

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH 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. 21053 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI YANKANNA S/O BANGARAPPA,
AGE ABOUT 53 YEARS,
ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR,
BENGALURU SOUTH,
OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICAL INSPECTORATE
OFFICE ADDRESS NO.52/3, 1ST FLOOR,
BEHIND NIJAGUNA KSHETRA
OPP:BULL TEMPLE MAIN ROAD,
BASAVANAGUDI,
BENGALURU - 560019.

RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS:
NO.218, PRAGYNYAN,
2ND CROSS, VIJAYASHREE LAYOUT,
MYLASANDRA, KENGERI,
BENGALURU - 560060.

Digitally signed by
NANJUNDACHARI

Location: High
Court of
Karnataka

(BY SRI. D.R. RAVISHANKAR, SR. COUNSEL
SMT. SIRI RAJASHEKAR, ADV.)

...PETITIONER

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560001.

2. THE UNDER SECRETARY DEPARTMENT
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560001.
3. SRI.NAGARAJ
AGED MAJOR,
ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR,
OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICAL INSPECTORATE,
SHIVAMOGGA - 577201.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V SHIVAREDDY, AGA FOR R1 & 2
SRI VIKRAM HUILGOL, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI ADITYA R CHAKRAGIRI, ADV. FOR C/R3)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION, QUASHING THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 07/07/2026 PASSED BY THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU IN APPLICATION NO.3133/2026 VIDE ANNEXURE-C, INsofar AS THE TRIBUNAL HAS DECLINED TO GRANT INTERIM PROTECTION AND HAS RECORDED FINDINGS THAT THE PETITIONER HAS COMPLETED HIS MINIMUM TENURE AND THAT THE IMPUGNED TRANSFER IS NOT PREMATURE AND ETC.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDER ON **13.07.2026** COMING ON THIS DAY, **S.G.PANDIT J.,** PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
AND
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO

CAV JUDGMENT

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

Petitioner is before this Court, questioning non-grant of interim order of stay of transfer by order dated 07.07.2026 in Application No.3133/2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at Bengaluru (for short "Tribunal").

2. Heard learned senior counsel Sri.D.R.Ravishankar along with learned counsel Smt.Siri Rajashekar for petitioner, Sri.V.Shivareddy, learned Additional Government Advocate for Respondents No.1 and 2, learned senior counsel Sri.Vikram Huilgol for Sri.Aditya Chakragiri, learned counsel for respondent No.3. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was working at Hassan as Electrical Inspector and by notification dated 26.10.2023, the petitioner was transferred from Hassan to Bangalore East. Subsequently, by order dated 02.09.2025 the

petitioner has been transferred from Bangalore East to Bangalore South as Electrical Inspector. Under impugned notification dated 01.07.2026 (Annexure-A3) the petitioner has been transferred from Bangalore South to office of the Additional Chief Inspector of Electricity, Mysore. Questioning the said notification, the petitioner is before the Tribunal in the above stated application, wherein the petitioner also sought for interim stay of the said order of transfer on the ground that the petitioner has not completed his tenure as Electrical Inspector at Bangalore South and also on the ground that the transfer is made only to give favourable posting to respondent No.3. The Tribunal, under the impugned order taking note of the fact that the petitioner is working in Bangalore since 2023 who is holding Group-A post was of the *prima facie* opinion that the petitioner has completed minimum tenure. Questioning the said order, the petitioner is before this Court.

4. Learned senior counsel Sri.D.R.Ravishankar would contend that the petitioner has made out *prima facie* case for grant of interim order since the petitioner has not completed his tenure in the present post as Electrical Inspector at Bangalore South, since he was posted to work as such at Bangalore South under notification dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure-A2). As such, he is yet to complete one year in the above said post. Therefore, when the petitioner has established that he has not completed his tenure, the Tribunal ought to have granted interim order.

5. Per contra, learned counsels appearing for respondents would submit that the petitioner has completed more than 2 years at Bangalore, as such, he is transferred from Bangalore to Mysore. Further, they would submit that the application is directed to be listed on 04.08.2026 and by that time, the respondents would file their objections and the Tribunal could be directed to hear the application and pass appropriate orders.

6. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the entire writ petition papers, we are not inclined to interfere with the discretionary order passed by the Tribunal.

7. To grant or not to grant interim order is the discretion of the Tribunal/Court depending on the facts and circumstances of each case. In the instant case, the Tribunal taking note of the fact that the petitioner is working in Bangalore since 2023, was of the opinion that the petitioner has completed his minimum tenure, refused to grant interim order. The finding of the Tribunal is only in respect of considering interim prayer of the petitioner. The Tribunal has to examine as to whether the tenure shall be in a post or in a place. If the tenure is to be considered in a post, then the petitioner has not completed his tenure. Therefore, without being influenced by the findings recorded in the impugned order as well as any observations of this Court in the course of this order, the Tribunal shall consider the application on its merit and

shall dispose of the application as expeditiously as possible.

8. The respondents have undertaken to file statement of objections by the next date of hearing and if objections are filed as undertaken, the Tribunal is requested to hear the application and dispose of the same early.

9. With the above, the writ petition stands ***disposed of.***

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

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

MPK
CT:bms