



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

WRIT PETITION NO. 15042 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF WOMEN AND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT EMPOWERMENT OF
DIFFERENTLY ABLED, AND SENIOR CITIZENS
3RD GATE, GROUND FLOOR, M.S.BUILDING,
DR B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE – 560 001.
2. THE DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF WOMEN AND CHILD
DEVELOPMENT, 2ND AND 3RD FLOOR,
PWD BUILDING CAMPUS,
ANANDA RAO CIRCLE, LAKSHMANPURI,
GANDHI NAGAR,
BENGALURU – 560 009

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. V.G.BHANUPRAKASH, AAG A/W
SRI. K.R.RAJENDRA, AGA)

AND:

1. SMT. SARITA NAIK
W/O SANTHOS NAIK,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
WORKING AS SUPERVISOR,
CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT OFFICE (CDPO),
KANAKAPURA TALUK,



RAMANAGARA,
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK – 562 117

R/AT NO 52, LA VASA,
R K FARM GATE, BYAGADADENAHALLI,
ANEKAL TALUK,
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT 562116

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. M.R.SHIVASHANKARAIH, ADVOCATE FOR C/R1)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS IN APPLICATION NO.22/2026 ON THE FILE OF THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 18/02/2026 IN APPLICATION NO.22/2026 PASSED BY THE HONBLE KSAT, BENGALURU VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT)

The State Authorities in the Department of Women and Child Development and Empowerment of Differently Abled and Senior Citizens are before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India questioning order dated 18.02.2026 in Application No.22/2026 passed by the



Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench at Bengaluru (for short, 'the Tribunal') allowing the respondent's application quashing impugned order dated 29.12.2025, by which the order of posting the respondent from Kanakapura to Anekal is cancelled.

2. Heard learned Additional Advocate General Sri.V.G.Bhanuprakash along with Sri.K.R.Rajendra, learned Additional Government Advocate for petitioners/State and learned counsel Sri.M.R.Shivashankaraiah for respondent. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

3. The respondent was working as Supervisor in the second petitioner department. While she was working at Anekal as Supervisor, she was transferred to Kanakapura by order dated 27.06.2024. Immediately thereafter, the respondent is said to have reported to duty at the transferred place Kanakapura. The respondent is holding Group-C post and four years tenure is provided to



Group-C post. Thereafter on 06.12.2025, again the respondent was transferred from Kanakapura to Anekal. However, it is stated that the respondent was not relieved at Kanakapura so as to enable her to report at Anekal. Subsequently, by order dated 29.12.2025 of the second petitioner, order dated 06.12.2025 transferring respondent from Kanakapura to Anekal was cancelled. Questioning the said cancellation order dated 29.12.2025, the respondent was before the Tribunal and the Tribunal under the impugned order quashed the order dated 29.12.2025 cancelling the respondent's transfer from Kanakapura to Anekal. The Tribunal in view of the fact that there was no approval of the Chief Minister to the order dated 06.12.2025, quashed the impugned order dated 29.12.2025.

4. Learned Additional Advocate General Sri.V.G.Bhanuprakash for petitioners would submit that there is a shortage of Supervisors at Kanakapura, as such, transfer of petitioner from Kanakapura to Anekal was



cancelled directing the respondent to continue at Kanakapura. It is submitted that out of 10 posts of Supervisors, only 3 were posted and out of 3, one is on unauthorized absence. Therefore, the respondent's transfer to Anekal was cancelled. It is his submission that in the exigencies of administration, the services of the respondent would be necessary at Kanakapura. Therefore, he prays for allowing the writ petition and to set aside the impugned order passed by the Tribunal.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel Sri.M.R.Shivashankaraiah for respondent would submit that the petitioners have not relieved the respondent on her transfer from Kanakapura to Anekal and in the meanwhile, the said order was cancelled by order dated 29.12.2025, without obtaining approval from the Chief Minister, which is required in terms of the transfer guidelines which were prevailing at the time of passing the order. Thus, he would pray for dismissal of the writ petition.



6. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties on 15.06.2025, we directed learned Additional Advocate General to produce original file relating to impugned order of cancellation dated 29.12.2025 and accordingly the file relating to impugned order of cancellation of transfer dated 29.12.2025 is produced. We have gone through the records relating to impugned cancellation of transfer. On perusal of the note sheet relating to impugned order of cancellation of transfer, the Tribunal is justified in coming to the conclusion that the cancellation of transfer is without the approval from the Chief Minister. The transfer guidelines which were in existence as on that day required approval of the Chief Minister for transfer beyond general transfer period. The original file after perusal is returned to the learned Additional Advocate General.

7. We do not find any error or irregularity in the order passed by the Tribunal. No ground is made out by



the petitioners to interfere with the order passed by the Tribunal.

8. Accordingly, writ petition stands rejected. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to effect transfer in accordance with law, by recording reasons and in the exigencies of administration.

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

**SD/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE**

NC
CT: RK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 30