



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 8TH 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. 455 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. SADASHIVAPPA
S/O LATE SHIVANNA
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS
RESIDING AT 308
POORVI AIRAVATHA
3RD MAIN, 1ST CROSS
JUDICIAL LAYOUT, 2ND PHASE
THALAGATTAPURA
BENGALURU - 560 109.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI GANGADHARAPPA A.V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. DEEPAK CHAVAN
FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN
TO THE COMPLAINANT
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKAS SOUDHA, BENGALURU - 560 001
2. PRABHULINGA KAVALIKATTI
FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN
TO THE COMPLAINANT



AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
COMMISSIONER AND DIRECTOR
OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION
VISHWESHWARAIHA TOWER
BENGALURU - 560 001

... ACCUSED

3. GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKAS SOUDHA
BENGALURU - 560 001

...PRO-FORMA RESPONDENT

(BY SRI S.H. RAGHAVENDRA, AGA)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE
CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO ISSUE NOTICE TO
ACCUSED AND SUITABLY PUNISH THEM FOR THEIR WILFUL
DISOBEDIENCE TO THE ORDER DATED 21.11.2024 PASSED IN
W.P. NO.19268/2024, CERTIFIED COPY OF WHICH PRODUCED AS
ANNEXURE-A.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, 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 21.11.2024 passed by the Co-
ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.No.19268/2024 (S-KSAT)



[impugned order]. The operative part of the said order reads as under:

"In the above circumstances, this Petition is allowed and following directions are issued:

[i] A Writ of Mandamus issues to the Respondents to sanction & release regular pension & all terminal benefits to the Petitioner within two months, with interest at the rate of 1% per mensem from the day the same have been withheld.

[2] The rate of interest shall stand altered to 2% in the place of 1% per mensem with retrospective effect, if delay exceeds two months. Further, Respondents shall pay a cost of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) only to the Petitioner.

[3] The interest & costs may be recovered from the erring officials of the concerned Departments, in accordance with law.

Liberty is reserved to the Petitioner to make an appropriate representation to the Respondents to seek redressal of his grievance as to fitment of pay and such other things. If such a representation is made, the same shall be considered within a period of eight weeks on merits. The delay issue shall not be raised since the legal battle has been fought all through."

2. During the course of the present proceedings, the accused had filed compliance affidavit indicating the amounts paid to the complainant. However, the main dispute is regarding the payment of interest.

3. The accused has filed the last compliance affidavit on 06.04.2026 setting out in detail the calculation of the amounts paid. In



one of the tabular statements it is stated that it had calculated the interest at the rate of 2% per month as per the compliance affidavit filed on 02.04.2025. The learned counsel for the complainant submitted that this indicates that interest after 02.04.2025 has not been calculated. However, the reference to the date in the compliance affidavit is erroneous. It refers to compliance affidavit filed on 02.04.2026 and the interest has been calculated upto that date.

4. The complainant has also filed a rejoinder to the compliance affidavit dated 06.04.2026 to point out variation in the calculations. A plain reading of the said rejoinder indicates that the variation is on account of interest computed at ₹17,79,200/- on a sum of ₹3,12,663/- which is the part of complainant's salary that was withheld. The claim for the said sum arises on account of 50% salary that was withheld from 07.04.1998 to 08.03.2000, during which the complainant was placed under suspension. There is no dispute as to the amount of ₹3,12,663/- which has been remitted to the complainant's accounts today.

5. As noted above, the dispute is only regarding the interest on the said amount, which the complainant has computed at ₹17,79,200/-.



6. There is also a discrepancy in the computation of the earned leave encashment benefit i.e., a sum of ₹16,800/- on account of interest payable on the amount towards leave engagement benefit.

7. As far as the claim for interest of ₹17,79,200/- is concerned, the same is clearly not a part of the terminal benefits and therefore there is no order directing payment of this interest. Consequently, no proceedings for disobedience of order dated 21.11.2024 under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 are maintainable on account of non-admission of this claim.

8. We also find no error in the Interest as calculated for the earned leave encashment benefit as computed by the accused. In any event, no proceedings for willful disobedience of the orders passed by this Court are required to be initiated on this account.

9. The complaint is, accordingly, closed.

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

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