



CNR: KAHC010579562026

NC: 2026:KHC:49175-DB
CCC No. 1082 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI

AND

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 1082 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SRI. S K ARUNKUMAR,
S/O. S K MALLIKARJUN,
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
R/A "ATHREYA" #53/36,
SHANKAR SANNIDDHI STREET,
2ND MAIN, 2ND CROSS,
S G KAVAL NEW LAYOUT,
KOTTIGEPALYA,
BENGALURU - 560 091.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI.NAGENDRA NAIK R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. AMARENDRA KUMAR,
GENERAL MANAGER (HRD),
PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK,
A BODY CONSTITUTED UNDER
THE BANKING COMPANIES
(ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF
UNDERTAKINGS) ACT 1970,
HAVING ITS CIRCLE OFFICE AT
NO.26-27, RAHEJA TOWER,
M.G.ROAD, BANGALORE-560 001.

...ACCUSED

Digitally signed
by K G
RENUKAMBA
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



CNR: KAHC010579562026

NC: 2026:KHC:49175-DB
CCC No. 1082 of 2026

THIS CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971 R/W ARTICLE 215 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMPT OF COURT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR THE VIOLATION OF THE ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE COURT IN W.P.NO.974/2025(S-DE) DATED 01.12.2025 AS PER ANNEXURE-A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI
and
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI)

Heard the learned counsel for the complainant.

2. This contempt petition is filed alleging violation of the order dated 01.12.2025 in Writ Appeal No.974/2025. The Appellate Court has observed as follows:

"16. We do not disagree with the finding of the learned Single Judge. However, instead of substituting the opinion of the Court to that of the Disciplinary/Appellate Authority on quantum of punishment, i.e., reduction of the punishment of reducing two stages of ranking of the petitioner to withholding of one increment that too without cumulative effect, should not have been substituted by the learned Single Judge. Instead of exercising such a discretion, the learned Single Judge ought to have remanded the matter back to the Appellate Authority to see that whether major penalty of reduction of two stages of ranking of the petitioner to one increment without cumulative effect would be sufficient in view of the findings recorded in the order.

17. Therefore, substituting the punishment by the learned Single Judge to that extent from reduction



CNR: KAHC010579562026

of two stages ranking of the petitioner to withholding of one increment without cumulative effect is set aside and we deem it appropriate to remand the matter back to the Appellate Authority to consider whether the imposition of the major penalty by the Disciplinary Authority in the light of the findings recorded by the learned Single Judge would be justified.

18. In view thereof, the instant appeal is allowed and the matter is remanded to the Appellate Authority with a direction to reconsider the whole case in the light of the findings recorded by the learned Single Judge, and then take a considered and informed decision for imposing the appropriate penalty on the petitioner.

19. It is needless to say the petitioner/employee shall be issued a notice by the Appellate Authority before inflicting the appropriate punishment on him as directed.

20. Accordingly, pending applications if any, stands dismissed."

3. Thereafter, it appears that an order dated 05.06.2026 was passed by the Appellate Authority who is the accused herein considering the submissions of the complainant, the law on the subject as well as the directions of the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench of this Court in the writ petition as well as in the writ appeal, concluded that the penalty of Reduction to a lower grade, i.e., from MMG Scale-III to JMG Scale-I imposed vide order dated 28.10.2010 remains justified and commensurate with the misconduct established in



**NC: 2026:KHC:49175-DB
CCC No. 1082 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010579562026

the disciplinary proceedings. Accordingly, no merit was found in the appeal and the appeal was rejected.

4. The sole contention of the learned counsel for the complainant is that in terms of the order of the Division Bench in the Writ Appeal, the Appellate Authority could have imposed a punishment other than what was imposed earlier. In our considered view, this submission of the learned counsel for the complainant is not warranted. The order of the Division Bench of this Court, is quoted above, which does not reflect any such observation that would assist the complainant. If the complainant is aggrieved, it is for the complainant to seek an appropriate remedy against the Appellate order passed by the Authority. This contempt case is consigned.

**Sd/-
(JAYANT BANERJI)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(TARA VITASTA GANJU)
JUDGE**