



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH 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. 17798 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI. M. SHARASCHCHANDRA BABU
S/O LATE B. MUNIYAPA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.102, 2ND FLOOR
PALLAVA TERRACR APARTMENT
JAYANAGAR 6TH BLOCK
BANASHANKARI II STAGE
KANAKAPURA NORTH MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE-560 070

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV MALIMATH, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by PANKAJA S
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
MS BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. THE REGIONAL COMMISSIONER
AND DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY
BANGALORE DIVISION,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE



2ND FLOOR, BMTC BUILDING,
K.H ROAD, SHANTHINAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 027.

...RESPONDENT

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

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER WRIT, QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 20/05/2026 (ANNEXURE-D) IN SO FAR AS IT FAILS TO GRANT THE AD-INTERIM EX-PARTE INTERIM RELIEF TO THE PETITIONER HEREIN.

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 MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K)

In this writ petition the petitioner assailed the order dated 20.05.2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru (for brevity, 'the Tribunal') in Application No.2579/2026.

2. The factual matrix of the case is that the petitioner is working as Social Security Scheme Shirastedar, Taluk Office, Bangalore Dakshina Taluk, Bangalore City District and based on the complaint, the disciplinary proceedings initiated against him and thereafter, the disciplinary authority-respondent No.2 has



suspended the petitioner vide order dated 30.04.2026 in Order No.RCB/TAHB/CCA/28/2026. The said order has been challenged by the petitioner before the Tribunal.

3. Challenging the same the petitioner filed the application before the Tribunal and sought an interim prayer to stay the suspension order before the Tribunal. However, the Tribunal issued notice to the respondent/State to file reply statement to the interim prayer. The said order has been challenged in this writ petition.

4. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents.

5. The primary contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the suspension order is not in accordance with law and the disciplinary authority has not considered the Rule 10(3) of Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957 (for brevity, 'the CCA Rules, 1957') and not examined the materials and allegations raised against the petitioner. As such, the same is bad in law. Hence, the said order has to be set aside.



6. *Per contra*, learned Additional Government Advocate submits that despite issuing show cause notice to the petitioner, he failed to respond to the show cause notice. As such, the authority has rightly passed the suspension order.

7. We have given our anxious consideration both on the submission made by the learned counsel for the parties and perused the suspension order and other documents on record.

8. As could be gathered from the suspension order, sufficient opportunity has been provided to the petitioner to response on the allegations made against him. However, he failed to do so. In such circumstance, left with no other option the authority has passed the order of suspension. At present, the petitioner has already challenged the same and the matter is pending for adjudication before the Tribunal. At this stage we are unable to accept the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that Section 10(3) of the CCA Rules, 1957 is not complied with, hence, we are declined to allow this writ petitioner by granting an interim prayer. However, a week's time granted to the learned Additional Government Advocate to file his statement of objection if any before the Tribunal and



thereafter, the Tribunal shall consider the main prayer of the petitioner in accordance with law at the earliest.

With this direction the writ petition is ***disposed of***.

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

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

CR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 10