



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

WRIT PETITION NO. 7387 OF 2021 (L-TER)

BETWEEN:

THE CHAIRMAN,
KARNATAKA GRAMEENA BANK,
HEAD OFFICE GANDHINAGAR,
BELLARY - 583 103.
REPRESENTED BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER
SRI. B.G. MANJUNATH,

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HANSI ZULFIQUAR AHMED
NISAR AHMED.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. REVANASIDDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/O. REVANSIDDHESWARA NILAYA,
H NO.1-892/72/70, TAMKE LAYOUT,
JEWARGI ROAD,
GANESH NAGAR,
GULBARGA - 577 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. NAGABHUSHANA RAO., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. R. NAGENDRA NAIK, ADVOCATE)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI AND OR ANY OTHER WRIT OR ORDER AND QUASH THE IMPUGNED AWARD DATED:07.12.2020 PASSED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, BENGALURU IN ID NO.11/2016, PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A TO THIS WRIT



PETITION, THEREBY QUASHING THE AWARD OF MODIFICATION OF THE PUNISHMENT FROM DISMISSAL TO REMOVAL FROM SERVICE WITH ALL TERMINAL BENEFITS AWARDED TO THE RESPONDENT AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH)

The present writ petition has been filed impugning the award dated 07.12.2020 passed by the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore (for short 'CGIT') in ID.No.11/2016.

2. The respondent-workman was employed initially with erstwhile Pragathi Grameena Bank, now named as Karnataka Gramin Bank, who raised the industrial dispute regarding the major punishment of dismissal imposed on him.

3. The allegation against the respondent-workman was that while he was posted as Office Assistant at Deodurga Branch of the Karnataka Grameena Bank, he



was issued charge sheet and after conducting the domestic enquiry, Enquiry Officer submitted the enquiry report to the Disciplinary Authority who inflicted the major punishment of dismissal from service vide order dated 19.02.2014.

4. The appeal preferred by him before the Board of Director was rejected in affirming the order passed by the Disciplinary Authority. These orders passed by the Disciplinary Authority and the Appellate Authority were subject matter of the industrial dispute before the CGIT.

5. The CGIT vide order dated 25.07.2019 had decided the preliminary issue regarding the fairness and validity of the domestic enquiry in favour of the management and held that the enquiry was held in fair and proper manner. However, the question of perversity and insufficiency of evidence to restrict the punishment of major penalty was to be considered during the final order.

6. The allegation against the respondent-workman was that credits in the SBI Account No.18683 of Jai



Hanuman, Vidya Shikshana Samste was posted by him against norms governing dealing with subsidy and he had dealt with the cheques having material alternations. They were altogether 16 transactions of such issue.

7. It is not in dispute that the respondent-workman was working under field officer Rahmatulla. However, Rahmatulla has been compulsorily retired and except for the respondent-workman, no other official of the bank was punished with major penalty of dismissal from service.

8. The CGIT has noted that when the punishment order came to be passed on 19.02.2014, the respondent-workman had put in 20 years of service. He was not subjected to any other previous disciplinary enquiry or punishment inflicted on him. The CGIT in exercise of its powers Section 11A of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, has modified the order of punishment to removal from service. Considering the fact, that the field officer Mr.Rahmatulla, under when the respondent-workman was



working and he was following his instructions was punished with the compulsory retirement, whereas the respondent-workman has been punished with dismissal from service and therefore, the CGIT in its discretion considering the facts and circumstances of the case has modified the order of punishment from dismissal to removal from service.

We find no reason to interfere with the impugned order passed by the CGIT. Considering the aforesaid fact as taken note by the CGIT, we therefore ***dismiss*** this writ petition and affirm the order passed by the CGIT.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(T.M.NADAF)
JUDGE**