



CNR: KAHC010629782024

NC: 2026:KHC:47794
WP No. 30846 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M

WRIT PETITION NO. 30846 OF 2024 (L-KSRTC)

BETWEEN:

M.R.MUNIRAJU,
S/O. M.RAMANJINAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R/AT WARD NO.21,
J.J.NAGAR, RAILWAY STATION ROAD,
CHINTAMANI TOWN,
CHIKKABALLAPUR DISTRICT - 563 125.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M.C.BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE DIVISIONAL CONTROLLER
AND DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY,
K.S.R.T.C.,
CHIKKABALLAPUR DIVISION,
CHIKKABALLAPUR - 562101.

...RESPONDENT

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

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, SEEKING CERTAIN
RELIEFS.

THIS WRIT PETITION IS LISTED FOR PRELIMINARY
HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS
UNDER:



CNR: KAHC010629782024

NC: 2026:KHC:47794
WP No. 30846 of 2024

ORAL ORDER

Sri.M.C.Basavaraju., counsel for the petitioner, and Smt.H.R.Renuka, counsel for the respondent, have appeared in person.

2. The short facts are these:

The petitioner was selected and appointed as a Driver in the Corporation's establishment. He was subjected to disciplinary proceedings for an act of misconduct, namely unauthorised absence from 25.10.2018 to 13.06.2019, and an Article of Charge was issued. The disciplinary authority appointed an inquiry officer. The inquiry officer conducted a detailed inquiry and submitted findings holding that the charges were proved, and the petitioner was dismissed from service on 04.03.2020.

Aggrieved by the same, he filed a dispute before the Labor Court in I.D.No.03/2022. The Labor Court held that the domestic inquiry conducted by the Corporation was fair and proper. By award dated 06.08.2024, the Labour Court dismissed the claim petition. Under these circumstances, this



CNR: KAHC010629782024

**NC: 2026:KHC:47794
WP No. 30846 of 2024**

writ petition is filed on several grounds as set out in the memorandum of writ petition.

3. Counsel for the respective parties urged several contentions. The Court heard the arguments and perused the papers carefully.

4. The point that requires consideration is whether the award of the Labor Court requires interference.

5. The facts are sufficiently stated and do not require repetition. It should be noted that the workman underwent disciplinary proceedings and was dismissed. The core issue is unauthorized absence, with the charge that he was absent without permission from duty between 25.10.2018 to 13.06.2019.

6. The Corporation specifically contends that no leave application was submitted. If a leave application is filed, it must be supported by a Medical Certificate or Prescription if the leave is for health reasons.



CNR: KAHC010629782024

**NC: 2026:KHC:47794
WP No. 30846 of 2024**

7. An employee is obliged to attend work as scheduled and cannot leave without a valid reason. Unauthorized absence is considered misconduct in industrial employment and can lead to disciplinary measures. Employees do not have a right to take leave of absence; remaining absent without approval breaches discipline. Such unauthorized absence is misconduct that justifies disciplinary action. The severity of punishment for misconduct or unauthorized absence varies with the specific circumstances.

8. The Labor Court examined Ex.W1 to Ex.W3, which are medical documents and certificates presented by the workman to prove his inability to attend duty due to health reasons. However, the Court did not accept these documents, believing they seemed to have been created specifically for this case. As a result, the Labor Court did not rely on Ex.W1 to Ex.W3 to determine that the workman was unable to attend duty on medical grounds.

A review of the dismissal order shows that he has a history of nearly 21 cases, all for unauthorized absence. His past and current behavior indicate a lack of interest in



CNR: KAHC010629782024

NC: 2026:KHC:47794
WP No. 30846 of 2024

performing his duties diligently. An employee with such a record does not deserve sympathy, especially misplaced sympathy. After carefully considering the available evidence, the Labor Court correctly rejected the worker's claim. I believe the Labor Court's conclusions are fair and appropriate.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***dismissed***.

Because of the dismissal of the Writ Petition, any pending interlocutory applications, if any, are disposed of, and any interim relief, if any, stands discharged.

**Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE**

MRP
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 43