



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 34709 OF 2025 (S-TR)

BETWEEN:

DINESH M
S/O MALLEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELEC)
O AND M UNIT-1, S-18
POORNAPRAGNA LAYOUT
BESCOM, BANGALORE-560 085.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SUVARNA LAKSHMI M.L., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE KARNATAKA POWER
TRANSMISSION CORPORATION LIMITED
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
CORPORATE OFFICE, CAUVERY BHAVAN
BANGALORE-560 009.
2. THE DIRECTOR (ADMIN AND HR)
THE KARNATAKA POWER
TRANSMISSION CORPORATION LIMITED
REP. CORPORATE OFFICE
CAUVERY BHAVAN, BANGALORE-560 009.
3. BANGALORE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY COMPANY LTD.
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
CORPORATE OFFICE, K R CIRCLE
BANGALORE-560 001.
4. SHAHSHIKUMAR.T.P
MAJOR BY AGE

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



WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (TECH)
O AND M DIVISION SUB-DIVISION
CHAMUNDESHWARIPURA
CESCOM, MYSORE-570004

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. RAKSHITHA D J., ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R3:
SRI SATISH K, ADVOCATE FOR R4)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR THE ENTIRE RECORDS LEADING TO THE OFFICE ORDER DATED 14-11-2025 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT QUASH THE IMPUGNED OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM DATED 14-11-2025 BEARING NO. KPTCL/DGMP/MES1(B59)/19/2025 (ANNEXURE-E TO THE WRIT PETITION) ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT BY ISSUING A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

1. In this writ petition, the petitioner has called in question the impugned transfer order dated 14.11.2025 passed by respondent No.2 vide Annexure-E, whereby respondent No.4 has been transferred to the place of the petitioner i.e. Poornapragna Layout, Unit No.18, Sub-Division, BESCOM, Bangalore.



2. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed as an Assistant Engineer by way of direct recruitment in the respondent-Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited (KPTCL). Subsequently, the Bangalore Electric Supply Company Limited (BESCOM) conducted a separate recruitment process for the post of Assistant Engineer. The petitioner applied pursuant to the said notification and was appointed as an Assistant Engineer in BESCOM. Thereafter, by the official memorandum dated 03.07.2023 vide Annexure-A, he was transferred from O&M Unit, S-20 Sub-Division, ITI Layout, BESCOM, HSR Layout, Bengaluru, to O&M Unit-1, S-18 Sub-Division, Poornapragna Layout, BESCOM, Jayanagar. Thereafter, by the impugned transfer order dated 14.11.2025 vide Annexure-E, the petitioner was replaced and respondent No.4 was transferred in his place. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner is before this Hon'ble Court.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has raised the following contentions:



a) Firstly, by the impugned transfer order vide Annexure-E, respondent No.4 has been transferred to the place of the petitioner. However, no posting has been specified in respect of the petitioner. Therefore, the impugned transfer order is without jurisdiction. In support of her contention, learned counsel has relied upon the judgment of this Court in ***Miss Seema H. vs. State of Karnataka and Ors.***, reported in ***(2017) 2 AIR Kant R 59.***

b) Secondly, as per the Transfer Guidelines, general transfers are to be effected between 15.05.2025 to 14.06.2025. The impugned transfer order has been passed on 14.11.2025, beyond the said general transfer period and that too without assigning any reasons. It is further submitted that instead of file being emanated from the Competent Authority on the instructions of the Chief Minister, the file was forwarded for approval. Hence, the impugned transfer order is contrary to the Transfer Guidelines. In support of her contention, learned counsel



has also relied upon the decisions of this Court in W.P.No.16637/2022 and 11124/2022, which were disposed of on 14.09.2022 and 25.08.2022, respectively. Hence, she has sought for allowing the writ petition.

4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 3 has raised the following contention:

a) Firstly, the file was forwarded from the Department, thereafter the same was placed before the Chief Minister for approval. The impugned transfer order dated 14.11.2025 is a bulk transfer of 30 employees. In public interest, the respondents have effected the transfer. When there was a bulk transfer, the respondents were not required to assign reasons for each employee. In support of her contention, she has relied upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in W.P. No.24786/2023 and connected matters, disposed of on 22.01.2024.

b) Secondly, in the impugned transfer order, it is clearly stated that the petitioner has to report to the Head Office



for posting and also filed a memo enclosing documents to show that there are four vacant posts in Bengaluru and that the petitioner will be accommodated in one of those posts. Therefore, the petitioner cannot contend that he has been transferred without being indicated any place of posting.

5. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.4 has contended that the petitioner has completed his tenure and therefore, he cannot claim any vested right to continue at the same place. In support of his contention, he has relied upon the judgment of this Court in W.P.No.32799/2024 and connected matter, disposed of on 19.12.2024.

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

7. The impugned transfer order has been passed on 14.11.2025, vide Annexure-E. Along with the petitioner, a bulk transfer order involving 30 employees was issued on



03.11.2025. The Chief Minister has approved the said transfer and a copy of the approval has been produced along with the memo. The transfer order bears the signature of the Chief Minister on each page.

8. The Division Bench of this Court in W.P.No.24786/2023 and connected matters, disposed of on 22.01.2024, has held that when the order of transfer is made in bulk, it cannot be said that the Department is mandated to place detailed reasons for the transfer of each and every public servant. The relevant paragraph No.9 is extracted below:

"9.....
..... Accordingly, further proceedings in the records clearly depicts that, the transfers of the petitioner was made pursuant to prior-approval accorded by the Chief Minister. Moreover, at the cost of repetition, we find it relevant to mention that, when an order of transfer is made in bulk, it cannot be said that the department is mandated to place detailed reasons for transfer of each and every public servant provided, the same shall be forthcoming when read in conjecture with their service records.



Hence, we are not in congruence with the contention put forth by the petitioners."

9. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner that she was transferred beyond the general transfer period and that, as per Clause 9 of the Transfer Guidelines, reasons have to be assigned, is unsustainable.

10. Insofar as the contention that the file was not emanated from the Department is concerned, as per the records produced by the counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 3, the file was forwarded from the Department and also through the concerned Minister and placed before the Chief Minister. Thereafter, the Chief Minister has approved the transfer order. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner that the file was not emanated from the Competent Authority is unsustainable.

11. In the judgment relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner in W.P.No.24192/2023, disposed of on 15.12.2023, it was a case where there was no approval of



the Chief Minister. In the case on hand, I have gone through the records and the Chief Minister has approved the transfer by affixing his signature on each page.

12. With regard to the contention of the petitioner that no posting has been assigned to him, a perusal of the transfer order clearly indicates that the petitioner has been directed to report to the Head Office for posting. The respondents, by filing a memo, have placed on record that there are four vacant posts in Bengaluru and have stated that the petitioner will be accommodated in one of those posts. It is also relevant to note that the petitioner has been transferred only from one unit to another within Bengaluru and not outside the city. Further, the petitioner has already completed his tenure at the present place of posting. The Division Bench of this Court in W.P.No.226457/2020, disposed of on 11.11.2020, has held that upon completion of tenure, an employee cannot claim any vested right to continue in the same post as per



the Transfer Guidelines. The relevant paragraph No.13 of W.P.No.226457/2020 is extracted as follows:

"13. As regards the grievance respondent that by virtue of the order of transfer he being a Group 'B' Officer is being posted to a Group 'C' post, is the grievance as regard to posting and definitely is a distinct grievance from the order of transfer. In fact, while the petitioner has been transferred as per Annexure-A4 dated 23.07.2020 to the vacant post created by the transfer of Sri Bhimashankar Biradar, the second respondent has been transferred to the post of Sub-Registrar, Kerur which is a vacant post by a separate order at Annexure-A3. Such grievance relating to posting is a matter that could be remedied by approaching appropriate Authority in the line of administrative hierarchy. However, such grievance cannot have the effect of creating a vested right to remain in a post where he has already completed his tenure as per the Transfer Guidelines."

13. Similarly, this Court in W.P.No.32799/2024 and connected matter, disposed of on 19.12.2024 in paragraph 14 held as follows:



"14. It must be noticed that once the petitioner Sri B.C.Lokesh has completed his tenure of two years, in terms of Transfer Guideline No.7, the tenure may be extended or reduced under the circumstances enumerated therein. If that were to be so, once the minimum period of two years is completed, the petitioner cannot have a grievance as regards to his transfer subsequent to completion of such tenure."

14. The judgment relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner in the case of '**Miss Seema H**' (supra) relates to the transfer of an employee from one district to another district, wherein he had not completed his tenure. In the case on hand, the petitioner has completed his tenure. The posting has been shown, by filing a memo, to be within Bangalore. Therefore, the said judgment is not applicable to the facts of the present case..

15. In view of the above, the writ petition is devoid of merit. Accordingly, it is **dismissed**.

16. However, respondent Nos.1 to 3 are directed to issue appropriate posting orders to the petitioner within a period



NC: 2026:KHC:7881
WP No. 34709 of 2025

of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this
order.

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

HA
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 25