



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF JANUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 23518 OF 2024 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI KANUMANAYAKA B R
S/O RAMANNA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
R/O BAGGANADU VILLAGE
J G HALLI HOBLI, HIRIYURU TALUK
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT - 577511.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAMESH K R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT
CHITRADURGA - 577501.
2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
CHITRADURGA SUB DIVISION,
CHITRADURGA - 577 501.
3. THE TAHASILDAR
HIRIYURU TALUK
HIRIYURU, CHITRADURGA DISTRICT
CHITRADURGA - 577501.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.G RAMESH NAIK, AGA. FOR R1 TO R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED: 20.09.2022 PASSED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT BEARING NO: H.O.A.CR: 21/2017-18 AT ANNEXURE-J AND ETC.

Digitally signed by
MALATHI CHALUVA
IYENGAR
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

This writ petition is filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, calling in question the notification dated 16.08.2024 issued by the Tahsildar, Hiriyr Taluk, vide Annexure-H, whereby applications were invited to the post of Village Assistant for Katanayakanahalli Revenue Circle, J.G. Halli Hobli, Hiriyr Taluk, and also seeking to quash the order dated 20.09.2022 passed by respondent No.3 vide Annexure-J, dismissing the petitioner from service.

2. Briefly stating, the facts of the case are that the petitioner is a permanent resident of Bagganadu Village, J.G. Halli Hobli, Hiriyr Taluk, Chitradurga District. Respondent No.3 issued a notification dated 30.05.2020 inviting applications for appointment to the post of Village



Assistant for Katanayakanahalli Revenue Circle, J.G. Halli Hobli, Hiriya Taluk. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner applied for the said post and was called for interview vide notice dated 11.11.2021 (Annexure-A), fixing the interview on 07.01.2022. The petitioner appeared for the interview and was selected to the post of Grama Sahayaka. However, despite his selection, no appointment order was issued to him by the respondent-authorities. Consequently, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 06.12.2022 (Annexure-C) to the Deputy Commissioner, Chitradurga District. The Deputy Commissioner sought a report from the Assistant Commissioner, who submitted his report dated 12.06.2023 (Annexure-D). Thereafter, the Tahsildar issued the impugned notification dated 16.08.2024 (Annexure-H) calling for fresh applications to the post of Grama Sahayaka for Katanayakanahalli Revenue Circle, J.G. Halli Hobli, Hiriya Taluk. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court.



3. After issuance of notice, the Tahsildar filed an affidavit dated 24.02.2025 stating that the appointment order was not served on the petitioner on the ground that he was not residing in Bagganadu Village and that his whereabouts were not known. It is further stated that, by order dated 20.09.2022, the petitioner was dismissed from service. The said order was admittedly not communicated to the petitioner. Subsequently, the petitioner filed an amended petition challenging the dismissal order.

4. A perusal of the affidavit filed by the Tahsildar dated 24.02.2025 discloses that the appointment order dated 16.05.2022 was not served on the petitioner on the ground that he was not residing in Bagganadu Village. However, the report submitted by the Assistant Commissioner to the Deputy Commissioner dated 12.06.2023 categorically states that the petitioner was residing in Bagganadu Village as a permanent resident. It is thus evident that though the petitioner was selected and appointed as a Grama Sahayaka, the appointment order



dated 16.05.2022 was not served on him. After the filing of the writ petition, the learned Additional Government Advocate produced Annexure-J, stating that the petitioner was terminated from service on 20.09.2022 on the ground of dereliction of duty while working as a Grama Sahayaka at Katanayakanahalli. However, in the affidavit filed by the Tahsildar, it is clearly stated that the appointment order was not served on the petitioner and that he had not reported for duty. The reason assigned in the termination order is therefore contrary to the affidavit dated 24.02.2025 filed by the Tahsildar. The impugned order at Annexure-J has been passed without authority of law, without issuing any notice to the petitioner, and the same was also not communicated to him. For these reasons, the impugned order at Annexure-J is liable to be quashed.

5. In view of Annexures-A and B, it is clear that the petitioner was selected to the post of Grama Sahayaka for Katanayakanahalli Revenue Circle, J.G. Halli Hobli. Consequently, the notification dated 16.08.2024 issued



vide Annexure-H calling for fresh applications to fill up the said post also cannot be sustained and is liable to be quashed.

6. Accordingly, the following:

ORDER

- (i) The writ petition is allowed.
- (ii) The order dated 20.09.2022 passed by the third respondent vide Annexure-J and the notification dated 16.08.2024 issued by the third respondent vide Annexure-H, insofar as Item No.3 – Katanayakanahalli, J.G. Halli Hobli is concerned, are hereby quashed.
- (iii) The respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Grama Sahayaka, Katanayakanahalli Revenue Circle, J.G. Halli Hobli, Hiriya Taluk, Chitradurga District, keeping in view Annexures-A and B and the report submitted by



the Assistant Commissioner vide Annexure-D dated 12.06.2023, as expeditiously as possible and in any event within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE

CM
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 60