



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAYKUMAR A.PATIL

WRIT PETITION NO.110058 OF 2025 (S-KAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI. DHRUVARAJ B. PATIL
S/O BHEEMANAGOUDA
AGE. 59 YEARS,
OCC. CIRCLE POLICE INSPECTOR (CPI)
GADAG PS (NOW UNDER SUSPENSION)
R/O. CHABBI GRAMA, YADAHALLI,
BAGALKOT DISTRICT-587103.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SUNIL DESAI, ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER APPEARED
THROUGH VC)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOME,
M.S. BUILDING, DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE-560001.
2. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL AND
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE (DG & IGP)
OFFICE OF DG AND IGP, KARNATAKA STATE,
NRUPATUNGA ROAD, BENGALURU-560001.
3. SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
GADAG DISTRICT, GADAG-582101.
4. ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE (ADGP)
KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA, M.S. BUILDING,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI, BANGALORE-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ASHOK KATTIMANI, AGA FOR RESPONDENTS)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 01-12-2025 PASSED BY HON'BLE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BELAGAVI IN APPLICATION NO.11251/2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-B, AS ARBITRARY AND ILLEGAL & ETC.

THIS WRIT PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAYKUMAR A.PATIL

ORAL ORDER

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ)

The petitioner has sought for a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the order dated 01.02.2025 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Belagavi ('the Tribunal', for short), in Application No.11251 of 2025, whereby it rejected the interim relief sought by the petitioner for stay of the order of his suspension.

2. (i) It appears from the application filed before the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal that the Police Inspector-2 of the Karnataka Lokayukta, Gadag had submitted a complaint to the Superintendent of Police,



Gadag, on 23.06.2025, alleging that the petitioner had accumulated disproportionate assets during the period 01.01.2012 to 31.12.2024, and therefore requested registration of a case under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, and take necessary action. Thereafter, a case in Crime No.4 of 2025 was registered against the petitioner for offences punishable under Section 13(1)(b) R/w. Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

(ii) After registration of the case, warrants were issued against the petitioner and raids were conducted to ascertain the disproportionate assets allegedly possessed by him. At that point in time, the petitioner approached this Court in Criminal Petition No.103502 of 2025 for quashing the first information report, and the same is pending adjudication. In the meanwhile, a letter was addressed by the ADGP, Karnataka Lokayukta, to respondent No.2 on 18.07.2025 regarding the registration of Crime No.4 of 2025. Respondent No.2 thereafter passed the impugned order suspending the petitioner from service under Rule 5 of the



Karnataka State Police (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules, 1965.

(iii) The petitioner contends that the order of suspension was challenged before the Tribunal, where an interim relief was sought to stay the order of suspension. However, the same was refused by the Tribunal, against which this petition is filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the case in Crime No.4 of 2025 was stayed by this Court in Criminal Petition No.103502 of 2025 and therefore, it was incumbent upon the Tribunal to have considered the request of the petitioner favourably.

4. Learned AGA, on the other hand, submitted that the order of the Tribunal was passed on 01.12.2025, while the interim stay in Crime No.4 of 2025 was granted on 18.12.2025. He therefore submitted that the petitioner cannot take advantage of the order of stay granted by this Court to challenge the order passed by the Tribunal.



5. It is now trite that an order of suspension neither affects service nor is it a punishment. If the petitioner has challenged his suspension before the Tribunal, he has to work out his remedy before the Tribunal itself. It is not appropriate to pass any remark on the merits of the case, as this may prejudice or affect the proper disposal of the proceedings. If the case in Crime No.4 of 2025 was stayed after the impugned order passed by the Tribunal, it was open for the petitioner to go back before the Tribunal and renew his request for stay of the order of suspension. He was also entitled to seek early disposal of the application before the Tribunal.

6. In that view of the matter, no interference is warranted in this petition. It is open for the petitioner to go back before the Tribunal and renew his request either for stay of the impugned order of suspension or for early disposal of the application.

7. Writ petition is disposed of accordingly.



Learned AGA is permitted to file memo of appearance within 10 days from today.

**Sd/-
(R.NATARAJ)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(VIJAYKUMAR A.PATIL)
JUDGE**

gab
CT:VP
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 7