

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.P.VIVEKANANDA

WRIT APPEAL NO.661 OF 2024 (S-KSRTC)

BETWEEN:

SRI NIZAR AHAMED K.
S/O SRI KHALEEL SAB
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
GROUND FLOOR
NANJEGOWDA STREET
DODDAMAVALLI
BENGALURU-560 004

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. RAJARAM T, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE DIRECTOR
PERSONNEL AND ENVIRONMENT
KSRTC CENTRAL OFFICE
SHANTHINAGAR
BENGALURU-560 027

Digitally
signed by
RAKSHA
Local
High Court of
Karnataka

2. CHIEF PERSONNEL MANAGER (EAST) AND
APPOINTING AUTHORITY
KSRTC CENTRAL OFFICE
SHANTHINAGAR
BENGALURU-560 027

...RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE ORDER
DATED 04.03.2024 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN
W.P.No.13367/2019 AND REINSTATE THE APPELLANT WITH FULL
BACKWAGES AND CONTINUED SERVICE.

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED
FOR JUDGMENT ON 23.09.2026 AND COMING ON FOR
PRONOUNCEMENT OF JUDGMENT THIS DAY, **ANU SIVARAMAN**
J., PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.P.VIVEKANANDA

CAV JUDGMENT**(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN)**

This writ appeal is filed challenging the Order dated 04.03.2024 of the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.13367/2019 (S-KSRTC).

2. We have heard Shri. Rajaram, learned counsel appearing for the appellant.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant submitted that the appellant while working as a Conductor in the Karnataka State Road Transport Corporation ('KSRTC' for short) had been selected for appointment to the post of Establishment Supervisor by way of an internal recruitment process. The Appointment Order was issued on 17.10.2013, while so, a Show-Cause Notice was issued indicating that the marks card and certificate relating to Post-Graduate Diploma in HR Management Course submitted by him are not issued by the Institution recognized by the Central/State Government and not accredited to UGC/AICTE/AIU/DEC University. It is submitted that though a detailed

representation was submitted by the appellant, pointing out that Post-Graduate Diploma in Personnel Management and Industrial Relations submitted by the appellant was duly recognized by the State and Central Government, the respondent passed an Order dated 01.02.2017 removing the name of the appellant from the select list of Establishment Supervisor.

4. It is submitted that though an appeal was filed by the appellant, the same was rejected on 27.07.2018. Being aggrieved, the appellant had approached this Court and after hearing the respondent as well, the writ petition was dismissed on the ground that the Employment Notification notified the qualification as a Bachelor Degree and a Diploma from a University established by law. It is submitted the cost of Rs.25,000/- is also inflicted on the appellant, to be deducted at the rate of Rs.5,000/- per month.

5. We have considered the contentions advanced by the appellant. At the outset, it is clear that though the appellant's name has been deleted from the select list of

candidates selected for appointment as Establishment Supervisor, his original appointment as 'Conductor' stands undisturbed. Further, it is clear that the qualification prescribed for the post of Establishment Supervisor from in-service candidates, was a Bachelor Degree in Arts/Science/Commerce/BCA 3 years Course with Diploma in Personnel Management and Industrial Relations from any University established by Law with Computer knowledge. The show-cause notice issued on 22.12.2015 specifically required the appellant to show cause why his name should not be struck off from the select list of Establishment Supervisor and why his right for appointment shall not be forfeited, on the ground that the diploma certificate produced by the appellant is not one obtained from any Institution recognized by the UGC/AICTE/AIU/DEC.

6. After considering the reply Annexure 'Q' - Order was passed by the KSRTC. The Order specifically considers the contentions and finds that the Post-Graduate Diploma certificate produced by the appellant is not from a recognized Institution which does not have

UGC/AICTE/AIU/DEC accreditation. Though factual contentions were raised by the appellant, the same have been specifically adverted to in the order of the KSRTC as well as the appellate Order. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the Certificate produced by him was not fake and therefore, it ought to have been accepted by the respondents.

7. We also notice that there is no finding that the Certificate produced by the appellant was either fake or fraudulent. However, fact of the matter is that, the Certificate was only from the Council for Eradication of Scientific and Technical Illiteracy and there is no contention that the said Institution had any accreditation to the UGC/AICTE/AIU/DEC. In view of the clear terms of the Employment Notification, we are of the opinion that the contention raised by the appellant that his Diploma was from a Government Recognized Institution, cannot be accepted.

8. However, in the facts and circumstances of the instant case, we are of the opinion that the direction to pay costs of Rs.25,000/- may not be warranted, since there was

no allegation that the Diploma certificate produced was either fake or fraudulent. Therefore, the appeal shall stand ***disposed of.***

The findings of the learned Single Judge that the impugned orders are not liable to be interfered with, is upheld. However, the direction for payment of Costs is set aside.

**Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(T.P.VIVEKANANDA)
JUDGE**

cp*