



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF JUNE, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO. 15889 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI SHIVAKUMAR M S/O MALLAIAH
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
WORKING AS INSPECTOR OF POLICE
BESCOM VIGILANCE, RAMANAGARA
BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT AND
R/AT LAKSHMINARASIMHA APARTMENT
2ND CROSS, CHANNAPPA NAIDU LAYOUT
BANASHANKARI, BENGALURU-560085.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. D.R. RAVISHANKAR, SR. COUNSEL A/W
SRI SARAVANA S., ADV.)

Digitally signed by
NANTUN DACHARI
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOME (POLICE)
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BENGALURU – 560001.
2. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL AND
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
KARNATAKA STATE,
NRUPATUNGA ROAD
BENGALURU - 560001.



3. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
BESCOM VIGILANCE, NO.15
4TH FLOOR VECTRA HOUSE
1ST MAIN ROAD, 6TH CROSS
GAHANDHINAGAR,
BENGALURU – 560009.
4. SRI RAVIKUMAR H K
MAJOR
CRIME INVESTIGATION DEPARTMENT
BENGALURU
(NOW UNDER ORDERS OF
TRANSFER TO
BESCOM VIGILANCE,
RAMANAGARA
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT 562159)

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V SHIVAREDDY, AGA FOR R1 TO R3
SRI VIJAYA RAGHAVA SARATHY, ADV. FOR R4)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 20.05.2026 PASSED BY THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL COURT HALL NO.3, IN APPLICATION NO.2618/2026, AS PER ANNEXURE-B AND B) PASS SUCH OTHER ORDER OR DIRECTION AS THIS COURT MAY DEEM FIT AND PROPER IN THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
AND
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO



ORAL ORDER

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

The petitioner is before this Court questioning the interim order dated 20.05.2026 in Application No.2618/2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at Bengaluru (for short "Tribunal"), refusing to stay the order of cancellation of transfer dated 13.05.2026 (Annexure-A9).

2. Heard learned senior counsel Sri.D.R.Ravishankar for learned counsel Sri.Saravana S, learned counsel for petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate Sri.V.Shivareddy for respondents No.1 to 3 and Sri.Vijaya Raghava Sarathy, learned counsel for Caveator/respondent No.4. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

3. Learned senior counsel Sri.Ravishankar for petitioner would submit that the Tribunal committed a grave error in not granting interim order when the petitioner has made



out prima-facie case. It is submitted that the petitioner was working as Police Inspector at Maddur and he was kept under suspension on 11.09.2025 and his lien was shifted to State Intelligence. Thereafter, on 16.02.2026, suspension of the petitioner was revoked and he was continued at State Intelligence. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner would submit that on revocation of suspension of the petitioner, he sought posting to an executive post which was considered by the respondents and the petitioner was provided a posting as Inspector of Police, BESCOM vigilance squad under order dated 10.05.2026, which was cancelled by order dated 13.05.2026 by posting respondent No.4 in his place. Questioning the said order of cancellation of transfer, the petitioner was before the Tribunal and sought interim order to stay of the order dated 13.05.2026. However, the Tribunal under impugned order refused to stay the order of cancellation of transfer, observing that the petitioner has not made out a case to stay the operation of



the impugned order. Questioning the impugned order passed by the Tribunal, the petitioner is before this Court.

4. Learned senior counsel for petitioner would contend that the petitioner reported to duty at the transferred place at BESCO, vigilance squad. Ramanagara, however, without assigning any reason, the same was cancelled by an order dated 13.05.2026. Learned senior counsel would submit that observations of the Tribunal that respondent No.4 reported to duty and as the order of cancellation of transfer is implemented, the petitioner would not be entitled for any interim order is baseless. Learned senior counsel would submit that respondent No.4 was not relieved of his duties and he could not have reported to duty. Further, learned senior counsel referring to Annexure-C memo dated 18.05.2026 submits that the petitioner is not relieved of his duties and respondent No.4 has not reported to duty. Therefore, the Tribunal ought to have considered the interim prayer of the petitioner in his favour. In addition to the above grounds, learned senior



counsel also urged other grounds which are urged before the Tribunal and prayed for allowing the writ petition.

5. Learned counsel Sri.Vijaya Raghava Sarathy for respondent No.4 would submit that respondent No.4 reported to duty at the transferred place on 14.05.2026 and the said duty report was accepted by the Superintendent of Police, BESCOM under Annexure-R3 dated 14.05.2026 and in the said memo itself, the petitioner was relieved of his duties from BESCOM. Thus, learned counsel justifies the order passed by the Tribunal and prayed for dismissal of the writ petition.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the entire writ petition papers, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned interim order passed by the Tribunal. Whether the impugned order of cancellation of transfer is in accordance with law or whether the same is opposed to Section 20F of the Karnataka Police Act, is to be examined by the Tribunal at the time of disposal of the application. Moreover, it is



seen that suspension of the petitioner was revoked on 16.02.2026 and was continued in State Intelligence. Whether the petitioner was relieved from his duties at State Intelligence so as to enable him to report to duty at the transferred place i.e. BESCO, Ramanagara is to be examined by the Tribunal. There is no material placed on record to establish whether the petitioner was relieved from the State Intelligence. Learned senior counsel contended that the petitioner was not given reposting pursuant to revocation of suspension of the petitioner, as such he had not reported to duty at State Intelligence. The said contention is also to be examined by the Tribunal as no material is placed on record before this Court. Further when the suspension of the petitioner is revoked and he is continued in State Intelligence, no further reposting would be necessary. The order of transfer dated 10.05.2026 as well as order of cancellation of transfer dated 13.05.2026 would make it clear that the Head of the Unit or Department shall relieve the concerned transferred



Officer so as to enable him to report to duty at transferred place.

7. In that background, we are not inclined to entertain the writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition stands rejected. Since, the subject matter of application is transfer, the Tribunal shall endeavor for early disposal.

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

**Sd/-
(DR.K.MANMADHA RAO)
JUDGE**

MPK
CT:bms
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 4