, Industrial Producer and Manager, Arbitrator, Educationist, Provider of Health and Social Welfare services etc., has become a colossal service corporation. The bureaucracy, through which the executive organ of the state gives itself expression, cannot escape both the excitement and the

responsibility of this immense social commitment of the Welfare State. Today the bureaucracy in this country carries with it, in a measure never before dreamt of, the privilege and the burden of participation in a great social and economic transformation, in tune with the ethos and promise of the Constitution for the emergence of a new egalitarian and eclectic social and economic order – a national commitment which a sensitive, devoted and professionally competent administrative set up alone can undertake. A cadre comprised of men inducted through patronage, nepotism and corruption cannot, morally, be higher than the methods that produced it and be free from the sins of its own origin. Wrong methods have never produced right results.

15. What, therefore, should impart an added dimension and urgency to the recruitment to the services is the awareness of the extra-ordinary vitality and durability of wrong selections. With the constitutional guarantee of security, the machinery for removal of a government servant on grounds of inefficiency and lack of devotion remains mostly unused. The authors of a work on "Britain's Ruling Class" say:

One of the main attractions of working for the Civil Service is job security. Once they let you in, you have to do something spectacularly improper to get kicked out. In 1978 out of 5,67,000 non-industrial civil servants, just 55 were sacked for disciplinary reasons; 57 were retired early 'on grounds of inefficiency or limited efficiency'; 123 were retired early on grounds of 'redundancy'. In practice, a modest dose of common sense and propriety allows you to stay a civil servant until you retire. In the middle and senior administration grades many do just that. 82 per cent of Permanent Secretaries have been in the Civil Service for 25 years or more; so have 79 per cent of Deputy Secretaries, 62 per cent of Under Secretaries and 70 per cent of Senior Executive Officers.

.... Recruiting civil servants means picking as many potential high flyers as possible – and at the same time as few potential albatrosses. It is a task carried out by the Civil Service Commission – with scrupulous honesty, but questionable efficiency.

16. The history of the evolution of the civil services in some countries is in itself study in contrast as fascinating as it is disquieting. In France, until the Revolution almost every office, central or local, excepting the dozen or so of the highest offices were attainable only by private purchase, gift or inheritance. All public officers were treated as a species of private property and voluminous jurisprudence governed their transmission. Of this spectacle, a learned authority on Public Administration says:

Prices rose, but there was a frantic buying. Ministers made the most of their financial discovery. As it soon became too difficult to invest new offices, the old ones were doubled or trebled – that is, divided up among several holders, who exercise their functions in rotation, or who did what the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were too fond of doing, employed a humble subordinate to carry them out.....

Offices were sought, then, with a frenzied energy, and they were created with cynicism. Desmarets, one of Louis XIV's Comptroller-Generals, had proposed to the King the establishment of some quite futile offices, and the latter asked who would ever consent to buy such situation? 'Your Majesty' replied Desmarets, 'is forgetting one of the most splendid of the prerogatives of the Kings of France – that when the King creates a job, God immediately creates an idiot to buy it.'

(Emphasis supplied)

c) Indubitable facts are, State Government requisitioned the KPSC to select 362 Civil Servants. Total number of candidates who applied for various posts are 1,38,307. Out of them, 91,667 candidates appeared for written test(preliminary) and 7,188 were found eligible for the written test(main). Out of them, 6,211 candidates appeared

for written test(main), of which 1,086 passed and became eligible for personality test. From out of those who wrote written test(main), 929 candidates applied for re-totalling and 4 out of those were found eligible for personality test. Thus, in the result, 1090 candidates became eligible for viva-voce.

d) Based on the advice of the learned Advocate General, the State Government ordered an inquiry by the CID. The CID, in its preliminary report, has concluded that the process of evaluation of answer scripts of 'main examination' and the 'personality tests' have been vitiated. Having perused and being satisfied with the CID report, the State Government vide order dated 15.10.2013 annulled the results of the 'mains examination' and 'viva voce'; and further directed re-evaluation of the answer scripts and fresh viva voce. The said order was not followed by the KPSC compelling the State Government to pass the impugned order dated 14.8.2014, withdrawing the requisitions.

e) Public Service Commissions are established under Article 315 of the Constitution of India and their functions are regulated under Article 320 of the Constitution of India. Article 323(2) requires a State Public Service Commission to present its annual report to the Governor of the State. The Governor on receipt of such report, shall cause a copy thereof together with a memorandum explaining the causes, if any, where, the advice of the Commission is not accepted, the same shall be laid before the State Legislature. We are informed by Shri Aditya Sondhi, learned Additional Advocate General that the reasons for not accepting the select list was laid before the State Assembly during February 2017.

f) Thus, the central issue for consideration is legality and correctness of State Government's decision to accept CID report and reject the recommendation of Public Service Commission.

g) It is fairly well-settled that, it is the prerogative of the employer 'to appoint' or 'not to appoint' a candidate or

candidates against the notified posts. Unless, the order of appointment is communicated to the selected candidate, no right shall accrue to him. The State accepted the CID report and exercising their executive authority, rejected KPSC's recommendations. The reasons for not accepting the recommendations have been laid before the State Assembly. The matter should have ended there.

h) The Administrative Tribunal, in the impugned order at paragraph No.78, has accepted the legal principle that an applicant has no right of appointment.

i) The Administrative Tribunal chose to take it upon itself the task to examine as to whether there were any procedural irregularities in the CID report. In paragraph No.61 of the impugned order, it has recorded its findings and held, firstly, that the CID has to submit its report to the jurisdictional Magistrate; secondly, that the inquiry is not in accordance with the dictionary meaning of 'enquiry' as defined in the Law Lexicon; thirdly, that no inquiry was held against the candidates; and fourthly, that the CID report is

one sided and there are many lacunae in the report; and that the report is not in accordance with the Rules. We record that the Administrative Tribunal has not adverted to infraction of any specific 'rule'. Nor any contention was urged in that behalf before us in these proceedings. The Administrative Tribunal has further held in paragraph No.66 of the impugned order that the CID report has no 'probative value' unless the same is proved in a 'trial' and that its findings could not have been taken as '*gospel truth*'. With these observations, the Administrative Tribunal has directed the State Government to issue appointment orders to the applicants therein. This decision of the Administrative Tribunal, when translated into action, would result in appointment of Civil Servants whose selection by the KPSC has been seriously doubted by the State Government. Then the next question that would follow is, whether appointments of such candidates by virtue of judicial order by the Administrative Tribunal consists an element of public interest? The answer must be 'yes' because the State would be left with no option but to appoint the applicants in

compliance with the Administrative Tribunal's directions which is admittedly based on its opinion with regard to veracity of alleged mal-practices adopted in the selection process. Ultimately, it would result in appointment of Civil Servants whose selection process, according to the Executive had stood vitiated. Since this matter touches upon the appointment of bureaucrats in the State, it carries within itself an element of public interest. We, therefore, answer point No.(ii) in the affirmative.

(j) In W.Ps.No.13617-13627/2017 &W.P.No.14529/2017, the petitioners have filed I.A.No.3/2017, seeking leave of this Court to permit them to file and prosecute the said writ petitions in Public Interest.

(k) In W.P.No.11342/2017, petitioner has filed I.A.No.1/2017, seeking permission to file the said writ petition as the 3rd respondent filed an application in O.A.No.7941/2014, which is also disposed of by the impugned common order and the said order adversely affects her.

(l) In view of our finding that, an element of public interest is involved in these cases, I.A.No.3/2017 in W.Ps.No.13617-13627/2017 & W.P.No.14529/2017 and I.A.No.1/2017 in W.P.No.11342/2017, are allowed and the applicants/petitioners therein are permitted to prosecute these writ petitions.

27. Re. Point No.(iii):

Whether any interference is called for?

a) Having recorded our opinion that these petitions cannot be classified as service matters '*stricto sensu*' and that there exists an element of public interest, we proceed to analyse the need, if any, for interference.

b) The impugned judgment is based on Administrative Tribunal's assessment of CID report. Therefore, we deem it expedient to examine the same. A careful perusal of the CID report shows that investigation was conducted by a team of officers consisting of seven Deputy Superintendents of Police, twelve Inspectors and other staff under the direct supervision of the DIGP, CID. It is catalogued in three parts.

Part-B deals with the allegations contained in the FIR, allegations levelled by the candidates who were examined during investigation, mal-practices observed in evaluation of examination(mains), mal-practices during the personality test and the conduct of the accused.

c) We were taken through following allegation contained in the FIR:

Allegation No.(i):

Dr.Mythri who belonged to ST(W) category, had scored 1009 marks and was awarded 75 marks in the personality test, whereas, the next immediate candidate namely, Supriya Banagar in the same category who had scored 937 marks, was awarded 150 marks in the personality test;

Allegation No.(ii)

Dr.Mythri was called upon to pay illegal gratification by Dr.Mangala Sridhar through her personal assistant Ashok Kumar to ensure her selection to the post of Assistant Commissioner.

With regard to above allegations, we have noticed that the investigation report contains details of phone call records of Ashok Kumar (P.A. to Mangala Sridhar-Member, KPSC). It records exchange of twenty calls between Mythri and Ashok Kumar. It also records several calls with different candidates and the highest number of calls are made to one, Sumeeth A.R.(133 calls).

The call details of Mangala Sridhar's phone also records a call with Dr.Mythri.

Allegation No.(iii):

Sudhir, an Assistant Executive Engineer with B.W.S.S.B., Somanath, an Executive Engineer with B.D.A., and Rajashekar, an

employee of Karnataka Government Secretariat, acted as middlemen and bargained the illegal gratification.

With regard to above allegation, we have observed that, phone call details of Sudhir shows exchange of calls between him and members of KPSC namely, Krishna Prasad, Kaniram, and Dayashankar. Call details of Somanath shows exchange of calls with candidates and particularly, with candidate bearing registration No.11571(Bhimappa Parappa Ajoor) with as many as 86 calls.

We may record that exchange of phone calls between employees working in the Water Supply Department and Bangalore Development Authority with members of Public Service Commission who hold Constitutional posts, is rather disturbing. Equally, exchange of 86 calls with one of the candidate is appalling. But it is amazing to note that the Administrative Tribunal, despite having such stark and disturbing facts before it, turned the other way.

Allegation No.(iv):

Eight candidates were allegedly benefited in the re-totalling.

With regard to above allegation, we have observed that, the portion of FSL report extracted in the investigation report clearly shows that the marks have been overwritten.

Allegation No.(v):

Members allotted same quantum of marks to selected candidates in the personality test.

With regard to above allegation, we record that during the hearing, we were taken through table No.44 in the investigation report which contains a total number of 566 candidates. It shows that all members who interviewed candidates have awarded exactly same amount of marks to a particular candidate. For example, candidates with registration Nos.16806, 11300, 12287 have been awarded 150 marks each by all the members namely, Gonal Bhimappa, Krishna Prasad, Rangamurty, Parshwanath and

Dayashankar. Similarly, candidate with registration No.12809 has been awarded 65 marks and candidate bearing registration No.11509 has been awarded 50 marks each by all the members. Likewise, marks awarded by all members to any particular candidate are exactly the same.

It was submitted that as per the procedure followed in the KPSC, the members of the committee were required to award marks and affix their signature on each page after the interview. Those statements were required to be sealed and handed over to the Secretary, KPSC, for tabulation. It was urged on behalf of the petitioners that members of the committee awarded equal marks to candidates who appeared for viva-voce because, members did not make their respective objective assessment in respect of each candidate interviewed by them but collectively agreed and decided to award a particular number of marks to particular candidate. We are, persuaded to accept petitioners' argument, that unless members did agree to do so, for extraneous reasons, it is impossible that the marks awarded by five members would, exactly be the same without any variation. We say so

because, the CID investigation report, we have perused, reveals that all the 566 candidates listed therein have been awarded marks by all the members in this manner. Further, the theory of pre-determination and unison among the members is *prima facie* fortified by the statement of Gopal Krishna, Private Secretary to the Chairman, KPSC, recorded before the Magistrate, wherein he has stated that after the interviews on each day, the Chairman and Members were discussing the performance of candidates. His statement, thus provides a plausible answer as to how equal marks were awarded by all the members.

Allegation No.(vi):

The digital video recorder in the KPSC building has been replaced to destroy the evidence.

With regard to above allegation, CID investigation report records that the digital video recorder(DVR) has been replaced and the existing DVR contains records from 26.06.2013, i.e. after registration of FIR. This revelation in

the CID report is shocking. If only, the video recording of earlier period was available to the investigating officers, we are afraid, many more startling facts may have come to light.

28. Thus, in substance, in our view, the investigation report, *prima facie* reveals that:

- a) the candidates and the members of the Public Service Commission or their agents were in constant touch;
- b) interview marks were not awarded on the basis of merit and performance;
- c) security system was compromised and records of security systems such as CC TV cameras were destroyed/manipulated.

29. History of Public Service Commission dates back to the recommendation made by Lee Commission in the year 1924, which recommended thus:

"S.264.- The case for a "Public Service Commission" was thus set out by the Lee Commission of 1924:-
"Wherever democratic institutions exist, experience has

shown that to secure an efficient Civil Service it is essential to protect it so far as possible from political or personal influence and to give it that position of stability and security which is vital to its successful working as the impartial and efficient instrument by which Governments, of whatever political complexion, may give effect to their policies. In countries where this principle has been neglected, and where the 'spoils system' has taken its place, an inefficient and disorganized Civil Service has been the inevitable result and corruption has been rampant. In America a Civil Service Commission has been constituted to control recruitment of the Services, but, for the purposes of India, it is from the Dominions of the British Empire that more relevant and useful lessons can perhaps be drawn. Canada, Australia, and South Africa now possess Public or Civil Services Acts, regulating the position and control of the Public Services Commission, to which the duty of administering the Acts is entrusted. It was this need which the framers of the Government of India Act had in mind when they made provision in S.96-C for the establishment of a Public Service Commission to discharge 'in regard to recruitment and control of the Public Services in India such functions as may be assigned thereto by rules made by the Secretary of State in Council', (Lee Commission Report para. 24)".

(Emphasis supplied)

Ref: Commentary on the Government of India Act, 1935, by Sri N.Rajagopala Aiyangar, printed and published in 1937.

30. Civil Service in India originated from the time of establishment of East India Company and British Government in India. Initially, it was known as Covenanted Civil Services under the East India Company. In 1853, the Covenanted Civil Services were thrown open to general

competition to be called as 'Indian Civil Service'. In his report, in 1854, Lord Mecauly, recommended that patronage based system of East India Company should be replaced by a permanent Civil Service based on merit. In his report, he recommended, "Henceforth, an appointment of Civil Service of the Company will not be a matter of favour, but a matter of right. He, who obtains such an appointment will owe it solely to his own abilities and industry". The report made it clear that only the best and brightest would do for the Indian Civil Service. (Source: *Kulwant Kumar Kalsan Vs. State of Haryana 2015 SCC online P & H 7065*)

31. It is, therefore, unarguable that selection for any public posts and particularly to the post of a Civil Servant through Public Service Commission can only be on merit through an unimpeachable selection process.

32. It is no more *res integra* that the selection made by Public Service Commission is only recommendatory in nature. Government may reject recommendations made by

Public Service Commission subject to compliance of Article 323(2) of Constitution of India.

33. Following authorities cited by Shri Udaya Holla are apt, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

a) In the case of *Dr H.Mukherjee Vs. Union of India and Others (1994 Supp (1) SCC 250)*:

"8. It is obvious from what we have stated above that this Court clearly observed in *Jatinder Kumar case*¹ that the selection made by the Commission was only recommendatory in nature and it was open to the Government to either accept the recommendation or to depart therefrom. Observations on which the Tribunal relies merely convey that if the Government does not depart from the recommendation of the Commission the Government must make the appointments strictly adhering to the order of merit as recommended by the Commission. It cannot disturb the order of merit according to its own sweet will except for good reasons, namely, bad conduct or character but that does not mean that the Government cannot depart from the recommendation of the Commission. If it departs from the recommendation it must ultimately comply with the requirement of Article 323 of the Constitution. There is nothing in that article or in the rules to suggest that the Government cannot take into consideration the developments subsequent to the selection made by the UPSC. Such a view would not be in public interest and may lead to serious complications if the Government is enjoined to make the appointment notwithstanding certain serious matters having come to its notice subsequent to the recommendation made by the Commission. Counsel for Respondent 1, however, submitted that a line of demarcation must be drawn somewhere because the Government cannot be allowed to delay its decision till adverse circumstances appear against the candidate recommended for appointment. He submitted that this demarcation must coincide with

the date on which the recommendation is made by the Commission and at any rate must be confined to a reasonable period subsequent thereto."xxx

(Emphasis supplied)

b) In the case of *Hanuman Prasad and Others Vs. Union of India and Another (1996) 10 SCC 742*:

"3. It is seen that after the allegations were made that malpractices were committed, the matter was referred to CBI for enquiry. The CBI has submitted its preliminary report which indicated that the malpractices have been committed in writing the examination. They need not await the final report which would be to take further action against erring officers. Therefore, it is a case where the authorities have taken the decision on the basis of the report submitted by the investigating agency, containing proof in support of the allegations of malpractice committed in writing the examination. It cannot, therefore, be said that the order of cancellation does not contain any reasons."

(Emphasis supplied)

c) In the case of *Jatinder Kumar and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Others (1985) 1 SCC 122*:

"12. The establishment of an independent body like Public Service Commission is to ensure selection of best available persons for appointment in a post to avoid arbitrariness and nepotism in the matter of appointment. It is constituted by persons of high ability, varied experience and of undisputed integrity and further assisted by experts on the subject. It is true that they are appointed by Government but once they are appointed their independence is secured by various provisions of the Constitution. Whenever the Government is required to make an appointment to a higher public office it is required to consult the Public Service Commission. The selection has to be made by the Commission and the Government has to fill up the posts by appointing those selected and recommended

by the Commission adhering to the order of merit in the list of candidates sent by the Public Service Commission. The selection by the Commission, however, is only a recommendation of the Commission and the final authority for appointment is the Government. The Government may accept the recommendation or may decline to accept the same. But if it chooses not to accept the recommendation of the Commission the Constitution enjoins the Government to place on the table of the Legislative Assembly its reasons and report for doing so. Thus, the Government is made answerable to the House for any departure vide Article 323 of the Constitution. This, however, does not clothe the appellants with any such right. They cannot claim as of right that the Government must accept the recommendation of the Commission. If, however, the vacancy is to be filled up, the Government has to make appointment strictly adhering to the order of merit as recommended by the Public Service Commission. It cannot disturb the order of merit according to its own sweet will except for other good reasons viz. bad conduct or character. The Government also cannot appoint a person whose name does not appear in the list. But it is open to the Government to decide how many appointments will be made. The process for selection and selection for the purpose of recruitment against anticipated vacancies does not create a right to be appointed to the post which can be enforced by a mandamus. We are supported in our view by the two earlier decisions of this Court in *A.N. D'Silva v. Union of India* and *State of Haryana v. Subash Chander Marwaha* [(1974) 3 SCC 220 : 1973 SCC (L&S) 488 : (1974) 1 SCR 165 : 1973 Lab IC 1212 : (1973) 2 LLJ 266] . The contention of Mr Anthony to the contrary cannot be accepted."

(Emphasis supplied)

d) In the case of *Adarsh Shiksha Mahavidyalaya and others v. Subhash Rahangdale and others* [(2012) 2 SCC 425]:

"60. While rejecting the objection raised on behalf of the appellant that the writ petition filed by the respondent cannot be treated as a petition filed in public interest, this Court in *Shivajirao*

Nilangekar [(1987) 1 SCC 227] observed: (SCC p. 246, para 36)

"36. The allegations made in the petition disclose a lamentable state of affairs in one of the premier universities of India. The petitioner might have moved in his private interest but enquiry into the conduct of the examiners of the Bombay University in one of the highest medical degrees was a matter of public interest. Such state of affairs having been brought to the notice of the court, it was the duty of the court to the public that the truth and the validity of the allegations made be inquired into. It was in furtherance of public interest that an enquiry into the state of affairs of public institution becomes necessary and private litigation assumes the character of public interest litigation and such an enquiry cannot be avoided if it is necessary and essential for the administration of justice."

(Emphasis supplied)

e) In the case of *State of Gujarat and another v. Justice R.A. Mehta(Retired) and others* [(2013) 3 SCC 1]:

"92.Corruption in a civilised society is a disease like cancer which if not detected in time is sure to spread its malignance among the polity of the country leading to disastrous consequences. Therefore, it is often described as royal thievery. Corruption is opposed to democracy and social order, as being not only anti-people, but also due to the fact that it affects the economy of a country and destroys its cultural heritage. It poses a threat to the concept of constitutional governance and shakes the very foundation of democracy and the rule of law. It threatens the security of the societies undermining the ethical values and justice jeopardising sustainable development. Corruption devalues human rights, chokes development and corrodes the moral fabric of society. It causes considerable damage to the national economy, national interest and the image of the country. (Vide *Vineet Narain v. Union of India* [(1998) 1 SCC 226 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 307 : AIR 1998 SC 889] ; *State of M.P. v. Ram*

Singh [(2000) 5 SCC 88 : 2000 SCC (Cri) 886 : AIR 2000 SC 870] , SCC pp. 93-94, para 8; *State of Maharashtra v. Balakrishna Dattatrya Kumbhar* [(2012) 12 SCC 384 : JT (2012) 10 SC 446] and *Subramanian Swamy v. Manmohan Singh* [(2012) 3 SCC 64 : (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 1041 : (2012) 2 SCC (L&S) 666 : AIR 2012 SC 1185] .)”

(Emphasis supplied)

f) In the case of *Subramanian Swamy v. Manmohan Singh and another* [(2012)3 SCC 64]:

“**68.** Today, corruption in our country not only poses a grave danger to the concept of constitutional governance, it also threatens the very foundation of the Indian democracy and the Rule of Law. The magnitude of corruption in our public life is incompatible with the concept of a socialist secular democratic republic. It cannot be disputed that where corruption begins all rights end. Corruption devalues human rights, chokes development and undermines justice, liberty, equality, fraternity which are the core values in our Preambular vision. Therefore, the duty of the court is that any anti-corruption law has to be interpreted and worked out in such a fashion as to strengthen the fight against corruption. That is to say in a situation where two constructions are eminently reasonable, the court has to accept the one that seeks to eradicate corruption to the one which seeks to perpetuate it.”

(Emphasis supplied)

34. The principle contention urged by Sri P.S.Rajagopal, learned Senior Counsel for the KPSC and other respondents is that a public interest petition is not maintainable in a service matter. He heavily relied upon the authority in the

case of *Dr.Duryodhan Sahu and others v. Jitendra Kumar Mishra and others* [(1998) 7 SCC 273], wherein it is held as follows:

"18. The constitution of Administrative Tribunals was necessitated because of the large pendency of cases relating to service matters in various courts in the country. It was expected that the setting up of Administrative Tribunals to deal exclusively in service matters would go a long way in not only reducing the burden of the courts but also provide to the persons covered by the Tribunals speedy relief in respect of their grievances. The basic idea as evident from the various provisions of the Act is that the Tribunal should quickly redress the grievances in relation to service matters. The definition of "service matters" found in Section 3(q) shows that in relation to a person, the expression means all service matters relating to the conditions of his service. The significance of the word "his" cannot be ignored. Section 3(b) defines the word "application" as an application made under Section 19. The latter section refers to "person aggrieved". In order to bring a matter before the Tribunal, an application has to be made and the same can be made only by a person aggrieved by any order pertaining to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. We have already seen that the word "order" has been defined in the explanation to sub-section (1) of Section 19 so that all matters referred to in Section 3(q) as service matters could be brought before the Tribunal. If in that context Sections 14 and 15 are read, there is no doubt that a total stranger to the service concerned cannot make an application before the Tribunal. If public interest litigations at the instance of strangers are allowed to be entertained by the Tribunal, the very object of speedy disposal of service matters would get defeated.

(Emphasis supplied)

35. Learned Senior Counsel for KPSC placed reliance on the following authorities:

- a) *Kushum Lata Vs. Union of India and Others* [(2006) 6 SCC 180];
- b) *Charan Lal Sahu Vs. Giani Zail Singh and another* [(1984) 1 SCC 390]; and
- c) *Durga Charan Rautray Vs. State of Orissa and another* [(2012)12 SCC 513].

36. The first authority, *Kushum Lata* (supra), deals with *locus standi* of a public interest litigant. The second authority, *Charan Lal Sahu* (supra), deals with intentional mud-slinging in public interest litigation. The third authority, *Durga Charan Rautray* (supra), is on the point that once objection with regard to maintainability is upheld, it is not open to a Court to decide the matter on merits. In our view, none of these three cases apply to the facts of these cases. Learned Advocates for the private respondents also cited several judgments, which in our view, are not necessary for adjudication of these petitions.

37. The CID's investigation report, *prima facie* discloses that there are sufficient reasons to believe that the selection process was not inviolable. In the circumstances, the State

Government withdrew the requisition for selection of Civil Servants. Unless the decision making process by the State Government is satisfactorily proved to be arbitrary, capricious, or mala fide, it would be inappropriate for the Courts to impinge upon such decision.

38. It was also urged that the High Court can examine, only the legality and correctness of the judgment rendered by the Administrative Tribunal and cannot expand the scope. As noticed above, the Administrative Tribunal chose to take it upon itself to examine the facts of the case and substitute its opinion with the decision taken by the State Government in withdrawing the requisitions. The State Government, while defending their action before the Administrative Tribunal have averred thus:

"4) At the outset, the applications are not maintainable and the applicants have no locus stand, to question the policy decision of the State Government in withdrawing the letters releasing vacancies to KPSC for the recruitment of Gazetted Probationers for the year 2011 in view of the large scale irregularities like manipulation of the process of recruitment, rampant corruption, nepotism in the process of recruitment by the Members of the 2nd Respondent-KPSC and the involvement of candidates as is evident from the CID report dated 10/09/2013. In such circumstances, prima-facie the members and some officials, in KPSC are themselves involved in the alleged malpractices in

the Gazetted probationers recruitment process for the year 2011. Therefore, in the larger public interest, the State Government had taken decision to do revaluation of all answer scripts of the Main Examinations and to redo personality test/interview by issuing an order on 15/10/2013. The same was subject matter in A.No.7690-7699 of 2013 before the Karnataka administrative Tribunal while considering the interim prayer, **this Hon'ble Tribunal had observed, "In the present case the situation is unprecedented and perhaps such situation has not arisen earlier in any other State.** The Government has relied upon not merely on the media publication which was telecast for more than a week, it has referred in the impugned order the acts of certain persons viz. Sri M.Sridhar, Assistant Executive Engineer, BWSSB, Sri Somanath Executive Engineer BDA and Sri Rajashekar, a staff of Karnataka Legislative Secretariat, who according to investigation scouted for successful candidate in the Main Examination for the purpose of inducing them to pay money for selection. The media publication published also discloses certain attempt by a member of the KPSC to contact the candidates and these are mentioned in the impugned government order. The Government in pursuance of this disclosure sought for the advice of the Advocate General and in pursuance of the same directed an investigation by the CID. It is only in pursuance of the investigation and on conclusion and recommendation of the investigating agency that these steps have been taken when the investigation has disclosed that the selection process subsequent to the Main Examination has been initiated by corruption, nepotism etc, it cannot be said that the government as appointing Authority should have waited till the selection list it submitted"

5) when the process of viva voce for the Gazetted Probationer's Recruitment for 2011 batch were going on there were serious allegations against the then Chairman/Members, and other officials which were made known to the general public through some of the candidates and also through media in awarding marks in the viva voce. The State Government who is the appointing authority for Group-A & B posts could not be silent spectator. If the impugned decision was not taken, it would have been detrimental to public interest. The Public Service Commission is an

institution of utmost importance created by the constitution of India under Article 315. For the efficient functioning of a democracy, it is imperative that the public service commissions are manned by people of the highest skill and irreproachable integrity, so that the selections to various public posts can be immunized from all sorts of extraneous factors like political pressure or personal favoritism, corruption and are made solely on consideration of merit. However due to unfortunate events which unfolded in the recruitment process for the Gazetted Probationers, 2011 batch, there was a break down of the State Public Service Commission in the aforesaid recruitment, At this juncture, it is relevant to cite a decision of the Apex Court in the case where the Chairman and Members of the Public Service of Haryana were suspended. Extract of the judgment reported in (2009) 9 scc 378 (Ram kumar Kashyap v. Union of India) is reproduced herein.

15. In Ram Ashary Yadav (Dr.), Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, this Court discussed the role of the Members of the Public Service Commission's and made the following observations with regard to their duties and qualification: (scc p. 312, para 4)

"4 keeping in line with the high expectations of their office and need to observe absolute integrity and impartiality in the exercise of their powers and duties, the Chairman and members of the Public Service Commission are required to be selected on basis of their merit, ability and suitability and they in turn are expected to be models themselves in their functioning. The Character and conduct of the Chairman and Members of the Commission, like Caesar's wife, must therefore be above board. They occupy a unique place and position and utmost objectivity in the performance of their duties and integrity and detachment are essential requirements expected from the Chairman and Members of the Public Service Commissions."

At para 34 of the same opinion, the court further stated; (scc p. 321)

“34. The credibility of the institution of a public Service Commission is founded upon the faith of the common man in its proper functioning. The faith would be eroded and confidence destroyed if it appears that the Chairman or the Members of the Commission act subjectively and not objectively or that their actions are suspect. Society expects honesty, integrity and complete objectivity from the Chairman and Members of the Commission. The Commission must act fairly, without any pressure or influence from any quarter, unbiased and impartially, so that the society does not lose confidence in the Commission. The high constitutional trustees, like the Chairman and Members of the Public Service Commission must forever remain vigilant and conscious of these necessary adjuncts.”

6) Keeping in view the alleged irregularities, the State Government referred the matter to the CID to investigate vide Government order date 27/6/2013. The CID submitted its interim report after comprehensive investigation into the matter on the investigation of case in crime No.28/2013 under sections 34, 120(B), 418, 420, 465, IPC and section 7 of the prevention of corruption Act, 1988. Copy of the interim report of the CID dated 10/09/2013 is marked as **ANNEXURE- RI**. The following conclusions have been arrived by the CID in the report, which is reproduced herein:

“Considering the detailed investigation into the different allegations made and several other malpractices which have come to the notice of the investigation team during the course of investigation, it can be concluded that the process of evaluation of the mains answer scripts and the personality tests have been vitiated”.

In the evaluation of mains answers scripts, starting from the selection of examiners apart from the list provide by the Universities / authorities for evaluation, conducting the evaluation process in tearing hurry: not calling evaluators of particular subject even when they

were available : overwriting of entries in the marks sheet of candidates during the course of tabulation/re-totaling: to suspicious communication between the evaluators and the candidates, the discrepancies and malpractices are glaring. Coupled with the above, the resultant variation in the marks allotted during the evaluation conducted by the KPSC and sample test evaluation by experts during investigation suggest that the entire exercise has been done to favour some undeserving candidates due to extraneous consideration at the cost of deserving and meritorious candidates. Therefore, it is felt that the process of evaluation of mains answer script has been conducted in unjust and unfair manner, thereby vitiating at entire process and as such the Mains Evaluation process may be conducted once again, after putting in place necessary guidelines and safeguards. The personality tests have been conducted even more indifferently, as if it was no more than a mere pretence, and the marks that had to be allotted were already pre-decided. The entire process of personality test is completely impaired by the systematic abuse by the Chairman and the Members, in furtherance of their reprehensible designs and dishonest intentions. The members are found to have conducted interviews as a mere formality and awarded predetermined marks later on after discussion. Except for two candidates, for all 1083 candidates all the members have entered the same marks. Apparently, some members have awarded marks to candidates even though they were not present at the time of interview. Therefore, the illegal manipulation in the process of personality test have rendered it completely unacceptable and untenable and as such the same may also be conducted again by persons other than the one ; who are involved in the present case.

Apart from the above, the general procedure adopted by the KPSC, at every stage of the selection process of Gazetted Probationers seems to be impaired by glaring loop holes: which can always be exploited by unscrupulous elements. Hence, it is felt that the procedures being followed presently need to be reviewed and necessary changes incorporated."

7) It is submitted that the State Government have gone through the report and its contents, while accepting the findings and recommendations of the CID

report. It is further submitted that State Government constituted Committee headed by the Sri.P.C.Hota, IAS [retd.,] and his recommendations, have also been taken into consideration. The State Government had directed Cancellation of the result of the main examination as well as the viva-voce and further ordered revaluation of the answer scripts of the Main examination and to re-conduct the viva-voce. Thereafter the Respondent no.1 had issued the order dated 15/10/2013. The said order was subject matter of Application no.7690-7699 of 2013 and it is pending consideration.

Para (15) It is submitted that the impugned decision of the State Government is in terms of the rules and discretionary power which is vested and gist of the reasons are stated in the preamble portion of the impugned order. The State Government being the appointing authority has taken into consideration the relevant facts relating to valuation of answer scripts of the main examination and award of viva-voce marks which are highly arbitrary and which is prima-facie established in the CID report. The State Government is satisfied with the sufficiency of the materials collected so as to enable them to arrive at its satisfaction that the entire selection process was tainted in the Main Examination and Personality Test. The illegalities committed by the respective parties as held by the CID would go to the root of the matter which vitiate the entire selection/recruitment. It is further submitted that fraudulently obtained marks in the main examination and personality test could be legitimately treated as voidable at the option of the State Government. On the basis of such fraudulently obtained marks by the candidates, they cannot get any equity in his/her favour or any estoppels against the appointing authority/State Government. Thus, the decision of the State Government to nullify the process of recruitment of Gazetted Probationers for the year 2011 by withdrawing the process is in order.”

(Emphasis supplied)

39. It is pleaded by the State Government that, in the previous round of litigation, in Applications No.7690-7699/2013, the Administrative Tribunal has held that the "situation was unprecedented and perhaps such situation had not arisen earlier in any other State". However, in the instant proceedings, the Administrative Tribunal fell in an error in not adhering to the 'doctrine of separation of powers'. This is manifest by the strongly worded comments contained in paragraph No.104 of the impugned order, which reads as follows:

"104. Before issuing (*sic*) an order of appointment from the selection list under Rule 11(3) of the said 1997 Rules, the first respondent has taken the decision to withdraw the requisition dated 29.3.2011, 25.4.2011, 4.10.2011, 19.10.2011 and 9.2.2012 and has been withdrawn. The said decision taken based on the interim report of the CID and the opinion of the Advocate General and opinion of the Law Department. After careful consideration of the above mentioned rule and the reasons assigned by the first respondent, we are of the view that the action of the first respondent under the impugned order is not in accordance with the proviso to Rule 11(3) of 1997 Rules. **The impugned order is highly outrageous in its defiance of logic and of accepted moral standards giving an impression that the authorities have taken leave of their senses.**"

(Emphasis supplied)

40. The Administrative Tribunal, has not recorded any finding to show that the decision making process by the State Government is faulty in any manner except stating that, it is contrary to Rule 11(3) of 1997 Rules. The said Rule reads as follows:

"11. List of candidates suitable for appointment:- (1) Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (3) of Rule 4 and Rule 8, and the number of Posts advertised for each of the services in Group 'A' and Group 'B', the Commission shall prepare separate lists of names of the candidates equal to the available number of vacancies considered suitable for appointment for each of the said services in Group 'A' and Group 'B' arrange in the order of merit determined on the basis of total marks secured in the main examination comprising written examination and personality test:

Provided that the name of a candidate shall not be included in more than one such list.

2. The list prepared under sub-rule (1) shall be published by the Commission in the Official Gazette and the copies thereof shall be forwarded to.-

(i) the Government together with the marks secured by each of the candidates in the written examination and personality test; and

(ii) each candidate whose name is included in such list.

(3) Candidates whose names are included in the list prepared in accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (1) shall be considered for appointment to the vacancies notified in each of the services and groups of posts in the order in which their names appear in the list:

Provided that, no candidate shall be appointed unless the Government is satisfied after such enquiry and verification as may be considered necessary that the candidate is suitable for such appointment."

41. Rule 11(3) requires consideration of candidates, whose names are included in the Select List for appointment. The proviso to the Rule makes it clear that, no candidate shall be appointed unless the Government is satisfied, after such enquiry that the candidate is suitable for appointment. In the instant case, based on the CID report Government came to the conclusion that the selection process was vitiated. Consequently, Government's satisfaction with regard to suitability of candidates remained wanting. Therefore, Administrative Tribunal's finding that Government's decision is contrary to Rule 11(3), is unsustainable.

42. It has set aside State Government's decision to withdraw the requisitions by recording as follows in paragraphs No.109 to 114 of the impugned order:

- that, investigation against the Chairman and members of the KPSC shall not come in the way of consideration of candidature of the applicants;

- that, State Government did not chose to segregate the tainted and the untainted candidates; and
- that, the applicants were not supplied with investigation report and heard before passing any order; and that the State Government have ignored the selections made by Public Service Commission established under Article 315 of the Constitution.

43. In substance, the Administrative Tribunal has substituted its opinion with that of the State Government with regard to consideration of investigation report and the action taken thereon. This is impermissible in law.

44. Since the issue involves appointment of civil servants, we have also carefully examined the investigation report and recorded our findings supra. In substance, we have observed that the investigation report *prima facie* shows that the selection process was not free from interference.

45. In the light of facts recorded by the CID in it's investigation report, we are of the view that there is no

error in exercise of their powers under the transaction of business by the State Government in withdrawing the requisition given to the State Public Service Commission.

46. If the judicial pronouncement by the Administrative Tribunal is given effect to, it would compel the State Government to appoint candidates selected by a committee of questionable reputation.

47. It is well-settled that the Administrative Tribunal or the High Court while exercising power of judicial review is required to be extremely conscious of the scope of interference and the settled parameters. In the case of *Tata Cellular vs. Union of India [(1994)6 SCC 651]*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

"77. The duty of the court is to confine itself to the question of legality. Its concern should be:

1. Whether a decision-making authority exceeded its powers?
2. Committed an error of law,
3. committed a breach of the rules of natural justice,
4. reached a decision which no reasonable tribunal would have reached or,
5. abused its powers.

Therefore, it is not for the court to determine whether a particular policy or particular decision taken in the fulfilment of that policy is fair. It is only concerned with the manner in which those decisions have been taken. The extent of the duty to act fairly will vary from case to case. Shortly put, the grounds upon which an administrative action is subject to control by judicial review can be classified as under:

(i) **Illegality:** This means the decision-maker must understand correctly the law that regulates his decision-making power and must give effect to it.

(ii) **Irrationality, namely, Wednesbury unreasonableness.**

(iii) **Procedural impropriety.**

The above are only the broad grounds but it does not rule out addition of further grounds in course of time. As a matter of fact, in *R. v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex Brind* [(1991) 1 AC 696] , Lord Diplock refers specifically to one development, namely, the possible recognition of the principle of proportionality. In all these cases the test to be adopted is that the court should, "consider whether something has gone wrong of a nature and degree which requires its intervention."

48. The Administrative Tribunal could have examined the Government order dated 14.8.2014 only within the above parameters. The scope of interference even on evaluation of facts is also limited as held in paragraph 81 of *Tata Cellular* (supra), which reads as follows:

81. Two other facets of irrationality may be mentioned.

(1) It is open to the court to review the decision-maker's evaluation of the facts. The court will intervene where the facts taken as a whole could not logically warrant the conclusion of the decision-maker. If the

weight of facts pointing to one course of action is overwhelming, then a decision the other way, cannot be upheld.”

(Emphasis supplied)

49. Exercise of restraint and adherence to strict self-imposed restriction is the hallmark of judicial review. In words of Lord Denning, the sacrosanct duty of Court is stated thus:

40. As Lord Denning observed:

“This power to overturn executive decision must be exercised very carefully, because you have got to remember that the executive and the local authorities have their very own responsibilities and they have the right to make decisions. The courts should be very wary about interfering and only interfere in extreme cases, that is, cases where the court is sure they have gone wrong in law or they have been utterly unreasonable. Otherwise you would get a conflict between the courts and the Government and the authorities, which would be most undesirable. The courts must act very warily in this matter.” (See *Judging the World* by Garry Sturgess Philip Chubb.)

(Emphasis supplied)

[See *Transport & Dock Workers Union v. Mumbai Port Trust*, (2011) 2 SCC 575]

50. The parameters noticed in *Tata Cellular supra*, have not been answered by the Administrative Tribunal. It has not recorded any finding which would have otherwise justified the impugned order. To satisfy ourselves, we have

examined the aforementioned parameters *qua* the Government Order dated 14.8.2014.

- With regard to the first parameter of State Government having power to issue the order, we may record that, the State Government, being the employer, enjoy the power of discretion to either accept KPSC's recommendation or to reject the same, subject to laying the reasons before the Legislature.
- With regard to the second parameter namely error in law, having gone through the investigation report, we are of the view that, in the facts and circumstances of this case, there is no error in law in the decision making process by the State Government. Though, we have noticed several irregularities in the selection process, as recorded in the investigation report, awarding pre-determined marks, in our view, was a sufficient circumstance for the State Government to withdraw the requisition. State Government, have also complied with the requirement of laying the reasons for rejection of advise tendered by

the KPSC before the Assembly. Hence, we hold that the State Government decision does not suffer from any legal infirmity.

- With regard to the third parameter namely, breach of principles of natural justice, we see no infraction, as no right had accrued to the candidates prior to issuance of appointment orders. Therefore, no notice was necessary to the candidates.
- With regard to the fourth parameter namely, that a decision which a reasonable person could arrive at, we hold that the investigation report contains sufficient material to infer that the selection process had stood vitiated. In such circumstance, in our view, the decision taken by the State Government is not contrary to this parameter.
- With regard to the fifth parameter namely, the abuse of power, no material was placed before us nor any contention urged. At any rate, ground with regard to imputation of abuse of power by the Executive in the facts of this case is far too fragile to countenance. We say so because, firstly,

the action taken by the State Government in withdrawing the requisition is not directed against any individual and secondly, the Government have recorded reasons in their order.

51. We may also profitably notice that in the case of *Heinz India Private Limited and another Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Others [(2012) 5 SCC 443]*, the scope and ambit of judicial review has been stated as follows:

“61. The above principles have been accepted even by this Court in a long line of decisions handed down from time to time. We may, however, refer only to some of those decisions where the development of law on the subject has been extensively examined and the principles applicable clearly enunciated.

xxxxxx

63. Reference may also be made to the decision of this Court in *State of Punjab v. Gurdial Singh [(1980) 2 SCC 471]* where Krishna Iyer, J. noticed the limitations of judicial review and declared that the power vested in the superior courts ought to be exercised with great circumspection and that interference may be permissible only where the exercise of the power seems to have been vitiated or is otherwise void on well-established grounds. The Court observed: (SCC p. 475, para 8)

“8. ... The court is handcuffed in this jurisdiction and cannot raise its hand against what it thinks is a foolish choice. Wisdom in administrative action is the property of the executive and judicial circumspection keeps the court lock jawed save where the power

has been polluted by oblique ends or is otherwise void on well-established grounds. The constitutional balance cannot be upset."

64. There is almost complete unanimity on the principle that judicial review is not so much concerned with the decision itself as much with the decision-making process. (See *Chief Constable of the North Wales Police v. Evans* [(1982) 1 WLR 1155 : (1982) 3 All ER 141 (HL)] .) As a matter of fact, the juristic basis for such limitation on the exercise of the power of judicial review is that unless the restrictions on the power of the court are observed, the courts may themselves under the guise of preventing abuse of power, be guilty of usurping that power.

65. Frankfurter, J.'s note of caution in *Trop v. Dulles* [2 L Ed 2d 630 : 356 US 86 (1958)] is in this regard apposite when he said: (L Ed p. 653)

"... All power is, in Madison's phrase, 'of an encroaching nature'. ... Judicial power is not immune against this human weakness. It also must be on guard against encroaching beyond its proper bounds, and not the less so since the only restraint upon it is self-restraint."

66. That the court dealing with the exercise of power of judicial review does not substitute its judgment for that of the legislature or executive or their agents as to matters within the province of either, and that the court does not supplant "the feel of the expert" by its own review, is also fairly well settled by the decisions of this Court. In all such cases judicial examination is confined to finding out whether the findings of fact have a reasonable basis on evidence and whether such findings are consistent with the laws of the land. (See *Union of India v. S.B. Vohra* [(2004) 2 SCC 150 : 2004 SCC (L&S) 363] , *Shri Sitaram Sugar Co. Ltd. v. Union of India* [(1990) 3 SCC 223] and *Thansingh Nathmal v. Supdt. of Taxes* [AIR 1964 SC 1419] .)

67. In *Dharangadhra Chemical Works Ltd. v. State of Saurashtra* [AIR 1957 SC 264] this Court held that decision of a tribunal on a question of fact which it has jurisdiction to determine is not liable to be questioned in proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution unless it is shown to be totally unsupported by any evidence. To the same effect is the view taken by this Court in *Thansingh Nathmal case* [AIR 1964 SC 1419] where this Court held that the High Court does not generally determine questions which require an elaborate examination of evidence to establish the right to enforce for which the writ is claimed.

68. We may while parting with the discussion on the legal dimensions of judicial review refer to the following passage from *Reid v. Secy. of State for Scotland* [(1999) 2 AC 512 : (1999) 2 WLR 28 : (1999) 1 All ER 481 (HL)] which succinctly sums up the legal proposition that judicial review does not allow the court of review to examine the evidence with a view to forming its own opinion about the substantial merits of the case. (AC pp. 541 F-H and 542 A)

“Judicial review involves a challenge to the legal validity of the decision. It does not allow the court of review to examine the evidence with a view to forming its own view about the substantial merits of the case. It may be that the tribunal whose decision is being challenged has done something which it had no lawful authority to do. It may have abused or misused the authority which it had. It may have departed from the procedures which either by statute or at common law as a matter of fairness it ought to have observed. As regards the decisions itself it may be found to be perverse, or irrational or grossly disproportionate to what was required. Or the decision may be found to be erroneous in respect of a legal deficiency, as for example, through the absence of evidence, or of sufficient evidence, to support it, or through account being taken of irrelevant matter, or through a failure for any reason to take account of a relevant matter, or through some misconstruction of the terms of the statutory provision which the decision-maker is required to apply. But while the evidence may have to be explored in order to see if the decision is vitiated by such legal deficiencies it is perfectly clear that in case of review, as distinct from an ordinary appeal, the court

may not set about forming its own preferred view of evidence."

(Emphasis supplied)

52. In the light of above discussion, we are of the considered view that, the Administrative Tribunal erred in substituting its opinion and therefore, the impugned judgment quashing State Government's decision to withdraw the is wholly unsustainable. Consequently, direction to the State Government to issue appointment orders to the selected candidates is also rendered unsustainable in law.

53. In W.Ps.No.13617-13672/2017 & W.P.No.14529/2017, it is averred that, the State Government have issued an Un-Official Note dated 17.3.2017 (Annexure-N), instructing the heads of the Departments to issue appointment orders to the selected candidates as per the Final Select List dated 21.3.2014 issued by the KPSC. It is also averred that the Director of Municipal Administration has issued appointment orders to as many as 18 selected candidates vide Official Memorandum dated 27.3.2017 (Annexure-O). The

Petitioners, have sought for quashing the said Un-Official Note as also the Official Memorandum issued by the Director of Municipal Administration.

54. The Administrative Tribunal has quashed Government Order dated 14.8.2014, withdrawing the issued to KPSC. We have held that, the said common order is unsustainable in law. As a natural corollary, all appointment orders issued pursuant to Final Select List dated 21.3.2014 issued by the KPSC, are unsustainable liable to be declared as illegal.

55. Resultantly, these writ petitions eminently deserve to be allowed and accordingly:

a) Writ Petitions No.13617-13627/2017 & 14529/2017 and Writ Petition No.11342/2017 are **allowed;**

b) Common order dated 19.10.2016 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore, in Applications No.6268/2014 to 6395/2014 c/w 6432/2014 to 6444/2014, 6446/2014 to 6459/2014, 6597/2014 & 6598/2014, 7464/2014, 7941/2014 to 7946/2014, 7950/2014 to 7966/2014,

56. In view of disposal of these writ petitions, I.A.No.16/2017 (in W.Ps.No.13617-13627/2017 & 14529/2017) for impleadment, filed by the applicants claiming to be candidates in 2011 selection, does not survive for consideration and is accordingly disposed of.

57. Before parting with the case, we record our appreciation for the able assistance rendered by the learned Advocates, who appeared in these cases.

We make no order as to costs.

**Sd/-
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
JUDGE**