



CNR: KAHC010403262026

NC: 2026:KHC:45660-DB
WP No. 18047 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G BASAVARAJA

WRIT PETITION NO. 18047 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI. GOVINDARAJ H.G.
S/O LATE H.P. GANESH,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS
DEPUTY TAHSILDAR,
DUDDA HOBLI,
HASSAN TALUK,
HASSAN DISTRICT-573 201.
RESIDING AT NO.3426,
NEAR OPEN UNIVERSITY,
S.M. KRISHNA NAGAR,
ARASIKERE ROAD,
HASSAN-573 201.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NARASIMHARAJU, ADVOCATE (PH))

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560 001.



**NC: 2026:KHC:45660-DB
WP No. 18047 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010403262026

2. THE REGIONAL COMMISSIONER
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
MYSURU DIVISION,
MYSURU-570 001.
3. SRI. A.S. HARISH
S/O SHIVANNA A.H.,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS A
DEPUTY TAHSILDAR,
DUDDA NADA KACHERI,
DUDDA HOBLI,
HASSAN DISTRICT AND TALUK,
R/O. NO.56, H.N. PURA ROAD,
DEVAMMA TEMPLE ROAD,
CHANNARAYAPATNA POST,
DEVAMMA EXTENSION,
HASSAN-573 201.
4. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
HASSAN DISTRICT,
DC OFFICE,
MANGALORE ROAD,
RANGOLI HALL,
HASSAN-573 201.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B.O. ANIL KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR C/R-3 &
ALSO ACCEPTS NOTICE FOR R-3;
SMT. MALA B. BHUTE, AGA FOR R-1, R-2 & R-4 (PH))

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE 'WRIT OF CERTIORARI' BY QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 10.06.2026 PASSED BY THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL IN APPLICATION NOS.4806/2025 C/W 2190/2026 AS PER ANNEXURE-A AND CONSEQUENTLY DISMISS THE APPLICATIONS NOS.4806/2025 C/W 2190/2026 FILED BEFORE KSAT BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.



**NC: 2026:KHC:45660-DB
WP No. 18047 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010403262026

THIS WRIT PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON 14.08.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G BASAVARAJA

CAV ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ)

The petitioner has assailed the order dated 10.06.2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal ('KSAT' for short), in application Nos.4806/2025 c/w 2190/2026 (Annexure-A) and consequently, seeking to quash the impugned order and to dismiss the applications.

2. Vide Annexure-A1 dated 14.06.2025, the 2nd respondent issued an official reminder by which, the 3rd respondent herein, working as Deputy Tahsildar, Mallipattana Hobli, Arakalgud Taluk, Hassan District, was transferred to Dudda, Hassan Taluk and District, where the petitioner was working as a Deputy Tahsildar, and



CNR: KAHC010403262026

vice-versa. Vide Annexure-A3 dated 16.09.2025, the 1st respondent passed an order continuing the petitioner at Dudda Hobli, Hassan Taluk and District. No placement was shown to 3rd respondent. The same was challenged by the 3rd respondent before the KSAT on the ground that, his transfer is premature and he was disturbed from the post, at the behest of the petitioner herein, whereas, the petitioner has worked under the limits of Dudda Nadakacheri, Hassan Taluk and District for over 20 years and has worked as Deputy Tahsildar at Dudda for more than four years. It was also contended that the transfer order was fully implemented and both the parties have reported for duty in the places of transfer, and therefore, the impugned orders are in violation of transfer guidelines and settled law etc.

3. The KSAT has quashed the order dated 16.09.2025, at Annexure-A3, passed by the 1st respondent and the letter dated 07.11.2025, at Annexure-A4 in A.No.4806/2025, and the order dated 04.04.2026



**NC: 2026:KHC:45660-DB
WP No. 18047 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010403262026

at Annexure-A5 in A.No.2190/2026, issued by the 2nd respondent. Further, held that the applicant/3rd respondent herein, was entitled to continue as Deputy Tahsildar, Dudda, Hassan Taluk and District, till he completes his tenure or his transfer is necessitated in accordance with law. Further, the KSAT has also directed the respondents to provide suitable posting to the petitioner herein.

4. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that there is an inquiry against the 3rd respondent initiated, as he was trapped by the Lokayukta Police, while he was working as Deputy Tahsildar and therefore, after noticing the same, and in consonance with the transfer guidelines dated 25.06.2024, he was transferred and posted as Election Sheristadar, Kadur Taluk, Chikkamagalur District, a non-executive post. It is his contention that when an inquiry against the official is pending/initiated, he shall not be given an Executive post, as held by this Court in B.R.Ravi v. State of



CNR: KAHC010403262026

Karnataka in W.P.No.44085/2015 and W.P.No.1991/2020 in case of N.S.Chidananda v. State of Karnataka.

5. The learned counsel for the 3rd respondent contended that the petitioner was transferred from Dudda, as he had completed a tenure of more than four years and the 3rd respondent had also worked at Mallipatna for four years. The subsequent transfer was at the behest of the petitioner and not because of any inquiry pending against the 3rd respondent. He further contended that, even against the petitioner an inquiry was initiated by the Lokayukta, which culminated in imposing a penalty against him withholding two increments. He contended that insofar as inquiry initiated against the 3rd respondent, the same has been challenged and the said inquiry is stayed by this Court.

6. The learned AGA has filed statement of objections. She submitted that by virtue of the order passed by the KSAT, the petitioner has been given posting



**NC: 2026:KHC:45660-DB
WP No. 18047 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010403262026

as Election Shirestheadar at Holenarasipura, Hassan District, and he has already assumed the charge in the said post on 30.06.2026.

7. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was working as Deputy Tahsildar, Dudda Nadakacheri, Hassan District, and he worked there from 19.10.2020 and completed his minimum tenure of service. By virtue of Annexure-A1 dated 14.06.2025, he was transferred as Deputy Tahsildar, Malipatna Hobli, Arakalgud Taluk, Hassan District, in the place of 3rd respondent herein and vice-versa. It is also not in dispute that both were relieved from the place of transfer and reported for duty to the places where they were transferred. When such is the case, subsequent order at Annexure-A3 dated 16.9.2025, where no reasons are assigned, is not sustainable. It is pertinent to note that the petitioner has worked as Deputy Tahsildar at Dudda from 19.10.2020 till 16.06.2025 and completed more than four years of service. During general transfer, vide Annexure-A1 dated



CNR: KAHC010403262026

14.06.2025, the petitioner and the 3rd respondent herein were transferred. Once the transfer order is implemented, it is not permissible either to modify or cancel without assigning any reasons. The 3rd respondent was disturbed pre-maturely, without assigning any reasons, after the general transfer period, hence, the KSAT was justified in passing the impugned order.

8. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the 3rd respondent was given a non-executive post in view of the pending inquiry, and the subsequent transfer order at Annexure-A3 was not at the behest of the petitioner etc., cannot be accepted. We have noticed that no reasons are assigned in the subsequent order of transfer for retaining or continuing the petitioner at Dudda or while transferring the 3rd respondent as Election Shirestheadar, Kadur Taluk, Chikkamagaluru District, which order, he challenged in A.No.2190/2026. The said posting was obviously not on the ground that an inquiry is pending against him. The



CNR: KAHC010403262026

**NC: 2026:KHC:45660-DB
WP No. 18047 of 2026**

cancellation of the transfer order dated 14.6.2025 vide Annexure-A1 and posting of petitioner again to the earlier post, where he had already worked for more than four years, and thereby disturbing the 3rd respondent within three months was illegal and quashing of the impugned orders by the KSAT was therefore justified. Further, as submitted by the learned AGA, the petitioner has now taken charge at the place where he has been transferred. There is no merit in the writ petition. Accordingly, the petition is **dismissed**.

No costs.

**Sd/-
(MOHAMMAD NAWAZ)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(G BASAVARAJA)
JUDGE**