



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 09TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S G PANDIT

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE GEETHA K.B.

WRIT APPEAL NO. 100049 OF 2024 (S-DIS)

BETWEEN:

SRI RAVI S/O. CHANDRAPPA PATIL
AGE: 40 YEARS, OCC: SERVICE,
R/O. NEAR HANUMAN TEMPLE,
LAXMI NAGAR,
AT POST MACCEHE-590011
TQ. AND DIST. BELAGAVI.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI S.H.HOSAMANI, FOR SRI A.S. PATIL, ADVOCATE.)

AND:

1. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
KARNATAKA POWER TRANSMISSION
CORPORATION LTD., (KPTCL)
KAVERI BHAVAN, BENGALURU 560001.
2. THE DIRECTOR
(ADMINISTRATION RESOURCE)
AND THE DISCIPLINARY
AUTHORITY, KPTCL, KAVERI BHAVAN,
BENGALURU 560001.
3. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
ELECTRICAL O AND M



CITY DIVISION HESCOM
BELAGAVI 590001.

...RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, 1961, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 04.07.2023, PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN W.P.NO.103758/2018 (S-DIS) AND ACCORDINGLY TO ALLOW THE WRIT PETITION FILED BY THE APPELLANT AS PRAYED FOR, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS APPEAL COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S G PANDIT
AND
THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE GEETHA K.B.

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE GEETHA K.B.)

This intra-Court appeal under Section 4 of the Karnataka High Courts Act, 1961, is directed against the order dated 04.07.2023, passed by the learned single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.103758/2018.

2. Parties would be referred with their ranks as they were in the writ petition, for sake of convenience and clarity.



3. Petitioner has filed the writ petition praying for a writ of Certiorari and to quash the impugned order dated 17.12.2013, passed by respondent No.2 in No.KA/V/Pra/NiNi/Bi 54/18697/2010-11 and the impugned order dated 20.04.2015, passed by respondent No.1 in No.KA/V/Pra/Nini/Bi 82/42456/2013-14, as per Annexure-F and H respectively.

4. After hearing both the sides, the learned single Judge has dismissed the writ petition holding that the order of punishment imposed by the disciplinary authority, confirmed by the appellate authority needs no interference.

5. Aggrieved by the same, the appellant is before this Court.

6. Learned counsel for appellant Sri A.S.Patil, would submit that the enquiry was conducted against 11 employees. Amongst them, 04 employees were exonerated from the charges alleged against them and others were punished with punishment to withhold annual increment of



one or two; whereas only the petitioner was imposed with major punishment of dismissal from service. Furthermore, substantial portion of the alleged misappropriation amount was already deposited by the appellant. He is before us only regarding the harsh and disproportionate punishment imposed against the appellant.

7. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was involved in a case of misappropriation amounting to ₹.13,40,000/-, which resulted in departmental enquiry and the enquiry officer had submitted his report on 13.05.2011 holding that the charges levelled against petitioner were proved. Based on said enquiry report, the disciplinary authority has passed an order of punishment on 17.12.2013 dismissing the petitioner from service and ordered for recovery of ₹.7,78,672/- excluding the amount already recovered from him. Being aggrieved by the same, petitioner has filed an appeal before first respondent appellate authority, which was also dismissed vide Annexure-H dated 20.04.2015.



8. It is to be noted here that the proved serious allegation against petitioner is that from 10.07.2007 to 24.09.2010 while he was working in BESCO, Belagavi, he had created fake bank accounts of pensioners and mentioned names of family pensioners twice and was misusing the fund and transferred the amount to his personal account totally amounting to ₹.7,78,672/- and he has made wrong calculation and paid enhanced pension/DCRG/commutation amount totally amounting to ₹.5,61,329/-. Thus, the total amount of misappropriation is ₹.13,40,001/-.

9. On conducting proper inquiry, the disciplinary authority has imposed the punishment of dismissal, which is upheld by the appellate authority. Thus, the nature of allegation against the petitioner is misappropriation of funds over a period of 01 year 06 months and thus, considering the seriousness of charges levelled against the petitioner, the disciplinary authority and appellate authority have fairly



considered that punishment of dismissal from service, which was the only course open and thus imposed it.

10. Furthermore, we are not inclined to interfere with the order passed by the disciplinary authority generally unless it shocks the consciousness of the Court. The huge amount of misappropriation of funds within a span of 1-½ years in the service resulted in dismissal of the petitioner from service is properly appreciated in the writ petition. Hence, it needs no interference. Accordingly the writ appeal is ***dismissed***.

11. In view of disposal of the appeal, pending interlocutory applications, if any, stand disposed of as they do not survive for consideration.

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

**Sd/-
(GEETHA K.B.)
JUDGE**