

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN

CCC NO. 764 OF 2024 (CIVIL)



BETWEEN:

1. SRI CHANDRASHEKARA REDDY K M
S/O MUNIREDDY B
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
BAGEPALLI RANGE, BAGEPALLI TALUK
CHIKKABALLAPURA DISTRICT-562101
2. SRI SHIVAKUMAR H M
S/O M M HIREMATH
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
WORKING PLAN, BELLARY TALUK
BELLARY DISTRICT-583101
3. SRI MAHESH NAIK C
S/O CHANDRA NAIK
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
RANGAYYANADURGA WILDLIFE SANCTUARY
JAGALURU TALUK-577528
4. SRI SHANKAR ANTHARAGATTI
S/O GUNDAPPA
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
SOCIAL FORESTRY RANGE
SAVADATTI TALUK
BELAGAVI DISTRICT-590001

Digitally
signed by
VASANTHA
KUMARY B
K
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

5. SRI RAVIKEERTHI K N
S/O NARAYANAPPA K V
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
SOCIAL FORESTRY RANGE
MULABAGILU TALUK-517247
KOLAR DISTRICT
6. SRI MAHESH MARENNAVAR
S/O BALACHANDRA
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
BHIMAGAD WILDLIFE SANCTUARY
HEMMADAGA-591302, KHANPURA TALUK
BELAGAVI DISTRICT
7. SMT. VANISHREE HEGDE
D/O M D HEGDE
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
GOLIHALLI RANGE
KHANAPURA TALUK-591302
BELAGAVI DISTRICT
8. NIVEDITHA T P
D/O PARAMESHWARAPPA T L
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
ITC WING, ARANYA BHAVAN
18TH CROSS, MALLESHWARAM
BENGALURU-560003
9. POORNIKA RANI B J
D/O JAGANATH
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
GUDIBANDE RANGE
CHIKKABALLAPURA DISTRICT-562101
CHIKKABALLAPURA DISTRICT
10. SRI RAGHAVENDRA H P
S/O PALAKSHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER

SAKALESHPURA RESEARCH RANGE
ARANYA BHAVAN, DAIRY CIRCLE
HASSAN-573202

11. SRI MAHANTESH PETLUR
S/O RAMACHANDRA PETLUR
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
RESEARCH CENTRE
DHARWAD TALUK-580001
DHARWAD DISTRICT
12. SRI RAJESH GAVAL A
S/O K M APPALAPPA K M
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
SOCIAL FORESTRY RANGE
BAGEPALLI-561207
CHIKKABALLAPURA DISTRICT
13. SRI VINOD ANGADI
S/O LAXMAN ANGADI
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
KAKATHI RANGE, BELAGAVI TALUK-590001
BELAGAVI DISTRICT
14. SRI VARUN KUMAR
S/O VASUDEVA REDDY S T
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
HOSAKOTE RANGE
HOSAKOTE TALUK
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-560067
15. SMT. PADMASHREE N
S/O NANJAPPA M
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
SOCIAL FORESTRY RANGE
PERIYAPATNA TALUK-562114
MYSURU DISTRICT

16. SMT. SHRUTHI B M
D/O MALLESHA
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS
WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
SOCIAL FORESTRY RANGE
HOLENARASIPURA
HASSAN DISTRICT-573201
17. SRI VINAY J R
S/O RAJU
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS
WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
SAKKREBYLU WILDLIFE RANGE
GAJANUR, SHIVAMOGGA TALUK
AND DISTRICT-577201
18. SRI NAGARJUN N
S/O NAGARAJAPPA P T
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
SOCIAL FORESTRY RANGE
SHIDLAGATTA-562105
CHIKKABALLAPURA DISTRICT
19. SMT. DHANYASHREE M R
D/O RAJU M
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
GREENING URBAN RANGE
ASHOKAPURA, MYSURU-570008
20. SRI BASAVARAJ M
S/O MALLIKARJUNA M
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
NOW WORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER
GOVERNMENT TIMBER DEPOT
DANDELI-581325
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT

...COMPLAINANTS

(BY SRI P.S. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI B.O. ANIL KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI P C RAY, IFS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
FOREST, ECOLOGY AND
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
ROOM NO.442, 4TH FLOOR
GATE NO.2, M.S. BUILDING
BENGALURU-560001
**(V/O DATED 05.03.2026,
ACCUSED NO.1 IS DISCHARGED
FROM CONTEMPT OF COURT)**
2. DR. MEENAKSHI NEGI, IFS
PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS
ARANYA BHAVAN, 18TH CROSS
MALLESHWARAM, BENGALURU-560 003
**(V/O DATED 05.03.2026, THE PRESENT
PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF
FORESTS HAS BEEN IMPLEADED)**

...ACCUSED

3. STATE OF KARNATAKA
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
FOREST, ECOLOGY AND
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
M.S. BUILDING, BENGALURU-560001

...PROFORMA
RESPONDENT NO.3

(BY SRI REUBEN JACOB, AAG A/W
SRI BHAIKAV KUTTAIAH, AGA)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 215 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA R/W SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR WANTONLY, DELIBERATELY AND WILLFULLY DISOBEYING THE FINAL ORDER DATED 26.05.2023 PASSED BY THIS COURT IN W.P.NO.5453/2022 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON 22.09.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH** PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN

CAV ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging non-compliance and willful disobedience of the judgment and order dated 26.05.2023 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.P.No.5453/2022.
2. The complainants/petitioners had approached the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal (KSAT) in Application Nos.6754-6885/2020 for the relief that the *inter se* Seniority List dated 19.11.2020 insofar as it concerns the respondent Nos.5 to 7 in the writ petition be quashed and a direction be issued to the official respondents to re-do the seniority list strictly in accordance with the Government orders, circulars and relevant Rules.
3. The petitioners are direct recruits to the post of Range Forest Officer (RFO) on various dates. The recruitment to the post of RFO is from two sources i.e., by way of direct recruitment and by way of promotion from the cadre of Deputy Range Forest Officer (DRFO) in the ratio of 50:50. The feeder

cadre to the promotional quota for the post of RFO is from amongst the DRFO. The feeder cadre to the next promotional post of Assistant Conservator of Forests (ACF) is from the post of RFOs. The recruitment to the post of ACF is in the ratio of 75% by way of promotion and 25% by way of direct recruitment.

4. The cause for filing Application Nos.6754-6885/2020 before the KSAT was the seniority list/gradation list prepared by the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests for the purpose of granting promotion to the eligible RFOs for the post of ACF. It was alleged by the applicants that the gradation list was contrary to the Karnataka Forest Department Services (Recruitment) Rules, 2012 and against the decision in the case of **V.B. BADAMI AND OTHERS vs STATE OF MYSORE AND OTHERS ([1976] 2 SCC 901)**. The KSAT did not find merit in the case of the applicants and therefore, dismissed the applications vide order dated 15.02.2021 against which, the aforesaid writ petition came to be filed.

5. The Division Bench of this Court, vide judgment and order dated 26.05.2023, has set aside the order dated 15.02.2021 passed in the aforesaid applications and remitted the matter

back to the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests to re-do the seniority list in the light of the observations made in its order and strictly in accordance with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in **V.B. BADAMI**'s case (*supra*) and also as per the provisions of Rule 2 of the Karnataka State Civil Services (Regulation of Promotion, Pay and Pension) Rules, 1978 (hereinafter referred to as 'the said Rules of 1978'). It was further directed that the exercise of drawing of fresh seniority list was to be completed within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

6. As directed by the Division Bench of this Court, a fresh seniority list came to be issued on 29.06.2024.

7. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging that though the Division Bench has made a specific observation that the seniority list shall be drawn strictly in accordance with the law and the provisions of the said Rules of 1978, the alleged contemnor/accused No.2 viz., Principal Chief Conservator of Forests has finalized the seniority list of Range Forest Officer dated 29.06.2024 ignoring not just the directions of this Court, but also the objections/legal notice issued to the accused No.2 by the complainants/petitioners. Therefore, this seniority list

would amount to willful disobedience of the judgment and order dated 26.05.2023 passed by this Court in W.P.No.5453/2022.

8. It is further alleged that the final Seniority List dated 29.06.2024 is exactly similar to that which was previously quashed by this Court vide order dated 26.05.2023. While finalizing the seniority list, the accused No.2 has referred to a judgment of the Supreme Court stating that "*no retrospective promotion can be given and no seniority can be given a retrospective basis from the date when an employee has not been born*". The view taken by the accused No.2 is against the specific directions of this Court and the accused No.2 has resorted to interpreting the directions in the manner convenient to him. It is submitted that as the seniority list prepared by the accused No.2 is in violation of the judgment and order dated 26.05.2023 passed by this Court, the accused No.2 is guilty of committing contempt of this Court.

9. In pursuance to the notice issued in this contempt petition, an affidavit of compliance dated 26.09.2024 has been filed. In the compliance affidavit, it has been pointed out that there are appreciable, significant and conspicuous differences between the Seniority List dated 19.11.2020 which was

quashed by this Court and the re-done Seniority List published on 29.06.2024. It has been stated that the fresh seniority list is as per the judgment of the Supreme Court in **V.B.BADAMI's** case (*supra*). The seniority list clearly reflects the 50:50 quota for direct recruitment and promotional recruitment. When the exercise to re-do the seniority list was being done in pursuance to the order passed by this Court dated 26.05.2023 in W.P.No.5453/2022, the Vacancy Register contents were also checked and several mistakes were found such as, some of the names included therein were of those persons (of Forester Cadre) who worked on in-charge basis in the post of Range Forest Officer as per Rule 32 of the KCSR. Some names were in the Vacancy Register Block 15.11.1994 onwards as Sl.Nos.4, 5, 23 and 27 to 29 and these inclusions are against the provisions of the KCSR. The Vacancy Register has now been corrected and updated. It has been further stated in the compliance affidavit that the Seniority List dated 29.06.2024 has been finalized as per the revised vacancy list by correcting the errors noticed in the Promotion and Direct Recruitment quota as per the directions of this Court in W.P.No.5453/2022.

10. An additional compliance affidavit has been filed on 17.01.2026. In paragraph 6 of the said affidavit, it has been

specifically stated that in the finalized Seniority List published on 29.06.2024, the anomalies observed by this Court in the judgment dated 26.05.2023 passed in W.P.No.5453/2022 have been duly addressed. The anomalies addressed have been enlisted in the said paragraph, which would read as under:-

"i) Block periods have been maintained properly as per DPAR guidelines dated: 05.07.1976. In the previous seniority list, there were 28 block periods. In the finalized seniority list, there are 39 block periods.

ii) The previous seniority list had clubbed HK local cadre and Non-HK residual parent cadre of Range Forest Officers. In the Seniority list published on 29.06.24 both cadres were segregated and published separately.

iii) In each block period Vacancies were assigned to DR (Direct Recruitment or PR (Promotional Recruitment) quota as per the prevalent Cadre and Recruitment Rules in accordance with the directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in V.Badami's case.

iv) Principles laid out in Karnataka State Civil Services (Regulation of Promotion Pay and Pension) Rules, 1978 have been followed and complied with.

v) For ensuring that all Government Guidelines/Rules are strictly followed while redoing the seniority list, the Respondents authorities have taken into consideration;

-Previous RFO seniority lists

-RFO Vacancy Register which was corrected and updated from 30.04.1993 to 30.11.2024.

-Previous RFO to ACF Promotion orders were considered and entered in Vacancy Register accordingly.

vi) There are 33 names added to the final seniority list dated 29.06.2024 which were missing or inadvertently not found in the 19.11.2020 seniority list.

vii) Following due procedure, the Seniority list first was published as a draft on 15.04.2024 giving 15 days' time, for receiving any objections. The draft seniority list was also published in Karnataka Forest Department's official website. In total 43 objections were received and replies to all the objections were provided before the final seniority list being published on 29.06.2024."

11. It has been further stated that the fresh seniority list is prepared in accordance with the Government Guidelines/Rules and a Committee was constituted, vide order dated 15.08.2023, headed by Sri Ravindra Kumar N, Deputy Conservator of Forests, Bengaluru Urban Division, Bengaluru. The Committee for redoing the seniority list has considered the relevant rules, regulations, vacancy registers, records maintained pertaining to the previous seniority list and also the directions of this Court in its judgment dated 26.05.2023 passed in W.P.No.5453/2022.

12. A counter affidavit has also been filed by the alleged contemnor/accused No.2 stating that as many as 97 RFOs including several complainants/petitioners having got the benefit of the revised Seniority List dated 29.06.2024, were promoted to the higher cadre i.e., ACFs and no willful disobedience and non-compliance of the judgment dated 26.05.2023 passed by this Court, has been committed.

13. Further additional affidavit dated 22.07.2026 has been filed by the contemnor/accused No.2, wherein it has been stated that there are no provisions under the said Rules of 1978 to grant retrospective promotions on the basis of two different seniority lists published at different points of time. These Rules are only to cover promotions that could not be granted to officers figuring in the same seniority/gradation list due to departmental enquiry/deputation.

14. It has been further stated that the complainants/petitioners, who were born in the cadre in January 2014 and August 2014, cannot make any grievance against the ranking assigned to the promotees as per the settled principle of law enunciated by the Supreme Court, wherein it has been held that the direct recruits can count their

seniority only based on the date of entry into service and not earlier to that.

15. Heard Sri P.S. Rajagopal, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri B.O. Anil Kumar, learned counsel for the complainants and Sri Reuben Jacob, learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Sri Bhairav Kuttaiah, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the contemnors/accused.

16. In sum and substance, the grievance of the complainants is that the Seniority List dated 29.06.2024 is not prepared as per the direction issued by this Court in its judgment dated 26.05.2023 passed in W.P.No.5453/2022.

17. According to Sri P.S. Rajagopal, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the complainants, under Rule 2 of the said Rules of 1978, promotion may be made with effect from a retrospective date if, while being eligible according to his seniority in the list that was in force and otherwise fit for promotion according to the Cadre and Recruitment Rules, he had only been placed in independent charge of the post by Competent Authority and has discharged the duties of that post. According to him, if the excess promotion made against the promotional quota are pushed down, the complainants

should be entitled for their seniority and promotion with retrospective effect. The learned Senior Counsel has placed reliance on the following authorities:-

(i) ***PATEL RAJNIKANT DHULABHAI AND ANOTHER vs PATEL CHANDRAKANT DHULABHAI AND OTHERS ([2008] 14 SCC 561)***; and

(ii) ***PURNENDU MUKHOPADHYAY AND OTHERS vs V.K.KAPOOR AND ANOTHER ([2008] 14 SCC 403)***.

18. On the other hand, Sri Reuben Jacob, learned Additional Advocate General has contended that the seniority list has been prepared strictly in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Rules, Guidelines and the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***V.B.BADAMI***'s case (*supra*). The complainants/petitioners cannot claim seniority when they were not even born in the cadre and the promotee officers, even if they were promoted in excess of their quota, are all retired. At this stage, the complainants cannot claim promotion from a retrospective date when they were not even born in the cadre. He further submits that the direction of this Court was only to issue fresh seniority list, which has been issued in due compliance and there is no willful disobedience of the judgment passed by this

Court in W.P.No.5453/2022. The learned Additional Advocate General has placed reliance on the following authorities:-

(i) ***J.S. PARIHAR vs GANPAT DUGGAR AND OTHERS***
([1996] 6 SCC 291);

(ii) ***SNEHASIS GIRI AND OTHERS vs SUBHASIS MITRA***
([2023] 18 SCC 529);

(iii) ***SOORAJMULL NAGARMULL vs BRIJESH MEHROTRA AND OTHERS***
([2022] 17 SCC 604); and

(iv) ***ISRAR AHMAD KHAN vs AMARNATH PRASAD AND OTHERS***
(2026 SCC OnLine SC 322).

19. We have considered the submissions and perused the affidavit of compliance, additional affidavits as well as the authorities cited by the learned counsels representing the parties.

20. It is well settled law that where an authority takes a decision in purported compliance of the Court's judgment, which decision is alleged to be legally incorrect or inconsistent with the judgment, the proper remedy is to challenge the subsequent decision in an appropriate proceedings as it gives rise to a fresh cause of action. Contempt ordinarily does not lie

merely because the decision does not meet the aggrieved party's expectation. The contempt Court cannot sit in appeal or judicial review over the subsequent decision. It cannot determine whether the authority adopted the correct interpretation, whether the decision was legally right or whether the decision ought to have been different. In such a situation, the aggrieved party must approach the Court which passed the original order for clarification, or invoke the appellate review or other appropriate jurisdiction as held in the case of ***S.TIRUPATHI RAO vs M. LINGAMAIAH AND OTHERS (2024 SCC OnLine SC 1764)*** and ***DR. U.N. BORA, EX. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND OTHERS vs ASSAM ROLLER FLOUR MILLS ASSOCIATION AND ANOTHER ([2022] 1 SCC 101)***.

21. The governing question in contempt is not whether the subsequent decision is correct, but whether there has been clear, deliberate and willful disobedience of the direction in the judgment. If the direction in the judgment is for the authority only to consider and decide the representation, application or claim after following a specified procedure, then the authority actually takes that decision after following such procedure and

there would be no contempt even if the decision is not as per the correct interpretation of the judgment.

22. A challenge to the correctness or merit of the decision ordinarily cannot be converted into contempt proceedings. However, a contempt may lie where the subsequent action is not genuine compliance, but a deliberate device to defeat or circumvent the Court's specific and unambiguous direction. The contempt Court cannot add a new obligation, modify the original direction or grant substantive relief that was not contained in the original judgment. Such an exercise would amount to a review or rectification of a dispute which is impermissible in the contempt proceedings. The contempt jurisdiction cannot be used to add or modify substantive directions absent in the original judgment. The contempt jurisdiction cannot enlarge the original relief or impose fresh obligations not contained in the original judgment.

23. In **J.S. PARIHAR** (*supra*), it has been held that once there is an order passed by the Government on the basis of the directions issued by the Court, there arises a fresh cause of action to seek redressal in an appropriate forum. The preparation of the seniority list may be wrong or may be right

or may or may not be in conformity with the directions, but that would be a fresh cause of action for the aggrieved party to avail of the opportunity of judicial review. However, that cannot be considered to be a willful disobedience of the order.

Paragraph 6 of the said judgment is extracted herein:

*"6. The question then is whether the Division Bench was right in setting aside the direction issued by the learned Single Judge to redraw the seniority list. It is contended by Mr S.K. Jain, the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, that unless the learned Judge goes into the correctness of the decision taken by the Government in preparation of the seniority list in the light of the law laid down by three Benches, the learned Judge cannot come to a conclusion whether or not the respondent had wilfully or deliberately disobeyed the orders of the Court as defined under Section 2(b) of the Act. Therefore, the learned Single Judge of the High Court necessarily has to go into the merits of that question. We do not find that the contention is well founded. It is seen that, admittedly, the respondents had prepared the seniority list on 2-7-1991. Subsequently promotions came to be made. **The question is whether seniority list is open to review in the contempt proceedings to find out whether it is in conformity with the directions issued by the earlier Benches. It is seen that once there is an order passed by the Government on the basis of the directions issued by the court, there arises a fresh cause of action to seek redressal in an appropriate forum. The preparation of the seniority list may be wrong or may be right or may or may***

not be in conformity with the directions. But that would be a fresh cause of action for the aggrieved party to avail of the opportunity of judicial review. But that cannot be considered to be the wilful violation of the order. After re-exercising the judicial review in contempt proceedings, a fresh direction by the learned Single Judge cannot be given to redraw the seniority list. In other words, the learned Judge was exercising the jurisdiction to consider the matter on merits in the contempt proceedings. It would not be permissible under Section 12 of the Act. Therefore, the Division Bench has exercised the power under Section 18 of the Rajasthan High Court Ordinance being a judgment or order of the Single Judge; the Division Bench corrected the mistake committed by the learned Single Judge. Therefore, it may not be necessary for the State to file an appeal in this Court against the judgment of the learned Single Judge when the matter was already seized of the Division Bench."

(emphasis supplied)

24. In **SOORAJMULL NAGARMULL** (*supra*), it has been held that the discretion given to the Court in dealing with the proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act is to be exercised for maintenance of Court's dignity and majesty of law. An aggrieved party has no right to insist that the Court should exercise such jurisdiction inasmuch as the contempt is between the contemnor and the Court.

25. In ***SNEHASIS GIRI*** (*supra*), it has been held that in lawful exercise of contempt jurisdiction, the Court cannot examine the merits of a decision.

26. From the contents of the affidavits filed by the contemnor/accused No.2, it is evident that there is no willful disobedience of the judgment dated 26.05.2023 passed by this Court in W.P.No.5453/2022. In compliance of the judgment of this Court, fresh Seniority List dated 29.06.2024 has been drawn and if the complainants/petitioners are not satisfied, contempt is not the remedy. They may take recourse to the appropriate remedy as may be available to them under the law.

27. We, therefore, close this contempt petition. The contempt notice stands discharged.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN)
JUDGE**

BKV
CT:SN