



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 3<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2026**

**PRESENT**

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

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 19913 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)**

**BETWEEN:**

SRI. DALESH AL  
S/O. LATE SRI LAKSHMANE GOWDA,  
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,  
RANGE FOREST OFFICER,  
DEPARTMENT OF FOREST,  
PRESENTLY WORKING AS  
RANGE FOREST OFFICER,  
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,  
BANGALORE - 560 020.

R/AT. NO.779, 21<sup>ST</sup> CROSS,  
JNANABHARATHI 2<sup>ND</sup> STAGE,  
MARIYAPPANAPALYA,  
BANGALORE - 560 079.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. C.M. NAGABUSHANA, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by  
NANJUNDACHARI  
Location: High  
Court of Karnataka

**AND:**

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL  
ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY,  
DEPARTMENT OF FOREST ECOLOGY  
AND ENVIRONMENT,  
M.S. BUILDING,  
BANGALORE - 560 001.



2. THE PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR  
OF FOREST, AND (HEAD OF FOREST FORCE),  
ARANYABHAVANA,  
MALLESHWARAM, 18<sup>TH</sup> CROSS,  
BANAGLORE – 560 003.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V.SHIVAREDDY, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227 OF THE  
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH/CALL FOR  
RECORDS PERTAINING TO THE IMPUGNED OFFICE ORDER  
NO.B2/CEV/CR-02/2026-27 E-OFFICE NO.KFD/HOFF/B2  
(ENQ)/28/2026-LEGAL-KFD. OFFICE ORDER NO.28/2026-27,  
PASSED BY THE SECOND RESPONDENT (ANNEXURE-A6) AND  
SET-ASIDE THE SAME AND TO CONTINUE THE APPLICANT AS  
RANGE FOREST OFFICER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT  
AUTHORITY WITH ALL CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS 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 MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

**ORAL ORDER**

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

Petitioner, a Range Forest Officer of the second  
respondent department is before this Court aggrieved by  
order dated 25.06.2026 in Application No.2909/2026  
passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at  
Bengaluru (for short, 'the Tribunal') rejecting his prayer to



stay the officer order dated 16.06.2026, transferring the petitioner from the post of Range Forest Officer, Bengaluru Development Authority (for short, 'BDA') to the post of Range Forest Officer, Legal and ICT, Deputy Conservator of Forest office, Kolar Division, Kolar.

2. Heard learned counsel Sri.C.M.Nagabhushana for petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate Sri.V.Shivareddy for respondents. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner reported to duty at BDA on 04.10.2024. While working as Range Forest Officer, BDA, a search was conducted by the Lokayukta police and crime No.11/2026 was registered under Sections 13(1)(b) and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. Consequently, the Lokayukta police recommended to the second respondent to shift the lien of the petitioner from the present place and based on the said recommendation, second



respondent issued office order dated 13.06.2026 transferring the petitioner from BDA, Bengaluru to Kolar Division, Kolar. Learned counsel would submit that the question of tampering witness would not arise since the allegation does not relate to the act done by the petitioner during his official duty. Further, learned counsel would submit that second respondent without applying its mind, mechanically, based on the recommendation of the Lokayukta police, issued the impugned order. Therefore, he submits that the petitioner has made out *prima facie* case for grant of interim order of stay of the office order dated 16.06.2026.

4. *Per contra*, learned Additional Government Advocate, Sri.V.Shivareddy for respondents would support the order passed by the Tribunal and submits that the respondents, instead of keeping the petitioner under suspension, transferred him from Bengaluru to Kolar so as to enable fair investigation. Thus, he would pray for dismissal of the writ petition.



5. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the entire writ petition papers, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order passed by the Tribunal. The grounds urged by the petitioner are to be examined by the Tribunal at the time of final disposal. However, the Tribunal has rightly observed by placing reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***UNION OF INDIA AND ANOTHER VS. ASHOK KUMAR AGGARWAL [(2013) 16 SCC 147]*** that instead of keeping the petitioner under suspension, he might have been transferred.

6. Learned Additional Government Advocate would submit that respondents would file objections within two weeks before the Tribunal. If objections are filed, the Tribunal shall endeavor to dispose of the application early.



**NC: 2026:KHC:33172-DB  
WP No. 19913 of 2026**

7. With the above, writ petition stands disposed of.

All contentions of the parties are left open.

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

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

NC  
CT:RK  
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 4