



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 7900 OF 2025 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SMT.JAYAMMA
W/O LATE VENKATESH
AGED BOUT 60 YEARS
RESIDING AT KONANAHALLI VILLAGE
KASABHA HOBOLI, MANDYA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571104.

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. MANJULA D., ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE MANAGEMENT OF MESCOM
PANDAVANPURA
MANDYA DISTRICT-571434
REPRESENTED BY ITS
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. DEVARAJU H V., ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by
HEMALATHA A
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO RELEASE THE ARREARS OF SALARY, PENSION, PENSIONARY BENEFITS WITH ALL CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS OF THE DECEASED HUSBAND OF THE PETITIONER AND DIRECT THE RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION DATED: 26.09.2024 WHICH IS PRODUCED AS ANNEXURE-F AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

1. In this writ petition, the petitioner has sought for following relief/s:

"(i) **ISSUE**, a writ of mandamus or any other direction directing the respondents to release the arrears of salary, pension, pensionary benefits with all consequential benefits of the deceased husband of the petitioner;

(ii) **ISSUE**, a writ of mandamus or any other writ or direction directing the respondent to consider the representation dated:26-09-2024 which is proceed as **Annexure-F**.

(iii) Grant such other order or direction as deems fit to grant in the facts and circumstances of the case.."

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner's husband, Late Venkatesh, was appointed as a Lineman in the establishment of the respondent. While he was in service, he was terminated from the service. Being aggrieved by the same, the husband of the petitioner



challenged the termination before the Labour Court in Ref.No.90/2008. The Labour Court by order dated 11.11.2011, passed the following order:

- "1. Reference is allowed in part.*
- 2. Dismissal order passed by Second Party is hereby set aside. Second Party is hereby directed to reinstate First Party to the same post last held by him at the time of dismissal from service.*
- 3. It is made clear that First Party is not entitled to any back wages.*
- 4. It is open to the Second Party to conduct Domestic Enquiry, against First Party for his misconduct of unauthorized absence, strictly in accordance with the regulation No.11 and 11(A) of Karnataka Electricity Board Employees Classification, Disciplinary Control and Appeal Regulations, 1987 and proceed further in accordance with law.*
- 5. Office to send copy of the award in duplicate to the Labour Department, Bangalore for publication. After receipt of copy of publication, office to forward copy of award to the concerned Civil Court that may be specified by the first party for the purpose of*



execution as provided under the amended provision contained in Sec.11(10) of I.D.Act, as if it were to be a decree of the said court.

Intimate Government."

6. Being aggrieved by the order passed by the Labour Court, the respondent-Management filed a writ petition before this Court in W.P.No.44295/2012. During the pendency of the said writ petition, the petitioner's husband died. Since the respondent-Management did not take any steps to bring the legal representatives on record in W.P.No.44295/2012, the writ petition was dismissed for non-prosecution. Thereafter, the petitioner, who is the wife of the deceased employee of the respondent-Management, filed a representation dated 26.09.2024, vide Annexure-F, seeking release of the pensionary benefits in respect of her husband. As the representation vide Annexure-F dated 26.09.2024 has not been considered by the respondent, the petitioner is before this Court.



7. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent has submitted that if this Court grants some reasonable time, the representation of the petitioner vide Annexure-F will be considered, in accordance with law.

8. In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the writ petition is ***disposed of.***

9. Respondent-Management is directed to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 26.09.2024 vide Annexure-F, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, not later than three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE