



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 297 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. SHRUTHI J.U.
D/O LATE UMESHA J
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS
R/AT C/O. MANJUNATHA S.N.
D.NO. 183, HARITHSA NILAYA
CHIKKAHONNENAHALLI
NEAR SBI BANK, HASSAN - 01

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI PRATHEEP K.C., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. POORNIMA B.R., I.A.S.
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
ZILLA PANCHAYATH, HASSAN - 01

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI SUBRAMNAYA R., ADVOCATE A/W
SRI DEVARAJA M.S., ADVOCATE)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTION 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURT ACT, 1971, PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMPT OF COURT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR WILLFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN W.P. NO.15771/2022 DATED 24.07.2024 VIDE ANNEXURE-A & ETC.



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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The complainant has filed the present complaint alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 24.07.2024 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.No.15771/2022 (S-KSAT), whereby the respondent-authority was directed to consider the application of the petitioner for compassionate appointment in terms of the Rules in force without reference to the fact that the complainant is a married daughter of the deceased employee. Thus, the complainant's application for compassionate appointment could not be rejected on the ground of marital status.

2. The accused has filed an endorsement dated 04.04.2026, rejecting the complainant's application for compassionate appointment. Although the English translation of the endorsement does seem to suggest that it was rejected on the ground that the complainant was married before the demise of her father, however,



the Kannada version (which is the original) indicates the reason for rejection was that the complainant was not dependant on the deceased.

3. Additionally, it is stated that as far as the complainant's mother is concerned, (who was the only heir of the deceased employee), the family pension has been settled and is being paid.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the complainant submits that the complainant could not be considered as not dependant on the ground of the marital status and therefore the two are linked. He also submits that the grant of family pension does not preclude the appointment on compassionate grounds.

5. The endorsement also indicates that one of the reasons for rejection was, the complainant was not living with the deceased at the material time. This reason was also disputed by the learned counsel for the complainant.

6. We do not consider it necessary to examine the merits and the grounds on which the complainant's application was rejected. However, it is clear that it was not rejected on the ground of her



marital status. It was rejected on the ground that (i) she was not living with the deceased at the material time; (ii) that she is not dependant on the deceased; and (iii) that her mother has been granted family pension.

7. In view of the above, it would not be appropriate to initiate any proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. The complaint is, accordingly, closed.

8. We, however, clarify that this order would not preclude the complainant from availing substantive remedies, if any, in respect to the endorsement dated 04.04.2026, albeit in accordance with law.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE**