



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 24201 OF 2025 (S-TR)

BETWEEN:

MANJUNATH C N
S/O NANJUNDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
OFFICE SUPERINTENDENT
KARNATAKA RESIDENTIAL EDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTION SOCIETY
NO 8, MSB-1, 6TH AND 7TH FLOOR
CUNNINGHAM ROAD, BENGALURU 52.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. JAYAKUMAR S.PATIL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SRI
SOMASHEKAR K H., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE PRINCIPLE SECRETARY
SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT
DR B R AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU 01.
2. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
KARNATAKA RESIDENTIAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION SOCIETY
NO 8, MSB-I, 6TH AND 7TH FLOOR
CUNNINGHAM ROAD, BENGALURU 52

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.VIKAS R, AGA FOR R1:
SRI SHRIDHAR PRABHU, ADVOCATE FOR C/R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER
DATED: 23.06.2025 ISSUED BY THE R-2 MADE IN
NO.KREIS/EST/2025-ADMN VIDE ANNEXURE-J AND ETC.

Digitally signed by
HEMALATHA A
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



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

This writ petition is filed under Articles 226 & 227 of the Constitution of India, challenging the order dated 23.06.2025 vide Annexure-J, transferring the petitioner from Head Quarters, Bangalore to Atal Bihari Vajpayee Residential School, Bhagamandala, Madikeri.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed as a Computer Teacher at Kittur Rani Chennamma Residential School, Hulikatte, Magadi Taluk, Ramanagara District. Thereafter, he was deputed to the Karnataka Residential Education Institution Society as a Clerk. Subsequently, by order dated 19-07-2019, his post was merged and he was designated as an Office Superintendent in the Respondent No. 2 Society.

3. While the petitioner was working as Superintendent in Respondent No. 2 Society, Respondent



No. 1 received an anonymous letter containing allegations against him. Respondent No. 1 forwarded the said letter to Respondent No. 2, directing them to hold an inquiry and submit an independent opinion regarding the allegations. Pursuant thereto, Respondent No. 2 issued a show-cause notice to the petitioner on 27-10-2023, calling for his explanation.

4. The petitioner submitted a reply to the said show-cause notice, contending that the allegations were false and made with mala fide intention. After considering the reply and conducting an inquiry, Respondent No. 2 held that the allegations were baseless and further noted that the complaint did not even disclose the address of the complainant. Accordingly, Respondent No. 2 closed the matter.

5. When things stood thus, Respondent No. 1, by the impugned order dated 21-06-2025, appointed a retired District Judge as an Inquiry Officer to conduct an inquiry



into the very same allegations against the petitioner, this time based on a news item telecasted on Freedom TV. Soon thereafter, by order dated 23-06-2025, the petitioner was transferred from the headquarters at Bangalore to Atal Bihari Vajpayee Presidential School, Bhagamandala, Madikeri, which order is under challenge before this Court.

6. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner contended that, a government servant cannot be transferred merely on the basis of a complaint, without any action being taken on such complaint. In support of his contention, he relied on the order passed by a Division Bench of this Court in W.P.No.104846/2022, disposed of on 15.12.2022. Hence, sought to allow the writ petition.

7. Learned AGA appearing for the State submitted that the petitioner has been working in the same place for the last six years. Serious allegations were made against him, and a departmental enquiry has been initiated by the



first respondent. In the interest of justice and administrative exigency, the petitioner was transferred to Kodagu. Even under the transfer guidelines, when a departmental enquiry is pending and the employee has not been placed under suspension, he can be transferred to another station. Therefore, the AGA prayed for dismissal of the writ petition.

8. It is not in dispute that a departmental enquiry has been initiated against the petitioner. The petitioner has been working at the head office for the past six years. During the pendency of the enquiry, the transfer guidelines permit transfer of an employee who has not been placed under suspension.

9. The judgment relied upon by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner in W.P. No.104848/2024 is distinguishable. In that case, the employee had been transferred solely on the basis of a complaint, without initiation of an enquiry. In the present case, however, a



departmental enquiry is pending against the petitioner, and he has also completed six years at the head office. Therefore, the transfer guidelines justify the impugned transfer.

10. Accordingly, as the transfer order at Annexure-J has been passed on the basis of a pending departmental enquiry, there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order.

11. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

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

CM
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 0