



CNR: KAHC010175492025

NC: 2026:KHC:48325-DB
WP No. 7834 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT

AND

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO.7834 OF 2025 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA,
REP. BY ITS REGISTRAR
DR.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K. PRASANNA SHETTY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. K. GOPALA KRISHNA,
S/O K SRINIVAS RAO,
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS,
RETIRED VILLAGE ACCOUNTANT,
TALUK OFFICE, HIRIYUR II CIRCLE,
BHADRAVATHI TALUK,
SHIVMOGGA DISTRICT-577 302.
2. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP. BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
(SERVICE - II),
BENGALURU - 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHRAVAN BHARADWAJ B. V., ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SRI. B.S. SUDHINDRA, HCGP FOR R2)

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVENI

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010175492025

NC: 2026:KHC:48325-DB
WP No. 7834 of 2025

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER DATED 10.07.2024 PASSED BY THE HONBLE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL IN APPLICATION No. 3759/2023 (ANNEXURE-A).

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
and
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)

Heard Sri.K.Prasanna Shetty, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri.Shravan Bharadwaj.B.V who represents respondent No.1 and Sri.B.S.Sudhindra, learned High Court Government Pleader who represents respondent No.2.

2. The orders rendered by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru in Application No.3759/2023 dated 10.07.2024 are under challenge in this writ petition.



CNR: KAHC010175492025

NC: 2026:KHC:48325-DB
WP No. 7834 of 2025

3. Respondent No.1, as per the material available on record, filed Application No.3759/2023 before the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru seeking to quash the enquiry report dated 15.11.2021, the order dated 20.11.2021 and also the order dated 18.04.2022.

4. An unsuccessful trap was laid against respondent No.1. However, basing on a voice recording which disclosed that respondent No.1 demanded bribe of Rs.1,300/-, out of which he received Rs.500/-, disciplinary proceedings were initiated against respondent No.1. A report was submitted by the enquiry officer and thereafter the writ petitioner submitted report dated 20.11.2021 confirming the opinion expressed by the disciplinary authority and making necessary recommendations to impose penalty upon respondent No.1. Challenging the opinion thus expressed, respondent No.1 filed application seeking to quash the enquiry report and the recommendation of the writ petitioner. Having found



CNR: KAHC010175492025

**NC: 2026:KHC:48325-DB
WP No. 7834 of 2025**

justification in the relief sought for, the same was granted and aggrieved by the same, this writ petition is filed.

5. Undisputedly, during the disciplinary proceedings the genuineness of voice recording was not established. The demand of bribe could have been established by establishing the genuineness of the report of Assistant Director, Truths Labs Forensic Science Laboratory with regard to the pre-trap conversation between the complainant and respondent No.1. Though the voice sample as per the version of the disciplinary authority matched with the alleged trap conversation, as rightly observed, before the enquiry officer, the genuineness of the report and the CD's is required to be established by examining either the person who subjected that material to scientific examination or who furnished the report. However, the disciplinary authority failed to examine the author of the forensic report or any scientific expert who conducted scientific examination of the material sent. Therefore, in the enquiry, the charge



CNR: KAHC010175492025

leveled against respondent No.1 was not proved. Thus as rightly observed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, recommendation made by the writ petitioner basing on the enquiry report submitted is unsustainable as the enquiry report is not based on any concrete material which at least through preponderance of probability establish the case that is leveled against respondent No.1.

6. It is pertinent to mention that as the trap is unsuccessful, burden vests upon the disciplinary authority to establish the pre-trap conversation which formed basis for framing of charges. Unless the genuineness of the pre-trap conversation is established, the charge could not be said to have been established for the disciplinary authority to take action against the delinquent officer.

7. Therefore, we are of the considered view that there are no grounds to interfere with the well reasoned order passed by the Karnataka State Administrative



CNR: KAHC010175492025

NC: 2026:KHC:48325-DB
WP No. 7834 of 2025

Tribunal, Bengaluru. Thus we ultimately hold that this writ petition is not maintainable.

Resultantly, the writ petition is *dismissed*.

**Sd/-
(S.G.PANDIT)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE**

NS
CT:TSM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 22