



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 5TH 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. 16506 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI B N NATARAJA,
S/O LATE NARASHIMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
WORKING AS SECOND DIVISION ASSISTANT,
OFFICE OF THE SUB REGISTRAR,
HESARAGHATTA,
H C PUTTASWAMY LAYOUT,
NEAR NEW BUS STAND,
OPPOSITE TO KEB OFFICE,
HESARAGHATTA,
BANGALORE -560 088.

R/AT NO.347/1, 2ND MAIN ROAD,
JAGAJYOTHI LAYOUT,
MARIYAPPANA PALYA,
BANGALORE - 560 056.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SATISH K., ADV.)



AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
M S BUILDING,
BANGALORE - 560 001.
2. THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF REGISTRATION
AND COMMISSIONER OF STAMPS,
8TH FLOOR, KANDAYA BHAVAN,
K G ROAD, BANGALORE- 560 009.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K.R. RAJENDRA, AGA)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) CALL FOR RECORDS FROM THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BANGALORE IN RESPECT OF THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 02.06.2026 PASSED IN APPLICATION NO. 2705/2026 (ANNEXURE-A) AND ETC.

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, a Second Division Assistant working at Sub-Registrar Office, Hesaraghatta, Bangalore is before this Court, questioning the order dated 02.06.2026 passed in Application No.2705/2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at Bengaluru (for short "Tribunal"), rejecting petitioner's prayer for stay of transfer O.M. dated 27.05.2026, transferring him to District Registrar Office at Jayanagar, Bangalore.

2. Heard learned counsel Sri.K.Satish for petitioner and Sri.K.R.Rajendra, learned Additional Government Advocate for respondents No.1 and 2.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was posted to the present post on 02.12.2022. Under impugned order dated 27.05.2026, the petitioner is transferred from Hesaraghatta to District Registrar Office at Jayanagar even before he completes his



tenure of 4 years. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has completed 3 years 5 months and has a tenure till December 2026. As such, he submits that the transfer of the petitioner is premature. Further, learned counsel would submit that in terms of Transfer Guidelines, transfer within the Head Quarters would also amount to a transfer and in identical fact situations, the Tribunal had granted interim prayer. However, in the instant case, the Tribunal refused to stay the order of transfer. Thus, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for allowing the writ petition and to grant interim prayer as prayed for before the Tribunal. Further learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that by the time the Tribunal considers the petitioner's application and passes orders, the petitioner would complete his tenure, as such, the application before the Tribunal would become unnecessary.

4. 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 order dated 02.06.2026 passed by the Tribunal refusing to stay the transfer of the petitioner.

5. No doubt, posting within the Head Quarters from one office to another office is a transfer as per the Transfer Guidelines. But, that itself would not give right to the petitioner to enforce his right unless he demonstrates as to how he is aggrieved or how it affects his service conditions. When the petitioner is posted from one office to another office within Bangalore, no hardship would be caused to the petitioner.

6. The contention that in identical fact situations, the Tribunal has granted interim order is noted only for the purpose of rejecting the same as precedents do not apply in the matter of grant of interim prayer and it would depend on the facts of each case.

7. We do not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly, the writ petition stands ***rejected***.



It is open for the petitioner to seek early disposal of the application before the Tribunal. If such prayer is made, we are sure that the Tribunal would consider the same and take up the application for disposal, as expeditiously as possible.

SD/-
(S.G.PANDIT)
JUDGE

SD/-
(DR.K.MANMADHA RAO)
JUDGE

MPK
CT:bms
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 6