

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

WRIT PETITION NO. 21300 OF 2023 (S-KSAT)

C/W

WRIT PETITION NO. 13132 OF 2025 (S-KSAT)

IN WP NO. 21300/2023

BETWEEN:

SRI A V PRASAD
S/O LATE DR. A SREERAMULU
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS
ASSISTANT REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER,
RTO CENTRAL, HSR LAYOUT,
BENGALURU-560100
R/AT NO.5, 24TH MAIN,
BTM LAYOUT, II STAGE
BENGALURU-560076.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K.N. PHANINDRA, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI NAGARAJULU NAIDU G., ADV.)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT,
M S BUILDING
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF TRANSPORT
AND ROAD SAFETY,
1ST FLOOR, BMTC COMPLEX,
B.M.T.C COMPLEX, K H ROAD,
BENGALURU-560027.
3. SRI RAJKUMAR

Digitally signed by
NANJUNDA CHARI

Location: High
Court of
Karnataka

AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
S/O SRI SHIVAPPA
R/AT NO.114, 2ND MAIN,
11TH 'A' CROSS, 'A' SECTOR,
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN
BENGALURU-560052.

PRESENTLY WORKING AS
ASSISTANT REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER,
O/AT OFFICE OF RTO
RAJAJINAGAR (WEST)
BENGALURU-560010.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. HARISHA A.S., AGA FOR R1 & R2
SRI BASAVARAJA PATEL G.K., ADV. FOR C/R3)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS FROM THE KSAT BANGALORE IN RESPECT OF THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 19.07.2023 PASSED IN A.NO.4669/2022 C/W A.NO.4684/2022 (ANNEXURE-A) AND B) ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION QUASHING/ EXPUNGING / SET ASIDE THE PORTION OF THE ORDER DATED 19.07.2023 MADE AT PARA 23, 24, AND 25 IN A.NO.4669/2022 C/W APPLICATION NO.4684/2022 PASSED BY THE KSAT AT BENGALURU VIDE ANNEXURE-A IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

IN WP NO. 13132/2025

BETWEEN:

SRI A V PRASAD
S/O LATE DR. A SREERAMULU
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS
ASSISTANT REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER,
AND INCHARGE RTO
TUMKUR-572101.

R/AT NO.5, 24TH MAIN,
BTM LAYOUT, II STAGE
BENGALURU-560076.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K.N. PHANINDRA, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI NAGARAJULU NAIDU G., ADV.)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE COMMISSIONER
OF TRANSPORT AND ROAD SAFETY,
1ST FLOOR, BMTc COMPLEX,
B.M.T.C. COMPLEX, K.H.ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 027.
3. SRI. AMARESH CHELVA
FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS
ASSISTANT REGIONAL TRANSPORT OFFICER,
OFFICE OF THE ARTO, DEVANAHALLI,
BENGALURU- 562 110.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. HARISHA A.S., AGA FOR R1 & R2
SRI BASAVARAJA PATEL G.K., ADV. FOR R3)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR THE RECORDS FROM THE KSAT BANGALORE IN RESPECT OF THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 25.03.2025 MADE IN A.NO.314/2024 C/W APPLICATION NO.2061/2024 KSAT AT BENGALURU (ANNEXURE-A) AND B) ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT OR DIRECTION QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 25.03.2025 MADE IN A.NO.314/2024 C/W APPLICATION NO.2061/2024 PASSED BY THE KSAT AT BENGALURU VIDE ANNEXURE-A IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THESE PETITIONS HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDER ON **19.06.2026** COMING ON THIS DAY, **S.G.PANDIT J.,** PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

CAV ORDER

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

Since both the above writ petitions arise from common facts and involve common issues, both the writ petitions are taken up together, heard and disposed of by this common order.

2. The petitioner in W.P.No.21300/2023 was respondent No.3 before the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at Bengaluru (for short "Tribunal") wherein the applicant therein had questioned the seniority of the petitioner published under O.M. dated 29.11.2021 in the cadre of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspector and had sought for further direction to consider the case of applicant for promotion to the cadre of Assistant Regional Transport Officer (for short "ARTO") retrospectively, which was allowed with a direction on enquiry if the petitioner was not entitled to inclusion in the Local Cadre of Motor Vehicle Inspector cadre (for short "MVI") in the first instance and the promotion to the local cadre in Senior Motor Vehicle

Inspector and ARTO cadre on the basis of being included in the local cadre of Motor Vehicle Inspector.

3. In W.P.No.13132/2025, petitioner is before this Court, aggrieved by the order dated 25.03.2025 in Application No.314/2024 C/W Application No.2061/2024 passed by the Tribunal rejecting petitioner's challenge to seniority list published under O.M. dated 31.10.2022 placing the petitioner below the 3rd respondent and by considering the representations dated 04.02.2023 and 06.02.2023 to assign appropriate eligibility date and also to correct the date of birth in the seniority list. Further, the petitioner also prayed for quashing the O.M. dated 14.05.2024 publishing final seniority list as on 01.04.2024 to the cadre of ARTO insofar as applicant and respondent No.3 are concerned.

4. For the sake of convenience and better understanding, the petitioner in both the writ petitions would be referred to as petitioner; respondent No.3 in W.P.No.21300/2023 would be referred to as applicant and

respondent No.3 in W.P.No.13132/2025 would be referred to as respondent No.3.

5. The petitioner was initially appointed as Motor Vehicle Inspector on 05.05.1994. On his appointment and joining, the petitioner is said to have declared his permanent address and Home Town as Bellary. The applicant is said to have joined the cadre of MVI in the year 2009. In pursuance of the Karnataka Public Employment (Reservation in Appointment for Hyderabad-Karnataka Region) Order 2013 (for short "2013 Order") to include in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre, options were invited from the eligible candidates. It is stated that the petitioner exercised his option on 24.05.2014 for inclusion of his name in Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre. Subsequently also it is stated that the petitioner made several representations to include his name in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre. The second respondent herein addressed a letter dated 17.12.2020, the first respondent in the matter of inclusion of name of the petitioner in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre as per

2013 order. It is stated that the RTO, Bangalore Central by letter dated 26.12.2021 confirmed the filing of Appendix-A and C Forms by the petitioner and by enclosing copies of the same submitted a report that the petitioner has filed documents for inclusion of his name in Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre. By O.M. dated 10.03.2021 (Annexure-A13), the name of the petitioner was included in the seniority list of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspectors of Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre in between Sl.No.18 and 19 i.e., between Sri.Srinivasagiri and Sri.Amaresh Chelva assigning date of eligibility as 10.03.2021 and on the same day, DPC was held and decision was taken to promote the petitioner to the post of ARTO with retrospective effect from 19.11.2020. The second respondent issued O.M. dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure-A15) promoted the petitioner to the post of ARTO with retrospective effect from 19.11.2020. The applicant approached the Tribunal in Application No.1624/2021 challenging the O.M. dated 06.04.2021

contending that the petitioner belongs to residual cadre and not to Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre.

6. The Tribunal, by order dated 03.09.2021 set aside the O.M. dated 06.04.2021 and directed the respondents to publish the provisional seniority list of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspectors reflecting the name of the petitioner and thereafter call for objections and to finalise the final seniority list of senior Motor Vehicle Inspectors of Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre and thereafter to effect further promotion. Aggrieved by the said order of the Tribunal, the petitioner approached this Court in W.P.No.16735/2021. This Court, by order dated 21.10.2021 (Annexure-A18) set aside the order dated 13.09.2021 in Application No.1624/2021; restored the promotion of the petitioner as ARTO with retrospective effect from 19.11.2020. Subsequently, by O.M. dated 29.11.2021 (Annexure-A19) the petitioner's name was included in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre seniority list between Sl.No.18 and 19 of the cadre of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspectors.

7. The applicant sought information under RTI as to whether the petitioner has submitted application in Appendix-A and C on 24.05.2014 in terms of 2013 Order and the ARTO by letter dated 22.08.2022 replied to the Joint Transport Commissioner stating that the Appendix-A and C of the petitioner is found in the Service File of the petitioner and he forwarded the same on 26.02.2021. Again, Joint Transport Commissioner, by letter dated 23.08.2022 sought information of Appendix-A and C submitted on 24.05.2014 by the petitioner. The same ARTO by letter dated 25.08.2022 replied stating that the Appendix-A and C dated 24.05.2014 is not found in the Service File of the petitioner and further stated that no document was forwarded to the Transport Commissioner. Based on the said letter of ARTO, Joint Transport Commissioner addressed a letter to the Commissioner of Transport to take action against the petitioner. The applicant approached the Tribunal in Application No.4669/2022 praying to quash the O.M. dated 29.11.2021 (Annexure-A19) as illegal, arbitrary and

without application of mind. The applicant also filed one more application No.4684/2022 before the Tribunal seeking direction to consider his representation dated 03.09.2022 to consider his case for promotion to the cadre of ARTO retrospectively w.e.f 11.11.2020. On 31.01.2023 (Annexure-R18), the second respondent published final seniority list of the cadre of ARTO wherein the name of the petitioner was shown below the 3rd respondent showing the eligibility date of the petitioner as 06.04.2021 instead of 19.11.2020. Questioning the said O.M. dated 29.11.2021, the petitioner approached the Tribunal in Application No.314/2024 c/w Application No.2061/2024.

8. In Application No.4669/2022 and Application No.4684/2022 though the Tribunal dismissed the application of the applicant directed the respondent-State to pass necessary order after due enquiry, with liberty to rescind order of inclusion of the petitioner in the local cadre of Motor Vehicle Inspector and also the promotion to the cadre of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspector and ARTO.

9. The Tribunal rejected Application No.314/2024 and Application No.2061/2024 holding that the petitioner has not challenged the Review DPC dated 07.07.2021 and in the seniority list of MVI dated 28.04.2015, the petitioner was not included in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre but he was placed in residual cadre at Sl.No.38.

10. Heard learned Senior Counsel Sri.K.N.Phaneendra for Sri.Nagarajulu Naidu G., learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel Sri.Basavaraj Patel G.K., for Respondent No.3 in both the writ petitions and learned Additional Government Advocate Sri.Harisha A.S., for respondents No.1 and 2. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

11. Learned Senior Counsel would submit that the petitioner was appointed as MVI on 05.05.1994 and in his Service Register his Home Town was shown/entered as Bellary. On introduction of 2013 Order, the petitioner submitted Appendix-A and C dated 24.05.2014 with a request to include his name in Hyderabad-Karnataka local

cadre. When the same was not considered, the petitioner submitted several representations. On considering his representations, rightly by O.M. dated 10.03.2021 (Annexure-A13) included the name of the petitioner in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre of MVI between Sl.No.18 and 19 i.e., between Sri.Srinivasgiri and Sri.Amaresh Chelva. Learned counsel would contend that the Division Bench of this Court in its order dated 21.10.2021 in W.P.No.16735/2021 wherein the petitioner was before this Court, questioning the order dated 03.09.2021 in Application No.1654/2021 of the Tribunal, whereunder O.M. dated 06.04.2021 including the name of the petitioner in Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre in the cadre of MVI was quashed by the Tribunal. This Court has recorded that the respondents have admitted that the action on the option/representation of the petitioner to include his name in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre was taken only on 26.02.2021 and the same was transmitted to the competent authority. Further, learned Senior Counsel would submit that this Court has given a

further finding that fixing the seniority of the petitioner higher in rank as against the applicant is just and proper. He submits that the said order of the Division Bench of this Court has become final and none have challenged the said order further. When that finding has become final, the respondents could not have tinkered with the seniority of the petitioner any more. Further, learned Senior Counsel would submit that the petitioner was not issued with any notice before Review DPC dated 07.07.2021 and in pursuance of the said DPC, no notification or order modifying the date of eligibility is passed. Moreover, learned Senior Counsel for petitioner would submit that in view of the finding of this Court in W.P.No.16735/2021, the respondents could not have conducted a Review DPC to modify the date of eligibility of the petitioner. Thus, learned Senior Counsel would pray for allowing the writ petitions.

12. Per contra, learned counsel Sri.Basavaraj Patel for applicant would submit that the petitioner has played fraud and created documents to say that he had submitted

Appendix-A and C in the year 2014. Further, learned counsel would submit that the ARTO letter dated 25.08.2022 (Annexure-A23) makes it clear that the option submitted by the petitioner in Appendix-A and C dated 24.05.2014 is not found in the Service File of the petitioner. Therefore, he submits that the petitioner would not be entitled for inclusion of his name in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre in the seniority list of Motor Vehicle Inspectors. Learned counsel Sri.Basavaraj Patel for applicant would further submit that the petitioner's name was shown in the residual cadre of the seniority list of MVI which was published in the year 2015 at Sl.No.38 and the petitioner has never questioned the same. The said seniority list published in the year 2015 makes it clear that the petitioner had not submitted his option for inclusion of his name in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre. Thus, learned counsel would pray for dismissal of the writ petitions.

13. Learned AGA, Sri.Harisha A.S., would support the order passed by the Tribunal and would pray for passing appropriate order.

14. None appeared for respondent No.3.

15. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the papers of both the writ petitions, we are of the opinion that the petitioner in both the writ petitions has made out ground to interfere with the order passed by the Tribunal for the following reasons:

In terms of 2013 order, the petitioner submitted his option for inclusion of his name in the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre in the format Appendix-A and C dated 24.05.2014. As the said option was not considered, the petitioner made several representations. On the representation of the petitioner, the second Respondent by letter dated 22.01.2021 addressed to Regional Transport Officer (for short "RTO"), Bangalore Central sought information with regard to submission of Appendix-A and C by the petitioner, the RTO, Bangalore Central by letter

dated 26.02.2021 confirmed the submission of Appendix-A and C and by enclosing copies of the same forwarded the same to the competent authority. Thereafter, by O.M. dated 10.03.2021 (Annexure-A10), the name of the petitioner was included in the seniority list of the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspector in between Sl.No.18 and 19 i.e., between Sri.Srinivasgiri and Sri.Amaresh Chelva respectively. On the same day, DPC was held and the petitioner was promoted to the cadre of ARTO with retrospective effect i.e. from 19.11.2020, the date on which, his juniors were promoted. Accordingly, O.M. dated 06.04.2021 was issued promoting the petitioner to the post of ARTO.

16. The applicant filed Application No.1375/2021 questioning the retrospective promotion of the petitioner dated 06.04.2021 and one more Application No.1624/2021 seeking to include his name for promotion as ARTO under the Hyderabad-Karnataka local cadre. Both the applications were clubbed together and the O.M. dated 06.04.2021 promoting the petitioner was set aside with a

direction to the Official Respondents to publish the provisional seniority list of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspectors reflecting the name of the applicant and to publish the final seniority list after objections are invited and considered. The said order of the Tribunal was the subject matter of W.P.No.16735/2021 filed by the petitioner herein. This Court by order dated 21.10.2021 allowed the writ petition and set aside the order passed by the Tribunal dated 03.09.2021 and restored promotion O.M. of the petitioner dated 06.04.2021. This Court also directed the official Respondents to consider the case of applicant for promotion to any one of the existing vacancies in the cadre of ARTO. While allowing the above stated writ petition, the co-ordinate bench of this Court at paragraph 9 observed as follows:

"9. After considering the rival contentions of the parties, it is not in dispute that the Applicant before the Tribunal was junior to the petitioner. Petitioner herein has joined service as Motor Vehicle Inspector in the year 1994, whereas the third respondent (Applicant before the Tribunal) has joined service in the cadre of Motor Vehicle Inspector in the year 2009 and therefore, the Tribunal, upon perusal of the original record, had come

to a conclusion that the petitioner herein has exercised his option for inclusion of his name in the Hyderabad-Karnataka Local Cadre on 24th May, 2014, however, the respondent-authorities have failed to send the representation/form made by the petitioner herein opting benefit under Article 371-J of the Constitution of India and therefore, the name of the petitioner was not included in the Seniority list of either in the list of Motor Vehicle Inspector or Senior Motor Vehicle Inspector that was published from time to time. The respondent-authorities noticed their mistake in not forwarding the representation/form made by the petitioner opting benefit under Article 371-J of Constitution of India in time, and have admitted that it was only on 26th February, 2021 (Annexure-R3) that the option exercised by the petitioner herein was transmitted to the competent authority and immediately thereafter, took action to modify the ranking in the seniority list placing the petitioner in between Sl.No.18 and 19 and the said action on the part of the respondent-authorities modifying the ranking in the seniority list, keeping the position of the petitioner higher in rank as against respondent No.3 herein is just and proper. However, the finding recorded by the Tribunal taking into consideration that the petitioner failed to file objection to the revised provision list, and as such, passed the impugned order denying promotion to the petitioner, is contrary to Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and therefore, we find force in the submission made by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner that the finding recorded by the Tribunal, denying promotional avenue to the petitioner after

noticing the defect in not forwarding the representation/form by the Government immediately recourse to opting benefit under Article 371-J of the Constitution of India and therefore, quashing the Official Memorandum dated 06th April, 2021 by the Tribunal is bad in law and accordingly, same is restored insofar as the petitioner is concerned. In the result, having allowing the writ petition by setting aside the impugned order passed by the Tribunal, respondent authorities are directed to reconsider the case of the respondent No.3 herein for promotion afresh to any of the existing vacancies available in the cadre of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspector. Hence, the following:

ORDER

- 1. Writ petition is allowed;*
- 2. Impugned order dated 03rd September, 2021 passed in Application No.1624 of 2021 by the Tribunal is quashed;*
- 3. The Official Memorandum bearing No. AD/15Aç-1/aÊÊÀ-57/2015-16 dated 06th April, 2021 (Annexure12 A7) in Application No.1624 of 2021 issued by the second respondent insofar as it relates to the petitioner is restored;*
- 4. The official respondents 1 and 2 are directed to consider the case of the respondent No.3 herein for promotion to any one of the existing vacancies in the cadre of Assistant Regional Transport Officer to be promoted*

from the cadre of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspectors;

5. The Official respondents are directed to publish the final seniority list of Senior Motor Vehicle Inspectors of Hyderabad-Karnataka Local Cadre in terms of Annexure-R13 dated 10th March, 2021 in an expedite manner;

6. Compliance shall be made within six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order;

7. In view of the disposal of the main matter, all pending IAs stand disposed of.

In the above writ petition, this Court has given a categorical finding that the option of the petitioner was transmitted only on 26th February 2021 to the competent authority and immediately thereafter took action to modify the ranking in the seniority list placing the petitioner between Sl.No.18 and 19 with further observation that the said action on the part of the Respondent-authorities modifying the ranking in the seniority list, keeping the position of the petitioner higher in rank as against the applicant is just and proper. Further, the above said order of this Court dated 21.10.2021 in W.P.No.16735/2021 has

become final and binding on all the parties since the order has not been taken further in appeal. When once the finding with regard to option of the petitioner has become final and held to be proper, the Tribunal in subsequent proceedings could not have again examined the submission or otherwise of option of the petitioner.

17. The Tribunal, under impugned order proceeded to direct enquiry solely on the subsequent report forwarded by the same ARTO stating that no document such as Appendix-A and C dated 24.05.2014 is found in the Service File of the petitioner and the said ARTO himself had sent report earlier confirming the submission of the option by the petitioner. The Tribunal failed to appreciate that the co-ordinate bench of this Court has come to a definite conclusion which has become final that considering the option and keeping position of the petitioner higher in rank as against the applicant is just and proper.

18. Furthermore, the applicant had not questioned fixation of petitioner's seniority under O.M. dated

18.01.2021 (Annexure-A10) between Sri.B.S.Srinivasagiri and Sri.Amaresh Chelva i.e., between Sl.No.18 and 19 i.e., above the applicant. Without challenging the fixation of seniority of petitioner in any of the proceedings, the applicant had only challenged the order of promotion of the petitioner dated 06.04.2021. Further, the said promotion has been upheld and restored by this Court in the above stated order dated 21.10.2021 in W.P.No.16735/2021. When the seniority of petitioner in terms of O.M. dated 18.01.2021 and promotion order dated 06.04.2021 has become final and when it is upheld by this Court, in the above stated order, the Tribunal could not have gone beyond the order of this Court and could not have directed enquiry with regard to the submission of option dated 24.05.2014 by the petitioner. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that when seniority list of ARTO was revised by O.M. dated 01.04.2024 wherein the 3rd Respondent is placed above the petitioner and one more DPC was conducted subsequently where decision was taken to revise the promotion of the petitioner. No

order subsequent to that DPC is said to have been passed and the O.M. or Notification issued subsequent to such DPC is not placed on record. However, those proceedings are also contrary to the order of this Court dated 21.10.2021 in W.P.No.16735/2021.

19. Learned counsel Sri.Basavaraj Patel contending that the petitioner has played fraud by submitting false documents of option and placed reliance on the decision of S.P.CHENGALVARAYA NAIDU (DEAD) BY LR_s V/S. JAGANNATH (DEAD) BY LR_s reported in (1994) 1 SCC 1. The said decision would not assist the applicant in any way, wherein it would state that the fraud would vitiate every proceedings. Here the applicant has failed to prove the fraud. Moreover, submission of option dated 24.05.2014 is confirmed and this Court has also confirmed fixing of seniority of the petitioner based on such option in the cadre of senior Motor Vehicle Inspector under O.M. dated 18.01.2021.

20. We find merit in the contentions urged by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner and accordingly, both the writ petitions succeed with the following order:

(i) Both the writ petitions are allowed.

(ii) The order dated 19.07.2023 passed in Application No.4669/2022 C/W Application No.4684/2024 passed by the Tribunal is set aside.

(iii) Order dated 25.03.2025 in Application No.314/2024 C/W Application No.2061/2024 passed by the Tribunal is set aside.

Sd/-
(S.G.PANDIT)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE

MPK
CT:bms