HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:19722-DB
CCC No. 1372 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 1372 OF 2024

BETWEEN:

MANJUNATHA K
S/O KALAPPA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEAWRS
WORKED AS ASSISTANT HIGHER PRIMARY SCHOOL
TEACHER
KOCHANAHALLI VARUNA HOBLI,
R/AT NO.81/1
JANAHITHA 1ST CROSS LIG-2
BOGADI 2ND STAGE
MYSORE 570 026

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. PRATHEEP K. C., ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by RAKSHA
Location: High Court of Karnataka

AND:

1. RITESH KUMAR SINGH
   THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
   THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
   DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY
   AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
   M S BUILDING
   BENGALURU 560 001

2. R KRISHNAPPA
BLOCK EDUCATION OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
TALUK ZONE, MYSORE 01

3. S T JAVAREGOWDA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTI (ADMN)
AND DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
MYSORE 01

…ACCUSED

4. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY
AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
M.S.BUILDING
BENGALURU-560 001
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY.

…PROFORMA RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. KAMROZ KHAN, AGA)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMPT OF COURT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THIS COURT IN WP NO.17689/2022 DATED 10.03.2023 VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN)

We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the complainant.

2. The learned counsel for the complainant submits that the complainant had been dismissed from service. He had challenged the dismissal before the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal (KSAT). Looking to the nature and gravity of the charge proved against the applicants, the KSAT held that the penalty of dismissal from service was reasonable, proper and proportionate. The applications were dismissed holding that there was no merit.

3. The writ petition filed by the complainant had been allowed and the order passed by the Tribunal was set-aside, however, reserving similar liberty to the State as stated in the Writ Petition No.14652/2022 and connected matters. The liberty granted therein was to the Government to conduct an enquiry insofar as the persons against whom allegations had been made were concerned.

4. It is submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the complainant that the complainant is a person against whom no such specific allegations were made and that therefore, he ought to have been reinstated in service. The direction of the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition No.17689/2022 (S-KSAT) and connected cases, reads as follows:-

"3. In view of the order passed by this Court in W.P No.14652/2022 and connected matters and the observations made therein, the writ petitions are allowed. The orders passed by this Tribunal is set-aside by reserving similar liberty to the State as stated in W.P.No.14652/2022 and connected matters."

5. Writ Petition No.14652/2022 was disposed of as follows:

"18. We are unable to appreciate the conduct of the petitioners/State. The action is contrary to its own Notification noted supra. Without going into the legality of both the entrustment order and the charge memo, we proceed to uphold the order of the Tribunal in W.P.Nos.14652/2022, 135/2023 and 24830/2022 quashing the impugned orders of the Government and the writ petitions are hereby rejected.

19. Liberty is reserved to the State to re-do the exercise in consonance with the observations made by the Tribunal in paragraph No.7 of its order dated 25.01.2022 in Application Nos.5702-5708/2021 and as re-iterated and upheld by this Court in paragraph No.17 of this order."

6. In the above view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the contention that there is non compliance of the directions of the Division Bench passed in Writ Petition No.17689/2022, cannot be accepted.

7. The learned counsel for the complainant submits that he intends to file a review petition in the writ petition. Leaving open the contentions of the parties to be decided in the review petition but without expressing any view on such contentions, the Contempt of Court case is ***closed***.

Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(TARA VITASTA GANJU)
JUDGE

RAK
List No.: 3 Sl No.: 4