



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.17185 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI. SOMASHEKAR.G.
S/O GANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
WORKING AS JAIL WARDER,
BAYALU BHANDIKANE,
DEVANAHALLI, AAVATHI POST,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT.

RESIDING AT THYAGADAHALLI,
MANDIGERE, NELAMANGALA,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU-562123.

Digitally signed
by
SHARADAVANI
B
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SIDHARTH BABURAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF HOME



(PRISONS AND CINEMA),
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560001.

2. THE ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL
OF POLICE DEPARTMENT OF PRISON AND
REFORMS SERVICE,
(DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE),
POLICE HEADQUARTERS,
NO.2, NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V.SHIVAREDDY, AGA)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT, ORDER
OR DIRECTION IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI TO QUASH
THE ORDER DATED 02/01/2024 MADE IN APPLICATION
NO.3172/2022 AT ANNEXURE-A PASSED BY THE KARNATAKA
STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU BENCH 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 DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO



ORAL ORDER

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

An unsuccessful applicant before the Tribunal is before this Court in this writ petition questioning the order dated 02.01.2024 in Application No.3172/2022, by which the petitioner's prayer to quash the order of penalty of withholding one annual increment for a period of one year without cumulative effect for proved misconduct is rejected.

2. Heard Sri. Sidharth Baburao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri. V.Shivareddy, learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

3. While the petitioner was working as Jail Viewer at Central Prison, Bengaluru, a charge memo came to be issued to the petitioner alleging that the petitioner has failed to view CCTV on 30.08.2016 at about 9:00 a.m., when one prisoner by name David @ Arya escaped in a vegetable van, which amounted to misconduct in terms of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957, as well as violation of Jail Manual. The State conducted a detailed



enquiry and held that alleged charge is proved. The petitioner was issued with second show-cause notice along with enquiry report and the petitioner is said to have submitted his reply to the second show-cause notice. The Disciplinary Authority imposed punishment of withholding one annual increment for a period of one year without cumulative effect under order dated 06.05.2019. Against which, the petitioner filed an appeal before the State Government and the State Government under order dated 02.03.2022 dismissed the appeal. Questioning the order of penalty as well as Appellate Order, the petitioner was before the Tribunal in the above stated application.

4. The Tribunal on considering the rival contentions of the parties, under order dated 02.01.2024 rejected the prayer of the petitioner to quash the order of penalty. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court in this writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the findings of the Enquiry Officer as well as order of penalty is opposed to the material on record. Learned counsel further submits that the Guard at main gate ought to have



checked the vehicle which was going out from jail premises and he failed to properly check the vehicle. However, the Government allowed the appeal of Guard on the ground that the said R.V.Umesh was not working on the said date. Further, learned counsel submitted that totally there were 97 cameras in 04 monitors, screens were very small which escaped the petitioner's attention. Further, learned counsel would submit that the escaped prisoner was traced and he was brought back, which aspect has not been taken into consideration by the Disciplinary Authority while imposing the punishment.

6. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents would support the order passed by the Tribunal and further would submit that if the petitioner were to be alert while viewing CC Camera screening, the convict could not have escaped from the Central Jail. Thus, he submits that for the proved misconduct, minor punishment has been imposed and prays for dismissal of the writ petition.

7. 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 order passed by the Tribunal as



well as the order of penalty passed by the Disciplinary Authority.

8. The petitioner was working as Jail Viewer and his main duty was to observe the CCTV screening and the movement of the prisoners in the Central Jail. On 30.08.2016, when a prisoner or convict escaped from the Central Prison at about 8:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., the petitioner has failed to identify in the screening the escaping of the said prisoner. The said charge is proved against the petitioner. For the proved misconduct, the petitioner has been imposed with very minor punishment. The grounds urged by the petitioner would not merit any consideration. The petitioner has failed to establish that he had properly viewed the CCTV screens. However, the petitioner cannot blame the Guard who was at the main gate. The misconduct alleged against the Guard at main gate and against the petitioner is entirely different. The petitioner who is a Jail Viewer cannot compare himself with main gate Guard. Thus, we do not find any error in the order passed by the Tribunal. The Tribunal taking note of the prison manual and the evidence of PW.1, has rightly rejected the application.



**NC: 2026:KHC:33721-DB
WP No. 17185 of 2026**

Hence, we do not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly the same stands ***rejected***.

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

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

SMJ
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 24