



CNR: KAHC010325412021

NC: 2026:KHC:54026-DB
WP No. 16455 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 16455 OF 2021 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SMT.MANGALAMBA,
W/O RANGASWAMY,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
SERVING AS GRADE-I SECRETARY,
TAYALURU GRAMPANCHAYAT,
MULABAGILU TALUK,
KOLAR DISTRICT.

RESIDENTIAL PERMANENT ADDRESS:

SMT. MANGALAMBA,
W/O RANGASWAMY,
NO.56, RAJENDRA LAYOUT,
OPP TO UNIQUE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL,
MARUTHI EXTENSION,
2ND STAGE, MALUR,
KOLAR DISTRICT.

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND PANCHAYAT RAJ,
M. S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND
UNDER SECRETARY
(GRAMA PANCHAYAT),



CNR: KAHC010325412021

NC: 2026:KHC:54026-DB
WP No. 16455 of 2021

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND PANCHAYAT RAJ,
M. S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560001.

3. THE ZILLA PANCHAYAT,
REPRESENTED BY C.E.O,
KOLAR-563101.
4. THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
TALUK PANCHAYAT,
OFFICE OF THE TALUK PANCHAYAT,
MULAGAGAL-563131.
5. ADDITIONAL REGISTER OF ENQUIRES-I
KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA,
DR AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
M.S.BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. S.C. DESHMUKH, AGA FOR R1 AND R2;
SRI. B.J. SOMAYAJI DV., FOR R4 (DECEASED);
SRI. ASHWIN S. HALADY, ADVOCATE FOR R5;
R3-SERVED)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR
RECORDS FROM HONBLE KARNATAKA ADMINISTRATIVE
TRIBUNAL IN APPLICATION No-2719/2020 AND ALSO
RECORDS IN NO-GRAAAAPA/206/GRAPAMKAA/2019
BENGALURU DATED 25.02.2020 VIDE ANNEXURE-C PLEASE TO
ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ORDER AND QUASH THE
ORDER DATED 25.02.2020 IN
GRAAAAPA/206/GRAPAMKAA/2019 BENGALURU VIDE
ANNEXURE-A16 IN APPLICATION No-2719/2020 SET ASIDE
THE ORDER DATED 06.08.2021 IN APPLICATION No-2719/2020



**NC: 2026:KHC:54026-DB
WP No. 16455 of 2021**

PASSED BY THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BANGALORE VIDE ANNEXURE-C AND CONSEQUENTLY ALLOW THE APPLICATION No-2719/2020.

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)

Seeking the Court to set aside the order passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bangalore in Application No.2719/2020 dated 06.08.2021 and consequently to quash the order dated 25.02.2020 in No.GraaAaPa/206/GraPamKaa/2019, Bengaluru, passed by the Disciplinary Authority, this writ petition is filed.

2. The facts which led the petitioner to file this writ petition as per the material available on record are that the petitioner succeeded one Sri.Rama Krishna Reddy who worked as Panchayath Development Officer, Abbenahalli Grama



CNR: KAHC010325412021

**NC: 2026:KHC:54026-DB
WP No. 16455 of 2021**

Panchayath, Malur Taluk, Kolar District. While officiating duties she registered a Sale Deed in respect of a site on behalf of Panchayath in the name of his Excellency the Governor of Karnataka without verifying the title of the vendor. On the ground that she purchased the said site without verifying the property documents, paid the sale consideration amount to the vendor and furnished false information to the higher officials, a departmental enquiry was conducted against her. The petitioner took a defense that she had only implemented the resolution passed by the Panchayath for the sale transaction and obtaining Sale Deed. By the time she took charge, the decision for purchasing the site was taken by the Panchayath and thus she has no role to play. However, the Enquiry Officer recorded a finding that the Disciplinary Authority has proved the charge levelled against her. In the recommendation made under Rule 14(A)(2)(d) of the Karnataka Civil Services (CCA) Rule, 1957, the Karnataka Lokayukta expressed its opinion that the doctrine of reasonable care imposes an obligation or a duty upon a person to take reasonable care in discharging of the duties and it is a matter of common prudence that the



documents would have been verified and a legal opinion would have been obtained before purchasing the immovable property.

3. The Disciplinary Authority finally passed order imposing penalty withholding three annual increments without cumulative effect. Aggrieved by the finding thus given, the petitioner knocked the doors of the Karnataka Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru. However, her application stood dismissed through the impugned order and aggrieved by the same, this writ petition is filed.

4. Heard Sri.Gowthamdev C. Ullal, learned counsel who represents for petitioner, Sri.S.C.Deshmukh, learned AGA, who represents for respondents No.1 and 2 and Sri.Ashwin S. Halady, learned counsel who represents respondent No.5.

5. Arguing the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner contended that by the time petitioner took charge as Panchayath Development Officer of Abbenahalli Grama Panchayath, entire process for purchasing the disputed site was completed. Petitioner was only a signatory to the Sale Deed. When the Panchayath has passed a resolution after



looking into each and every aspect of the case, it is not expected on part of the petitioner to re-verify entire papers. That apart, there is no allegation that the petitioner is guilty of entering into sale transaction with malafide intention or that she gained any monetary benefit. Thus, it is clear that the petitioner has no role to play in the process of purchasing the site. Without considering these aspects, the enquiry officer submitted his report and the same was confirmed by the Karnataka Lokayukta. Learned counsel ultimately states that the punishment imposed is disproportionate to the alleged misconduct and therefore, this Court is required to pass necessary orders.

6. Per contra, learned AGA as well as learned Standing counsel who represents Lokayukta submits that the petitioner being an officer holding responsible post is expected to verify all relevant documents before entering into sale transaction and signing the Sale Deed on behalf of the Governor of the State. The negligence on part of the petitioner in discharging her duties is borne by record and therefore the Disciplinary Authority has rightly taken a decision to impose penalty upon



CNR: KAHC010325412021

the petitioner. It is also submitted that the penalty imposed is minor and thus the petitioner should have no grievance.

7. Entire issue arose due to negligence on part of the officials in looking at all relevant documents and verifying the title of the subject property before entering into sale transaction. Undoubtedly liability vests upon the Panchayath Development Officer who holds a responsible position to verify the records thoroughly before putting signature on any of the documents. Here is a case where a sale transaction was entered into by the Panchayath by paying sale consideration for getting a property whose title is defective. Thus, when the totality of facts and circumstances is looked into, we are of the view that no error is committed either by the Enquiry Officer who held that the charge levelled against the petitioner is proved or the Disciplinary Authority which ultimately imposed penalty upon the petitioner. Further, as rightly contended, the penalty imposed is not disproportionate so as to interfere with. Thus, viewed from any angle, we find no grounds to grant the relief claimed.



CNR: KAHC010325412021

**NC: 2026:KHC:54026-DB
WP No. 16455 of 2021**

Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed.

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

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

AP
CT:TSM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 24