



CNR: KAHC010533682025

NC: 2026:KHC:54329
WP No. 24496 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 24496 OF 2025 (S-KSRTC)

BETWEEN:

SRI. ABDUL KHUDDUS
S/O SRI K MOHAMMED BASHA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
PRESENTLY WORKING AS PRINCIPAL
KARNATAKA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT
CORPORATION REGIONAL TRAINING CENTRE
BANAVARA ROAD, PANCHANAHALLI
CHIKMAGALURU 577182

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NAIK V S.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE KARNATAKA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT
CORPORATION.,
CENTRAL OFFICE K H ROAD
SHANTHINAGAR, BENGALURU 560027
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
2. THE BENGALURU METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORT CORPORATION
CENTRAL OFFICE K H ROAD
SHANTHINAGARA, BENGALURU 560027
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. RENUKA H.R., ADVOCATE)

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA





NC: 2026:KHC:54329
WP No. 24496 of 2025

CNR: KAHC010533682025

THIS WP 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 IMPUGNED CHARGE SHEET DATED 16.12.2024 BEARING NO.BMTC-CO-DISCIPLINE- SA-471/7133 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT VIDE ANNEXURE-L INsofar AS IT RELATES TO THE PETITIONER. (B) ISSUE ANY OTHER WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION AS THIS HON'BLE COURT DEEMS FIT AND PROPER UNDER THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CASE IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

1. This writ petition is filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the Charge Memo dated 16.12.2024 issued by respondent No.2 vide Annexure-L.
2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was working as Chief Accounts Officer and Financial Advisor in the respondent-Corporation. The petitioner submitted a report to respondent No.2-Managing Director, BMTC proposing initiation of an enquiry against certain officials of the Traffic Commercial Department and Accounts



NC: 2026:KHC:54329
WP No. 24496 of 2025

Department. The Managing Director of the respondent-Corporation, instead of acting upon the said report, called upon the petitioner to explain as to why the matter was not brought to the notice of the Managing Director at the earliest and why he should not be held responsible. The petitioner submitted his explanation on 29.11.2023. However, respondent No.2, by letter dated 06.01.2024, recommended initiation of disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner for dereliction of duty. Thereafter, the petitioner was placed under suspension by order dated 19.01.2024 pending departmental enquiry. The suspension was subsequently revoked by order dated 16.08.2024 and the petitioner was transferred to Chikkamagaluru as Principal of the Regional Training Centre of respondent No.2. Thereafter, the respondent No.2 issued a common Charge Memo dated 16.12.2024 against the petitioner and other delinquent employees. Being aggrieved by the issuance of the Charge Memo, the petitioner is before this Court.



3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the charge memo has been issued against 28 officials including the petitioner, despite having no involvement in any of the allegations made therein. He submits that, even prior to initiation of the enquiry in the year 2023, the petitioner himself had brought the matter to the notice of the higher authority by submitting a letter. In respect of the allegation relating to the credit notes, the report and explanation submitted by the petitioner is produced as Annexures-B and D. Despite the petitioner having no involvement in the alleged misconduct, the Charge Memo has been issued including his name and criminal proceedings were also initiated against him. He further submits that the petitioner had challenged the criminal proceedings in Crime No.22/2024 before this Court in Crl.P.No.4977/2024 and the said petition came to be allowed, quashing the criminal proceedings. It is therefore contended that the charges levelled against the petitioner are vague and that, despite him having no involvement in



the said allegation, the departmental enquiry has been initiated against him. Hence, he seeks allowing of the petition.

4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondents contends that the petitioner, being the Chief Accounts Officer, had signed all the documents relating to the credit notes and was also involved in the allegations made against the other 27 officials. Accordingly, a detailed Charge Memo, as per Annexure-L, has been issued against 28 officials, including the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner had every opportunity to defend himself before the Enquiry Officer. It is further contended that a challenge to the Charge Memo under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not maintainable unless the same is issued by an authority lacking jurisdiction or competence. She further contends that, though the criminal proceedings against the petitioner have been quashed by this Court, it has been specifically observed



that such quashing would not come in the way of any other proceedings initiated against the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the parties. Perused the writ petition papers.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was working as Chief Accounts Officer and Financial Advisor. The departmental enquiry has been initiated against 28 officials including the petitioner in respect of the alleged misappropriation of funds relating to the credit notes. Accordingly, the Charge Memo has been issued as per Annexure-L.

7. A perusal of Charge Memo at Annexure-L would indicate that the allegations against each of the employees have been set out in detail. Therefore, it is clear that the charges levelled against the petitioner are not vague. It is also not the case of the petitioner that the Charge Memo has been issued by an incompetent authority.

8. The only contention of the petitioner is that he was not involved in the allegations made against him in the



Charge Memo and that he had himself had brought the matter to the notice of the competent authority in the year 2023. All these defences are available to the petitioner before the Enquiry Officer. At this stage, unless it is established that the charges are vague or that the Charge Memo has been issued by an incompetent authority, this Court cannot interfere with the departmental proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

9. In view of the above, the petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly ***dismissed***.

10. It is, however, made clear that the petitioner is at liberty to submit an application before the competent authority seeking any documents relating to the charges. The respondents shall furnish the said documents to the petitioner, subject to their relevance and availability, to enable him to effectively defend his case before the Enquiry Officer. The petitioner is also permitted to submit an additional reply to the charges within a period of two weeks from today.



CNR: KAHC010533682025

NC: 2026:KHC:54329
WP No. 24496 of 2025

11. The respondents is directed to conduct the enquiry in accordance with law after giving an opportunity to the petitioner.

All pending IAs., if any, shall stand disposed of.

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE

HA
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 19