



CNR: KAHC010476252026

NC: 2026:KHC:36701-DB
WP No. 21518 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 17TH 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. 21518 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

K SUNDRESH
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
S/O K. BASAN GOUDA,
R/AT NEAR ESWARI TEMPLE,
VTC BALLATGI, PO BALLATGI,
MANVI, RAICHUR,
KARNATAKA - 584 129.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MUHAMMAD SHAMIL, ADV.)

AND:

Digitally signed by
NANJUNDACHARI
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
M.S. BUILDING,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. KARNATAKA EXAMINATION AUTHORITY (KEA)
REP. BY ITS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
18TH CROSS, SAMPIGE ROAD,
MALLESHWARAM,
BENGALURU - 560 012.

...RESPONDENTS

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



**NC: 2026:KHC:36701-DB
WP No. 21518 of 2026**

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO PASS AN ORDER/WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARIA) QUASH THE IMPUGNED INTERIM ORDER DATED 07/07/2026 ISSUED BY THE HONBLE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL IN A.NO 3150/2026 (ANNEXURE-A)B) QUASH THE ADDENDUM NOTIFICATION DATED 01/06/2026 ISSUED BY THE SECOND RESPONDENT BEARING NO.ED/KEA/08/NE.V/2026(RPC), ED/KEA/09/NE.VI/2026(KK) (ANNEXURE-A9)

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR FINAL HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

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

ORAL ORDER

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

Petitioner is before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India questioning order dated 07.07.2026 in Application No.3150/2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at Bengaluru (for short, 'the Tribunal') wherein the Tribunal refused to grant interim order as prayed for.

2. Heard learned counsel Sri.Muhammad Shamil for petitioner and learned Additional Government



Advocate Sri.K.R.Rajendra for respondents. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner Sri.Muhammad Shamil would submit that the petitioner applied for the post of Assistant Agricultural Officer and Agricultural Officer and submits that in terms of the Cadre and Recruitment Rules, only persons with qualification from the University established by law and carries the accreditation of the Indian Council for Agriculture Research (ICAR or AICTE) shall be eligible. Learned counsel would submit that under addendum dated 01.06.2026 (Annexure-A9) the Karnataka Examination Authority permitted the candidates with B.Sc (Agri) from RAI Technology University (UGD Approved) to apply for the vacancies notified. It is his contention that the said RAI Technology University is neither accredited to ICAR nor AICTE. Therefore, addendum dated 01.06.2026 is opposed to the existing Cadre and Recruitment Rules. Hence, he



**NC: 2026:KHC:36701-DB
WP No. 21518 of 2026**

submits that the petitioner sought for stay of the said addendum and the Tribunal refused to grant interim order as prayed for. It is his submission that the petitioner has made out prima facie case by contending that the addendum is opposed to the Cadre and Recruitment Rules. However, the Tribunal failed to appreciate the said contention.

4. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate Sri.K.R.Rajendra for respondents would submit that the Tribunal rightly rejected the interim prayer of the petitioner and submits that the Tribunal has observed that the addendum notification dated 01.06.2026 (Annexure-A9) would be subject to the outcome of the present Application. Therefore, he submits that the writ petition requires to be rejected.

5. On hearing the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the entire writ petition papers, we are not inclined to interfere with the order



dated 07.07.2026 in Application No.3150/2026 passed by the Tribunal.

6. The process of selection is by written examination. The main contention of the petitioner is that RAI Technology University is not accredited to ICAR or AICTE. The said contention is to be considered on hearing the respondents. The respondents have to place on record whether the RAI Technology University is accredited to ICAR or AICTE. Furthermore, when the selection is by competitive written examination, permitting the candidates to write the examination who have obtained the degree from RAI Technology University would not prejudice the case of the petitioner. The Tribunal has rightly observed that the addendum notification dated 01.06.2026 (Annexure-A9) would be subject to outcome of the Application pending before the Tribunal. Granting stay would dislocate the entire selection process.



**NC: 2026:KHC:36701-DB
WP No. 21518 of 2026**

7. For the reasons recorded above, writ petition stands ***rejected***. As the matter relates to selection and appointment, the Tribunal is requested to dispose of the Application as early as possible.

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

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

NC
CT:bms
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 25