HC-KAR
CNR: KAHC010080902026

NC: 2026:KHC:62065
WP No. 3603 of 2026
C/W WP No. 38357 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S.KINAGI

WRIT PETITION NO. 3603 OF 2026 (S-RES)

C/W

WRIT PETITION NO. 38357 OF 2025 (S-RES)

IN WP No. 3603/2026
BETWEEN:

1. MR. JUSTUS C K
S/O. LATE, CK GEORGE,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
HAVING WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M)
OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M) -1,
YTPS, RPCL YERAMARAS,
RAICHURU DISTRICT - 584135

Digitally signed by B NAGAVENI
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

2. KUSHAVANT R KONNUR,
S/O. RAJAPPA F KONNUR
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANCE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E) OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (O AND M)
SUPA, KPCL, GANESHGUDI, TOIDA TALUK,
UTTARAKANNADA DISTRICT - 581365,

3. SOUMYA
D/O. LATE DEVENDRA M C,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANCE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E), OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER DESIGN KPCL
GREEN BUILDING, BENGALURU -560001

4. PRAVEEN V CHAVADI
S/O. LATE, VIRUPAKSHI CHAVADI,
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M)
OFFICE OF S E (O) BTPS, EE(ST-3)/ U-3, BTPS,
BELLARY, THERMAL POWER STATION,
BELLARY
KARNATAKA - 583152

5. SHAKTHIPRASAD
S/O. LATE ASHOK G YADAVE,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E)
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER THERMAL
DESIGN KPCL GREEN BUILDING,
BENGALURU 560001.

6. MADHUSHREE S D
W/O. ROHAN S PURANIK,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (C)
KPCL, R/O 'RADHEY SHYAM',
NO.1,2ND FLOOR, 4TH MAIN ROAD,
CHANDRAMMA LAYOUT, BANASAVADI,
KALYANNAGAR POST,
BENGALURU-560043

7. MAHESHWARA G
S/O. K GANAPATHI,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER,
O/O EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (CIVIL) KARGAL,
KARGAL POST, SAGARA TALUK
SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT PIN 577421

8. RAGHUNANDAN N CHITRAK
S/O. NARASIMHAMURTY VG CHITRAK
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (M)
OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE ENGINEERING

(O,PS AND C)N, KPCL AMBIKANAGAR,
HALIYAL TALUK,
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT-581 363.

9. NAVEED ASLAM H MULLA
S/O. LATE, HASANMIYA,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M),
KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LTD
THERMAL POWER STATION,
BELLARI-583101.

10. MANJUNATHA LAKKUNDI
S/O. SHANKAR LAKKUNDI,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(C), O/O. EE(C)/ADPH, KPCL, ALMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE,
SITIMANI, BAGALKOT

11. RAGHAVENDRA M MAYACHARI,
S/O. MALAJAPPA MAYACHARI,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGEENER,
(PS AND O) JOG, JOGFALLS POST
SAGARA TALUK, SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT - 577435

12. SHIVAKUMAR G
S/O. LATE GURUNANJAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(M), AT EE/GTPS OFFICE,
JANJGIR CHHATTISGARH DISTRICT,

13. RAGHU M
S/O. LATE, SATHYANARAYANA MANKAN,
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(C), OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER (O&M) YCCPP,
YELAHANKA - 560063.

14. SANKET
S/O. LATE, NARAYAN RAO
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(M), OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE ENGINEERING (SHP)
2 RTPS, KPCL SHAKTHINAGARA DISTRICT,
RAICHUR 584170.

15. DEEPAK G MATH
S/O. LATE, G K MATH
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, (C),
0/0. EE(OLA)C-1/RTPS, KPCL
SHAKTINAGAR, DISTRICT RAICHUR 584170.

16. CHETAN L CHAVAN,
S/O.LATE, LAKSHMANARAV CHAVAN,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(M), O/O. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, (MM)-1, RTPS,
KPCL, SHAKTINAGAR DISTRICT,
RAICHUR 584170.

17. SRINIVAS PRATAP M
S/O. MAHADEVAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(M), O/O. THE EEST-4/U7 & 8, RTPS, KPCL,
SHAKTINAGAR DISTRICT, RAICHUR 584170.

18. PRITHVIRAJ R SHET,
S/O. LATE, RAMESH G SHET,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANCE ENGINEER (M)
/SE(O)/YTPS
RAICHUR - 584170.

19. MAHESH KUMAR B
S/O. RAMALINGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,

WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER, (M),
O/O. 4/U7AND8, RTPS, KPCL,
SHAKTINAGAR DISTRICT, RAICHUR -584170.

20. RAVEESH VIJAYA KUMAR C D,
S/O. LATE, R DEVAKUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(M), OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M-4),
YERMARUS THERMAL POWER STATION,
CHICKASUGUR
RAICHUR 584 134.

21. VENKATESH G
S/O. LATE G NARASIMULU,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(E) OFFICE OF
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, (CHPE-1), RTPS, KPCL,
SHAKTINAGAR,
RAICHURU TALUK AND DISTRICT - 584170.

22. DEVANAGOWDA B T TOPANAGOWDA,
S/O.BASAVANAGOWDA TOPANAGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER(E) EXECUTIVE
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (O&M) KADRA,
KPCL KARWAR TALUK,
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT -581301

23. K PAVAN KUMAR
S/O. LATE, K RAMARAO
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, (E)
0/0. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ST-4/U/12), RTPS, KPCL
SHAKTINAGAR, TALUK AND DISTRICT
RAICHUR 584 170.

24. RAMDAS SHANKAR DESAI,
S/O. S R DESAI, AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(C)

O/O.. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (C) KADRA,
KPCL KARWAR TALUK,
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT 581301

25. PRASANNA KUMAR G R
S/O. RAJE GOWDA N
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E),
(UG) O/O. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (O&M) LPH, KPCL,
LINGANAMAKKI, SAGARA TALUK,
SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT 577421.

26. SHARANABASAPPA,
S/O. LATE MARTHANDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(M),
0/0. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M-1),
YERMARUS
THERMAL POWER STATION,
CHICKASUGUR-584134

…PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. VIKRAM HUILGOL, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. SHOWRI H R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT, ENERGY DEPARTMENT,
VIKAS SOUDHA,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU 560 001

2. KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LIMITED,
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR,
SHAKTHI BHAVANA,
RACE COURSE ROAD,
BENGALURU 560 001

3. THE DIRECTOR (ADMIN AND HR)
SHAKTHI BHAVANA,
RACE COURSE ROAD,
BENGALURU 560 001

....RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHASHI KIRAN SHETTY, A.G., ALONG WITH
SRI. G RAMESH NAIK, AGA FOR R1
SRI. SHASHIKIRAN SHETTY, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. AJAY J NANDALIKE, ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE PROVISIONAL SENIORITY LIST-II DATED. 01.12.2025 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LIMITED (KPCL FOR SHORT), VIDE ANNEXURE-A. B) ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER DIRECTION THAT THE ACT OF THE RESPONDENT NO.2 APPLYING THE RATIO OF THE ORDER AT ANNEXURE PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT ON PETITIONERS AND REVISING THE SENIORITY LIST AS PER ANNEXURE- A IS IMPROPER AND NOT JUSTIFIED. C) ISSUE ANY OTHER WRIT OR DIRECTION TO MEET THE ENDS OF JUSTICE. D) AND PASS ANY ORDERS AS DEEMED FIT AND PROPER IN THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCE OF THE CASE.

IN WP NO. 38357/2025

BETWEEN:

1. H B SIDDALINGASWAMY

S/O S BASAVANNA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 05-2645
R/AT NO.T-4/12
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK,
UDUPI-576282

2. MANJUNATH P N
S/O NANJEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 46 YEARS.
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL),
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-2648
R/AT TYPE- B/67, RTPS COLONY
SHAKTHINAGAR, RAICHUR-584170

3. MANJUNATH H S
S/O SHAMANNA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE)
KPCL, CEED, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 05-2498
R/AT NO.10/1, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
JUSTICE BHIMAYYA LAYOUT
K R PURAM, BENGALURU- 560 036.

4. SUMA H
D/O LATE HANUMANTHARAYA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(M)
KPCL, CEED, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 05-2529
R/AT NO.530, 1ST MAIN ROAD, C CROSS,
3RD STAGE, 4TH BLOCK,
BASAVESHWARA NAGAR,
BENGALURU-560079

5. KRISHNEGOWDA LK
S/O KANTHARAJU
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION: ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(ELE) KPCL, BIDADI WASTE TO ENERGY PROJECT.
EC NO 06-10152
R/AT NO.244, 7TH MAIN, RPC LAYOUT
HAMPINAGARA, VIJAYANAGARA,
BENGALURU-560104

6. RAJESH D
S/O DEVAIAH L
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(ELE) KPCL,
YERMARUS THERMAL POWER STATION.
EC NO 06-10174
R/AT NO.301,3RD FLOOR, B3 BLOCK
YTPS BUILDING, KPCL COLONY, SHAKTINAGAR
RAICHUR- 584170

7. SUNIL KUMAR K
S/O KRISHNEGOWDA K C
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECH)
KPCL, BIDADI WASTE TO ENERGY PROJECT.
EC NO 07-10511
R/AT NO.44/1, KURUBALLI DODDI,
KABBAL POST, SATHANUR HOBLI,
KANAKAPURA TALUK,
BENGALURU SOUTH DIST-562126

8. PRADEEP M
S/O NAGARAJU S.M
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER(ELE)
KPCL, SHIVASAMUDRA POWER HOUSE.
EC NO 07-10165
R/AT NO.514, 9TH CROSS,

TK LAYOUT, MYSORE-570009

9. SHWETHA M P
W/O VINOD P
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER(ELE)
KPCL, SHIVASAMUDRA POWER HOUSE.
EC NO 07-10172
R/AT NO.119/A, 1ST MAIN, 4TH CROSS,
MS LAYOUT, JARAGANAHALLI, JP NAGAR,
6TH PHASE, BENGALURU-560078

10. SHESHU M
S/O MADAIAH
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(MECH)
KPCL, CEED, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 05-2490
R/AT NO.340/1, BESIDE MADESWARA TEMPLE
T NARASIPURA MAIN ROAD,
ALANAHALLI
MYSORE- 570 028.

11. UMADEVI G
W/O PRAVEEN S HIREMATH
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(E)
KPCL, CEED, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 06-2895
R/AT NO.33A, SHREE LINGA BASAVESHWARA NILAYA
2ND CROSS, SNEHANAGARA,
AMRUTHAHALLI MAIN ROAD,
BYATARAYANAPURA,
BENGALURU-560092

12. UDAY K M
S/O MURALISHANKAR
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELE) KPCL, CEED,

BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 06-10154
R/AT MAIN ROAD, 1ST BLOCK
KALVARA(POST), KAIVARA
CHINTAMANI TALUK,
CHIKKABALLAPURA DIST -563128

13. YASHASWINI T C
D/O CHANDARA RAJ URS T G
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER(E) KPCL, CEED,
BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 07-10489
R/AT NO.3419, 2ND FLOOR, 6TH CROSS ROAD
GAYATRI NAGAR, RAJAJINAGAR
BENGALURU-560021

14. DUSHYANTH T
S/O LATE THIRUMALE GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(M) KPCL,
CETD, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 05-2646
R/AT 2C JAYANTH SANTIS,
RAMANASHREE CALIFORNIA GARDENS,
ANANTHPURA GATE,
YELAHANKA, BENGALURU-560064

15. KEERTHI R
S/O LT. RAMEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(M)
KPCL, CETD, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 06-2705
R/AT RAVI ARAMANE, BCC LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, 4TH CROSS,
CHANDRA LAYOUT
BENGALURU-560040

16. NEELAM G GAONKAR

D/O GOPINATH F GAONKAR
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(E)
KPCL, EESOLAR, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 06-2794
R/AT NO.8 T1, SHREYAS APARTMENT,
6TH MAIN, 13TH CROSS,
VYALIKAVAL,
BENGALURU-560003

17. SHANTHAMANI
D/O LT. SIDDANAGOUDA PATIL
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(E)
KPCL, EESOLAR, BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 06-2894
R/AT M2004, BLOCK4, MANTRI SERENITY,
DODDAKALLASANDRA,
BENGALURU-560064

18. GANESHA C
S/O CHANDRAPPA V
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(M)
KPCL, CE(MINES), BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 06-2902
R/AT NO.76/2, 2ND FLOOR, VARALAKSHMI NILAYA,
GOVINDAPPA ROAD, BASAVANAGUDI,
BENGALURU-560004

19. PALLAVI H N
D/O NARAYANASWAMY D
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER(M)
KPCL, CE(MINES), BENGALURU-560 001.
EC NO 07-10229
R/AT NO.360, 6TH CROSS, 1ST FLOOR,
BCC LAYOUT, CHANDRA LAYOUT
BENGALURU-560040

20. SHIVAPRAKASH S
S/O SAHEBAGOWDA PATIL
AGE ABOUT 46 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECH)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
EC NO 2642
R/AT NO.407, RAGA FORT KOLAGAL ROAD,
VIDYA NAGAR
BALLARI, PIN-583104

21. SANTOSH KUMAR M S
S/O CHANDRASHEKAR RAO M S
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELE) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
EC NO 10579
R/AT PLOT NO.8/9, V V COLONY
HARIPRIYA NAGARA, MOKA ROAD
BALLARI, 583103

22. MANJUNATHA B
S/O LAKSHMAPPA B
AGED 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER
STATION, BELLARY, EC NO 06-10207
R/AT NO.619, W NO.29 B/H INDIAN BANK,
BELAGAL CROSS AT POST BALLARI-583104

23. SHANTHAMALLAPPA
S/O SHANKARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL) KPCL
BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY,
EC NO 10204
R/AT NO.17, GURU CRESCENT,
A2 HOUSE, AISHWARYA COLONY
BALLARI-583101

24. KARTHIKA KAMMAR
S/O K KOMARASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION AEE(M)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY,
EC NO 10192
R/AT 'NAMMANE', 1ST WARD
YASHAWANTHA NAGAR POST, SANDUR TALUK,
BALLARI-583124

25. CHETHAN KUMAR
S/O CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION AEE(E)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY,
EC NO 10150
R/AT NO.201, GS HEIGHTS
BEHIND KAVITHA WINES, TALUR ROAD
BALLARI-583103

26. JADESH KUMAR SHETTY
S/O SATHYA NARAYANA SHETTY
AGED 42 YEARS
DESIGNATION
AEE (E)KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
BELLARY,
EC NO 10159
R/AT PLOT NO 17C,
VADDE NAGAPPA COLONY
NEAR JAYARAMA VIDYALAYA SCHOOL
CONTONMENT, BELLARY 583104

27. GIRISH BEVOOR
S/O K F BEVOOR
AGED 46 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 2692
R/AT 1025, OPPOSITE AKASHAVANI
2ND CROSS, 35TH WARD VIDYARANYA BADAVANE

HOSPET-583201

28. ADARSHA M
S/O MANJUNATHA REDDY
AGED 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER(ELE)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 07-10491
R/AT NO.10, RENUKA NAGAR 17 TH CROSS,
TALUR ROAD, BALLARI 583103

29. VANISHREE V B
W/O B SHAILESH
AGED 41 YEARS
DESIGNATION AEE (E)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 10281
R/AT MIG 2-14, GANDHINAGAR KHB
NEAR BALABHODINI SCHOOL
BALLARI 583103

30. SANTHOSH KUMAR H T
S/O THIPPANNA S
AGED 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION AE(M)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY,
EC NO 10515
R/AT NO.48 AND 49
GROUND FLOOR, NEAR KIDZEE SCHOOL
BHATRI ROAD, VIDYA NAGAR,
BALLARI-583104

31. SHIVAGOND BIRADAR
S/O RAMAGOND
AGE 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
BALLARI
EC NO 10513
R/AT NO.378, 5TH MAIN, KUVEMPU NAGAR

BALLARI-583115

32. KRISHNA RANGAYYA
S/O VENKATA RANGAYYA
AGE 38 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 10191
R/AT GANDHINAGAR, BALLARY-583158

33. BABU KUMAR H
S/O KARIYAPPA
AGE 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
EC NO 10216,
R/AT 14TH WARD, SUBHASH NAGAR,
CHAPPARDALLI, SANDUR,
BALLARY-583119

34. HULIRAJA G
S/O G VENKAPPA
AGE 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECH)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 10213
R/AT NO.188, SKANDAPUR LAYOUT, SANDUR,
SANDUR TALUK,. BALLARY-583119

35. MALLIKARJUNA B
S/O B KM OMKARAPPA
AGE 43 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECH) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
R/AT NO.33, 1ST CROSS, KUVEMPU NAGARA,
BALLARI 583104

36. NAGANJAN S L
S/O LAKHISHMALAH SHETTY SN
AGE 43 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
EC NO 2889
R/AT NO.8, 1ST FLOOR, 4TH CROSS
VIDYA NAGAR, WEST BALLARI-583104

37. SACHIN V MAHAPURUSH
S/O VIVEKANANDA SWAMY M
AGED 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELE) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 10474
R/AT G04, SURYA HILL VIEW APRT,
VIDYANAGAR, 4TH CROSS, BELLARY-583104

38. IKRAMUDDIN LANGOTI
S/O NIJAMUDDIN
AGE 41 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 10202
R/AT SURYA HILL VIEW APRT, VIDYANAGAR
4TH CROSS, BELLARY-583104

39. K SOUJANYA
W/O KRISHNA KISHORE
AGE 34 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL) KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 10531
R/AT NO.33, VADDE NAGAPPA COLONY
TILAK NAGAR, BALLARI-583101

40. RAVI KUMARA B M
AGE 39 YEARS

DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION, BELLARY
EC NO 10201
R/AT BHARADWAJA NILAYA
4TH CROSS, VIDYA NAGAR
BALLARI-583104

41. NIRANJANA MURTHY. T.N
S/O T G NAGARAJA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E) KPCL,
SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATION EC NO.
NO. 2497
R/AT H. NO. PC 10, SE MOUNT, KPCL, JOG FALLS
SAGAR TQ.
SHIMOGA DIST. -577435

42. ALLAMAPRABHU M. AMBI
S/O MALLAPPA M. AMBI
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E) KPCL,
SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATION
EC NO. NO. 2531
R/AT H. NO. 82/2, KPCL COLONY,
KARGAL, SAGAR TQ.
SHIMOGA DIST. -577435

43. HASEENA K.,
W/O MOHAMMED AFROZ AHAMED
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E)
KPCL, SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATION
EC NO 2538
R/AT II. NO. PC 11, SE MOUNT, KPCL, JOG FALLS
SAGAR TQ, SHIMOGA DIST. -577435

44. APPANNA N.K
S/O KUTTAPPA N.K
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E)

EC NO 2888
R/AT D NO 432, GOKULAM, VIJAYNAGAR,
2ND STAGE, 1ST MAIN, 6TH CROSS,
SAGAR (T)-577401

45. SHLIPA S. MOTHI,
W/O NIRANJANA MURTHY. T. N
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M)
KPCL, GERUSOPPA POWER HOUSE. EC NO 2652
R/AT B-13/2, KPC COLONY,
JYOTHINAGAR, GERUSOPPA-581384

46. VENKATESHA R
S/O LATE RUDRAMUNI
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E)
KPCL, SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATION EC NO 10171
R/AT H.NO. PF 5/2
SVP COLONY, KPCL, JOG FALLS
SAGAR (T), SHIMOGA (D) -577435

47. MOHAMMED FAROOK AHMED
S/O LATE MOHAMMED BASHEER AHMED
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E)
KPCL, SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATOION
EC NO 10170
R/AT H.NO. PF-5/1, S.V.P COLONY, KPCL, JOGFALLS
SAGAR (T), SHIMOGA (D)-577435

48. CHANNAKESHAVA B.K
S/O BANDI KERIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER. (E)
KPCL, SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATOION
EC NO 10153
R/AT H.NO. PF 23/2, SVP COLONY, KPCL, JOG FALLS
SAGAR (T), SHIMOGA (D)-577435

49. SHIVANAND YAJI
S/O MANJUNATHA YAJI
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E)
KPCL, GERUSOPPA POWER HOUSE EC NO.10160
R/AT B-16/1, KPC COLONY,
JYOTHINAGAR,
GERUSOPPA-581384

50. DIVYA S
W/O MANOHARA C
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (E)
KPCL, SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATION EC NO. 10185
R/AT H. NO. B2/2,
KPCL COLONY, KARGAL-577435
SAGAR TQ. SHIMOGA DIST.

51. RAVISHANKAR S B
S/O BASAVARAJAPPA S
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (E). KPCL,
SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATION
EC NO-10168
R/AT H NO PF 1/2 SVP COLONY, KPCL, JOG FALLS
SAGAR (T), SHIMOGA (D) -577435

52. PURUSHOTHAMA S
S/O SREENIVASACHARI M
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (E) KPCL,
GERUSOPPA POWER HOUSE EC NO 10473
R/AT B-17/1, KPC COLONY, JYOTHINAGAR,
GERUSOPPA-581384

53. MARUTHI L
S/O LAKSHMINARASIMHAIAH
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS

DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (E) KPCL,
GERUSOPPA POWER HOUSE EC NO-10581
R/AT B-12/1, KPC COLONY, JYOTHINAGAR,
GERUSOPPA-581384

54. SATISH KUMAR K
S/O KRISHNAPPA P
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (E) KPCL,
GERUSOPPA POWER HOUSE EC NO 10475
R/AT B-17/2, KPC COLONY, JYOTHINAGAR,
GERUSOPPA-581384

55. PRASAD S
S/O SHIVANNA R
AGE 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (M) KPCL,
BHADRA GENERATING STATION E.C.NO 10509
R/AT H.NO. TYPE B 3/3, BHEP COLONY, KPCL,
B R PROJECT -577115 BHADRAVATI (T),
SHIMOGA(D)

56. MEGHARAJA H H
S/O LATE HUCHAPPA H H
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (M)
KPCL, SHARAVATHY POWER GENERATING STATION
EC NO. 06-2905
R/AT B BLOCK DOOR NO 4/4
SVP COLONY, KPCL JOG FALLS-577435 SAGAR T,
SHIMOGA DISTRICT

57. MANJOORILAHI JAKATI
S/O MAHAMMADARAFIK JAKATI
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL)
KPCL, NAGJHARI POWER HOUSE.
EC NO 06-10462
R/AT H.NO 28/2, TYPE 5, 2ND COLONY, KPCL,

AMBIKANAGAR, DANDELI-581363

58. ZAHEER AHAMAD
S/ O SULAIMAN SAHEB
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 07-10498
R/AT NO.T-3/27/2, KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

59. KISHORE KUMAR SHETTY B
S/ O LATE VASU SHETTY.
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECH)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 06-2808
R/AT NO.T-4/09
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

60. DINESH NAYAK
S/O LATE MANJUNATHA NAYAK
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(ELECTRICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 06-10179
R/AT NO.T-3/4/2
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

61. VISHWANATHA S K
S/ O KODANDARAM
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER(MECHANICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 07-10506
R/AT NO.T-3/43/2

KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

62. MAHESHACHARI MAYACHARI
S/O LATE NAGENDRA ACHARI
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(ELECTRICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 06-10175
R/AT NO.T-3/3/1
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

63. CHETHANA S SHETTY
S/O SHIVARAMA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 07-10479
R/AT NO.T-3/47/2
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

64. MADHU K R
S/O REVANASIDDAPPA K U
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 06-10173
R/AT NO.T-3/32/1
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

65. VAGESH HIREMATH
S/O BASAVARAJAYYA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)

VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
E.CODE 06-2686
R/AT NO.T-4/3
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK, UDUPI-576282

66. RADHESH
S/O. CHANDAYA BONTRA
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
KODSALLI POWER HOUSE
E. CODE 07-10490
R/AT NO.B-10/3
KPCL COLONY, KADRA
KARAWAR, UTTAR KANNADA- 581396

67. K SHASHIDAR
S/ O K BASAVARAJ
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
E.CODE 05-2499
R/AT NO.T-5/3
KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI
KUNDAPURA TALUK,
UDUPI-576282

68. SHRUTHI C.
W/O ABHIJITH
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
VARAHI HYDRO ELECTRIC PROJECT
EC NO 07-10176
R/AT NO.T-3/8/1, KPCL COLONY, HOSANGADI,
KUNDAPURA TALUK UDUPI-576282

69. SHWETHA TJ
W/O NAVEEN CP
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS

DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELE) KPCL,
SHIVA HYDRO EIEC NOTRIC STATION.
EC NO 07-10500
R/AT HOUSE NO C1, SBI BANK ROAD,
KPCL SHIVA COLONY, BLUFF, SHIVASAMUDRAM,
MALAVALLI 571430

70. SHIVAKUMAR B
S/O NAGENDRACHARI
AGE ABOUT 40 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO-10525
R/AT TYPE- 5/73, RTPS COLONY SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

71. YALLAPPA
S/O SHIVAPPA MADDIKAR
AGE ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (CIVIL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-10451
R/AT TYPE- 4/61, RTPS COLONY SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

72. LANKESH KUMAR M D
S/O DEVARAJE GOWDA M B
AGE ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-10206
R/AT TYPE- B/94, RTPS COLONY SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

73. SRINIVASA S C
S/O CHIKKANNA
AGE ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-10526

R/AT TYPE- 5/158, RTPS COLONY SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

74. NATESH BABU C S
S/O SRINIVASAPPA
AGE ABOUT 38 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO 10452
R/AT TYPE- B3/502,
YTPS QRTS,
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR.
RAICHUR 584170

75. NAGRAJ
S/O BHEEMANNA
AGE ABOUT 42 YEARS.
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER
STATION EC NO-10211
R/AT H.NO T-4/67,
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR 584170

76. SHIVARUDRA
S/O SHIVANNA
AGE ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER
STATION EC NO. 06-10203
R/AT B3-501,
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR 584170

77. SURESH B
S/O BHEEMAPPA
AGE ABOUT 33 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER
STATION EC NO-10528

R/AT T-6-702, RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR 584170

78. SOMEGOWDA B.S
S/O SOMEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO-10514
R/AT H.NO T-5/173 RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR 584170

79. AMRUTH C
S/O CHANDRA NAIK C K
AGE ABOUT 35 YEARS
EC NO-10584
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO-10584
H NO.T-5/208RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

80. ABHISHEK NAIK M
S/O MOTHILAL NAIK
AGE ABOUT 34 YEARS,
EC NO-10535
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL).
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO. 10535
R/AT H.NO T-5/190
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

81. SUGURESH
S/O NAGAREDDY
AGE ABOUT 42 YRS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL),
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO 2810

R/AT H.NO-T-4/64
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

82. MANJUNATHA G K
S/O KRISHNAPPA
AGE ABOUT 41 YRS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL),
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO.NO-07-10518
R/AT H.NO-TYPE-B/40
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

83. KRISHNAMURTHY G D.
S/O DODDAIH
AGE ABOUT 43 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL),
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO.NO-10530
R/AT TYPE-5/175, RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

84. VINOD D
S/O A DAS
AGE ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELE), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC
NO. 10493
R/AT TYPE-B/50, RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

85. CHANDRASHEKAR E
S/O ERAPPA
AGE ABOUT 41 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELE), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC
NO.NO-10164
R/AT TYPE-5/256

RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

86. MAHESHWARI B
D/O BASAVANNA
AGE ABOUT 38 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE),, KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO.NO-10182
R/AT TYPE-5/256
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

87. RAJASHEKAR
S/O SANGAPPA
AGE ABOUT 53 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO.NO-2647
R/AT TYPE- B-9, RTPS COLONY SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

88. MANJUNATH H SONNAD
AGE ABOUT 48 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO.2434
R/AT TYPE-3/H NO.3, RTPS COLONY
SHAKTHINAGAR, RAICHUR-584170

89. MANJUNATH HALEGOUDRA
S/O THIMMANAGOUDA HALEGOUDRA
AGE ABOUT 47 YEARS,.
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO. 2701
R/AT TYPE-5/192, RTPS COLONY,
SHAKTHINAGAR, RAICHUR-584170

90. SATHISHA C

S/O CHIKKADASAIAH
AGE ABOUT 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL),
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO,
NO-10524
R/AT TYPE-4/66, RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

91. KRISHNA SANGA
S/O SANTOSH
AGE ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELE) KPCL,
RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO. 10161
R/AT B-1/G3 RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR
RAICHUR-584170

92. GIRIBABU M. C
S/O CHOWDAPPA
AGE ABOUT 49 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO. 2717
R/AT B-1/303
YTPS QUARTERS, RTPS COLONY,
SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

93. ANAND
S/O PRAHLAD GANGAVATI
AGE ABOUT 44 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL),
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO 10197
R/AT T-B/33,
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

94. RAVI.B.S
S/O SOMEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 41 YRS

DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL),,
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-10527
R/AT T-5/201,
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

95. NAGARAJ M.G
S/O GAIBU
AGE ABOUT 38 YRS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL),, KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO.13382
R/AT YERAMARAS RAILWAY STATION AREA
RAICHUR-584134

96. RAKESH G.K
S/O KUBERAPPA
AGE ABOUT 33 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECH),, KPCL,
RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO-07-10521
R/AT T-5/271, RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

97. GOVERDHAN
S/O MALLIKARJUN
AGE ABOUT 49 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE), KPCL,
RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO-2683
R/AT T-5/209, RTPS COLONY SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

98. KADAPPA M NAYAK
S/O LATE MAGEPPA S NAIK
AGE ABOUT 55 YEARS
DESIGNATION SUPERINTENDED ENGINEER (CIVIL),
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-2460
R/AT T-2/2, RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

99. CHANDRAPPA G
S/O LATE GUGGARI HANUMANTHAPPA
AGE ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECH),, KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO 10519
R/AT T-B/115,
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

100. TEKURI HARIBABU
S/O LATE T KRISHNAIAH
AGE ABOUT 35 YEARS
DESIGNATION AE(E)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-10580
R/AT T-5/179,
RTPS COLONY, SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

101. GOWRI MAHESH
S/O LATE BASAVAIAH
AGE ABOUT 46 YEARS
DESIGNATION EE(E)
KPCL, YERMARUS THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-2630
R/AT T-4/88, RTPS COLONY
SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

102. MAHESH N. VERNEKAR
S/O NAGESH K VERNEKAR
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE), KPCL,
YERMARUS THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO-2662
R/AT T-B/14, RTPS COLONY
SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

103. NAGARJUN Y
S/O YAJAMAN HN
AGE ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELE),, KPCL, YERMARUS THERMAL. POWER STATION
EC NO-10151
R/AT H.N 81, AKSHARADAMA, NISARGA LAYOUT
ABBIGERE
BENGALURU -560090

104. SHASHIDHAR V KUNTOJI
C/O VEERESH B KUNTOJI
AGE ABOUT 40 YEARS.
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL), KPCL, ALMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE.
EC NO, NO-10449
R/AT OM NAGAR, NEAR POST OFFICE, BASAVANA
BAGEVADI, BIJAPUR-586203

105. AYISHA I H
D/O IMTHIYAZ HUSSAIN
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELE), KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO, NO-10285
R/AT T-V/150, RTPS COLONY
SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

106. SHIVAKUMAR BARBARE
S/O UMAKANT BARBARE
AGE ABOUT 44 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECH), KPCL,, ALAMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE
EC NO-2699
R/AT M.H.POWER P-19,22ND CROSS
SHIVALAYA TEMPLE, VIDYAGIRI,
BAGALKOT-587103

107. KAVITHA AMBALI
D/O RANGAPPA AMBALI
AGED ABOUT 33YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELE)
KPCL, ALAMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE.
EC 10485
R/T SHRI ALLAMAPRABHU NILAYA,
PLOT NO 63L, 4TH CROSS VIDYAGIRI,
BAGALKOT-587102

108. KHAJAPEER T
S/O MOHAMMED ISAK
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECH)
KPCL, BALLARI THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO 10522
R/AT H NO 21 1ST WARD FORT,
NEAR KALLESHWARA TEMPLE,
HUVINA HADAGALI - 583219

109. RAMESH TR
S/O LATE RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELE) KPCL,
BALLARI THERMAL POWER STATION.
EC 07-10477
R/T NO. GHOUSIA MANZIL,
1ST FLR, 1ST CROSS MK NAGAR,
BALLARI- 583104

110. J NATARAJA
S/O ESHWARAPPA J
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECH)
KPCL, BALLARI THERMAL POWER STATION.
EC 10209
R/T NO.209, VIDYANAGAR WEST
KSR PEARL APARTMENT,

3RD CROSS, BALLARI-583104

111. HANUMANTAPPA
S/O YALLAPPA MADIVALAR,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL) KPCL, BALLARI THERMAL POWER STATION.
EC 10459
R/T HOOLAGERI TQ, KUSTAGI
DT KOPPAL PIN- 583281

112. ARUN PS
S/O SANNEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL)
KPCL, BALLARI THERMAL POWER STATION.
EC 10458
R/T NO.28, NEAR OVERHEAD TANK
PEEHALLI(V) KADIYALA(P)
ARAKERE(H) SRIRANGAPATNA(T)
MANDYA DIST-571415

113. GOPALKRISHNA V
S/O SHANMUKHAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL)
KPCL, BALLARI THERMAL POWER STATION.
EC 10463
R/AT NO.137, WARD NO.3,
NEAR DYAVAMMA TEMPLE HOSADAROJI POST,
SANDUR TALUK,
BELLARY DISTRICT-583189.

114. PUSHPARAJA N
S/O M CHANDAPPA POOJARY
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECH)

MASTHIKATTE-577448
EC 10217
R/AT PB 2/3, KPC COLONY,
MASTHIKATTE,
HOSANAGAR TALUK,
SHIVAMOGGA-577448

115. RAMESH G V
S/O GURAPPA
AGE ABOUT 45 YEARS,
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL)
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO,2643
R/AT TYPE-B/130, RTPS COLONY,
SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

116. HARISH K M
S/O M MOODALAGIRI GOWDA
AGE ABOUT 44 YEARS,
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL)
O/O EE (O AND M), SHIVA, KPCL
EC NO 2528
R/AT KL 586, 11TH CROSS APMC ROAD
V V NAGAR, KALLAHALLI,
MANDYA-571401

117. SHARANABASAVA
S/O SUGAPPA K
AGE ABOUT 35 YEARS,
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL) EC NO. 13381
KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
R/AT TYPE-V/320, RTPS COLONY,
SHAKTHINAGAR,
RAICHUR-584170

118. SHOBHA

D/O VENKOBA
AGE ABOUT 45 YEARS,
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE) KPCL,
RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION
EC NO,2637
R/AT TYPE-B3/103, RTPS COLONY,
SHAKTHINAGAR, RAICHUR-584170

119. RAVI KUMAR V
S/O VEERESH H
AGE ABOUT 39 YEARS,
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL) KPCL, RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION EC NO, 10208
R/AT TYPE-B1/204, RTPS COLONY,
SHAKTHINAGAR, RAICHUR-584170

120. S VIJAY KUMAR
S/O S.H.SOMAPPA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
DESIGNATION EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELE)
KPCL, NAGJHARI POWER HOUSE.
EC 2532
R/AT TYPE-4/49,
KPCL COLONY,
DANDELI TALUK_581363
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT

121. CHANNABASAVA S U
S/O SHANMUKAPPA C U
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
OCC ASSISTANT ENGINEER (M)
EC. NO. 10507
H. NO. 9/2, TYPE-5, FIRST COLONY, KPCL
AMBIKANAGAR-581363 DANDELI TQ.
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT.

122. GIRISH L
S/O LAKSHMINARAYANA.M.C
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER

(MECH)
KPCL, BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION.
EC 07-10210
R/AT 2ND CROSS,
AISHWARYA COLONY,
BALLARI -583104

123. MAMATHA.S
W/O ASHOK KUMAR.B.V
AGED ABOUT 35YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECH)
KPCL, SHIVA HYDRO POWER STATION.
EC 07-10588
R/AT NO 2627, KOLAR MAIN ROAD,
GANDHINAGAR,
BANGARPETE,
KOLAR-563114

124. PRIYANKA I
W/O SIDDU RAVINDRA REDDY
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
DESIGNATION ASSISTANT ENGINEER(ELE) KPCL,
CETD,
BENGALURU-01 EC NO. 10157
R/AT NO. 203, VICTORY HARMONY APPT,
SSA ROAD, CHOLANAYAKANAHALLI HEBBAL,
BENGALURU, 560032,

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. P.S. RAJGOPAL, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. PRASANNA V R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LIMITED
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR,
NO.82, RACE COURSE ROAD,
SHAKTHI BHAVAN,
BENGALURU-560 001.

2. THE DIRECTOR (HR),
THE KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LIMITED,
NO.82, RACE COURSE ROAD,
SHAKTHI BHAVAN,
BENGALURU-560 001.

3. THE GENERAL MANAGER (ADMIN. AND HR)
THE KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LIMITED,
NO.82, RACE COURSE ROAD,
SHAKTHI BHAVAN,
BENGALURU-560 001.

4. SRI HARISHA K
S/O KESHAVAMURTHY G
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL)IN THE OFFICE OF THE SE(O)
KPCL-BTPS
AND R/AT MANDARA
NEAR VIDYARANTA TEMPLE
VIDYARANYAPURA, SRINGERI
CHIKKAMANGALORE DISTRICT - 577 139

5. SRI SHANKAR V K
S/O VISHWESHWAR S K
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELECTRICAL) IN THE OFFICE OF THE SEEK
KPCL-KADRA
AND R/AT C/O ARAVINDA
#605, SHRIHARI NILAYA
2ND FLOOR, 6TH CROSS, UPKAR LAYOUT
BANGALORE - 560 091

6. SRI SHANKAR SHAJAPPA LAMANI.
S/O. SHAJAPPA LAMANI,
AGED 48 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(CIVIL) IN THE OFFICE OF THE SE (C), KPCL-NPH.
AMBIKANAGAR, NK. DIST.

(RESPONDENT Nos.4 TO 6 ARE IMPLEADED AS PER THE COURT ORDER DATED 04.08.2026 ON I.A. NO.1/2026)

7. SRI. VIJAYAKUMAR V.M..
S/O. VEERAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS, WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, (MECHANICAL), OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINER (ORM) KPCL, GERUSOPPA, JYOTHI NAGAR. UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT- 581 384.

8. SRI. SUDEEP K,
S/O KRISHNA K..
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
WORKING AS ANSSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINER (CIVIL) OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (CIVIL), KPCL, GERUSOPPA, JYOTHI NAGAR.
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT-581-384.

9. SRI MANOJ DESAI.
S/O SATISH R DESAI.
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS.
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MACHANICAL) OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (O&M), KPCL GERUSOPPA, JYOTHI NAGAR,
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT-581384.

10. SRI S M. GIREESHA.
S/O B MAHADEVAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 17 YEARS.
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (CIVIL), KPCL, GERUSOPPA, JYOTHI NAGAR.
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT - 581 384.

11. SRI SHREESHAIL KAMAGOUDA,
S/O LATE GURUSIDDA M. KAMAGOUDA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS.
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL),

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (FUCB), KPCL
BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
KUDITHINI, BELLARY DISTRICT-583152.

12. SRI. MANJUNATHA J. HUDED,
S/O JAMBUNATH HUDED,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS.
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MACHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(BOILER AND MAINTENANCE), KPCL..
BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
KUDITHINI, BELLARY DISTRICT - 583 152.

13. SRI. RAVI KUMAR D J
S/O JAGADISHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(BOILER MAINTENANCE) KPCL
BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
KUDITHINI, BELLARY DISTRICT - 583 152.

14. SRI. SUNIL V YADAHALLI
S/O LATE V YADAHALLI
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS
WORKING AS ASISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(COAL HANDLING PLANT) M I , KPCL
BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
KUDITHINI, BELLARY DISTRICT - 583 152.

15. SMT. CHAITRA P M.
W/O SUNIL V YADAHALLI
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEEER
(ELECTRICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(OUTLYING AREA), ELECTRICAL , KPCL
BELLARY THERMAL POWER STATION,
KUDITHINI, BELLARY DISTRICT - 583 152.

16. SRI. GOVINDAPPA JARALI

S/O MALAPPA JARALI
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEEER (MECHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
(ELECTRICAL) KPCL
ALAMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE
BAGALKOT DISTRICT - 587 207

17. SRI. GANAPATHI WADDAR,
S/O. SHANKAR,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS.
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINER
(CIVIL), OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(CIVIL), NAGAJARI DAM AND POWER HOUSE
DIVISION, KPCL,
AMBIKANAGAR
UTTARAKANNADA DISTRICT-581 363

18. SRI. VASUDEVA MURTHY,
SO JAYADEVAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MACHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(COAL HANDLING PLANT) M-2, KPCL
RAICHUR THERMAL POWER SLALION,
RAICHUR DISTRICT - 584 170.

19. SRI. RUPESHA D..
S/O. DODDARAMAIAH.
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(MACHANICAL),
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(COAL HANDLING PLANT) M-2, KPCL.
RAICHUR THERMAL POWER STATION.
RAICHUR DISTRICT-584 170.

20. SRI DEEKSHITH G.P..
S/O. PALAKSHA G.
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,

WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINES (ELECTRICAL),
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL
MAINTENANCE OF OPERATIONS) SHEVA, KPCL.
SHIVA HYDRO ELECTRIC STATION (SHIVA)
SHIVA SAMUDRAM
MANDYA DISTRICT-571430.

21. SRI RAMESH T.N,
S/O. NANJAPPA SHOLLY
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (CIVIL),
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (CIVIL)
SHIVA HYDRO ELECTRIC STATION (SHIVA)
SHIVA SAMUDRAM, MANDYA DISTRICT-571 430.

RESPONDENT NO. 7 TO 21 ARE IMPLEADED AS PER COURT ORDER DATED 04.08.2026 IN I.A. NO. 2/2026.

22. SRI. H E ABHILASH
S/O S. EREGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS.
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(MACHANICAL) OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MSP) KPCL, ADMIN BLOCK. JOGFALLS.
SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT- 577 435.

23. SRI YATHEESH KUMAR, B.E,
S/O ESHWARAPPA D.,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS.
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MACHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MM) (MGHB),
KPCL. JOGFALLS.
SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT - 577 435.

24. SRI. CHAITHANYA G.,
S/O GOPALA GOWODA.
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
WORKING AS ARSSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(MACHANICAL),

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MM) MGHE
KP JOGFALLS, SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT-477 435

25. SRI BALAKRISHNA SHASTRY S.
S/O SREENIVASACHAR,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL),
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) MANI, KPCL,
MASTHIKATTE, SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT -577 425.

26. SRI. SHASHIDHARA SHETTY,
S/O. SHEKAR SHELLY.
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELECTRICAL),
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) MANI, KPCL
MASTHIKATTE
SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT - 577 425.

27. SRI. VINAYAK KUMAR K.,
S/O K.S. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(MACHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (GATES),
SHARAVATHI, KPCL., KARGAL
SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT - 577 121.

28. SRI SHARANAPPA KAMATAR,
S/O VEERAPPA P. KAMATĀR,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(MACHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE), KPCL.,
ALAMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE,
BAGALKOT DISTRICT - 587 207.

29. SRI AVINASH KANCHAGAR,
S/O. SUBHASHCHANDRA,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MACHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(OPERATION & MAINTENANCE), KPCL,

ALAMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE,
BAGALKOT DISTRICT-587 207.

30. SRI MANJUNATHA R. NESAR,
S/O. RAMAPPA
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(MECHANICAL), OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE
ENGINEER. (OPERATION & MAINTENANCE), KPCL...
ALAMATTI DAM POWER HOUSE,
BAGALKOT DISTRICT - 587 207.

31. SRI. SANTHOSH PUJARI.
S/O VISHNU PUJARI.
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(OPERATION & MAINTENANCE), KPCL,
GHATAPRABHA DAM POWER HOUSE, HIDAKAL,
DAM, BELAGAVI DISTRICT - 591 107.

32. SRI. SUNIL BAGALKOT.
S/O SUSHILENDRA BAGALKOT
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
(MACHANICAL),
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) KPCL
GHATAPRABHA DAM POWER HOUSE HIDKAL DAM
BELAGAVI DISTRICT - 591 107

33. SRI. SWAROOP M H
S/O HAMPANNA A K

AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELECTRICAL)
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
(OPERATION)
KPCL, YERMARUS, THERMAL POWER STATION
RAICHUR DISTRICT - 584 101

34. SRI. RENUKARAJ SAVANT
S/O PRAKASH
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(MECHANICAL) A - NPH
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MSP) KPCL
AMBIKANAGAR
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT - 581 363

35. SRI. ADARSHA P
S/O PRASANNA P
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELECTRICAL)
WORKING AS ASSISTANT ENGINEER (ELECTRICALS)
(OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE) BHADRA, KPCL
BHADRA GENERATING STATION
BHADRAVATHI , SHIVAMOGGA DISTRICT - 577 115

36. SRI. SATHYANARAYANA SHARMA H R
S/O RAGHAVENDRA H G
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
WORKING AS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (MECHANICAL)
TRANSIT OFFICE, KPCL
NEW DELHI - 110 049

RESPONDENT NO.22 TO 36 ARE IMPLEADED AS PER
THE COURT ORDER DATED 04.08.2026 ON I.A.
NO.3/2026.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHASHI KIRAN SHETTY, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. AJAY J NANDALIKE., ADVOCATE

SMT. SANJANA S JAIN & RACHEL RAJU ALICE, ADVOCATES FOR R1 TO R3
SRI. M SUBRAMANYA BHAT, ADVOCATE FOR R4 TO R6
SRI. M.S. BHAGWAT, SR, COUNSEL FOR ADITHYA R CHAKRAGIRI & KAVITHA G BHAGWAT, ADVOCATES FOR R7 TO R21
SMT. SUVARNA M L, ADVOCATE FOR R22 TO R36)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE PROVISIONAL REVISED SENIORITY LIST-2 IN NO.A1P1A/2449 DTD. 01.12.2025 ISSUED BY THE R-1 KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LIMITED VIDE ANNX-A IN SO FAR AS THE PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED (I-A) IS INSERTED VIDE COURT ORDER DATED 04.08.2026, AMENDED PORTION IS SEPERATELY FILED.

DIRECT THE R-1 KPCL TO RETAIN THE PROVISIONAL REVISED SENIORITY LIST IN NO. A1P1A/1661 DTD. 01.09.2025 AND ISSUE FINAL SENIORITY LIST IN TERMS OF THE SAID PROVISIONAL REVISED SENIORITY LIST NO. A1P1A/1661 DTD. 01.09.2025 VIDE ANNX-G.

THESE PETITIONS, HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON 20.08.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCMENT OF ORDER, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS PRONOUNCED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S.KINAGI

CAV JUDGMENT

[COMMON ORDER]

1. These writ petitions are filed by the petitioners being aggrieved by the provisional revised seniority list-II dated 01.12.2025 vide Annexure-A in both writ petitions and the final seniority list dated 12.06.2026 issued by the respondent – Karnataka Power Corporation Limited (for short, '***the KPCL***') vide Annexure-P in W.P.No.3603 of 2026.

2. Since these two writ petitions arise out of the same controversy concerning the fixation of seniority in the cadre of Assistant Engineers in the KPCL and involve common questions, they are taken together for disposal through common order.

3. Brief facts, leading rise to the filing of these writ petitions are as follows:

In WP No.3603 of 2026:

4. It is the case of the petitioners that the petitioners have been appointed on compassionate grounds under the Scheme dated 14.05.2003 and subsequently, elevated to the post of Asst. Engineer as per SR.62 based on their educational qualifications. It is contended that according to Rule 62, there can be elevation based on educational qualification. It is contended that on 20.04.2003 Tripartite agreement was entered into under Sections 12(3) and 18(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between Respondent No 2 employees union and the labour department. It is contended that on 14.05.2003, new compassionate appointment schemes were introduced by the KPCL, according to which only the persons with requisite qualification would be appointed under compassionate appointment scheme. Thereafter, the petitioners herein were appointed as helpers on compassionate

ground and further, as per SR.62 they were elevated as Asst. Engineers and now they are working in different posts at the KPCL.

5. It is contended that, thereafter, some of the employees of the KPCL have filed the writ petition in W.P. No.11925 of 2012 challenging the 3 year additional service benefit given to certain Junior Engineers transferred to the post of Asst. Engineers. The said writ petition came to be disposed of vide order dated 04.12.2024. It was observed therein that for implementation of the elevation scheme, a Junior Engineer shall have a minimum qualifying service in the post before being promoted to the post of Assistant Engineer. Further, in cases of appointment by transfer or under a ladder scheme, Junior Engineers promoted to the post of Assistant Engineers were to be placed below directly recruited Assistant Engineers based upon their respective dates of entry into service.

6. Being aggrieved, the KPCL assailed the same in writ appeal in W.A. No.548 of 2025 and connected matters. However, same came to be dismissed on 13.11.2025 the confirming the order dated 04.12.2024.

7. Pursuant to the judgment dated 04.12.2024, the KPCL issued the Provisional Seniority List dated 01.09.2025 bearing No.A1P1A/1661. According to the petitioners, the said list removed the benefit of one-third weightage for purposes of seniority and placed the Assistant Engineers who had entered the cadre through the Elevation Scheme below directly recruited Assistant Engineers with reference to their actual dates of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre. Thereafter, upon receipt of objections, the KPCL issued the impugned Provisional Revised Seniority List-II dated 01.12.2025 bearing No.A1P1A/2449.

8. The petitioners resisted the same by filing their objection. The petitioners contend that while undertaking the exercise pursuant to the aforesaid judgments, the KPCL has gone beyond what was directed by this Court by retrospectively applying a five-year minimum qualifying service requirement to employees who had already been elevated to the post of Assistant Engineer under the Elevation Scheme. However, being affected by the inaction on the part of KPCL, the petitioners have filed the instant petitions.

In W.P. No.38357 of 2025:

9. The petitioners are all employees of the KPCL, who were initially appointed as Junior Engineers (JE) since the year 2003-04 having qualification of Engineering Degree and some of them had acquired Engineering Degree during their tenure while working as Junior Engineers appointed with qualification of Diploma,

which was the basic qualification to get recruited for the post of Junior Engineer.

10. The petitioners, being the Employees of the KPCL, are governed under the provisions of the ***Karnataka Power Corporation Limited Services (Cadre, Recruitment, Probation, Promotion and Seniority) Rules, 1997***. The petitioners are concerned with the Standing Rules bearing No.SR062 dated 04.03.2003 under which a provision is made to elevate the Junior Engineers to higher position of Assistant Engineers on possessing or acquiring Engineering Degree qualification, however, they will be placed below the Assistant Engineers who were directly recruited.

11. Under the aforesaid Scheme, the employees appointed as Junior Engineers with qualification of Engineering Degree will be elevated as Assistant Engineers by calling applications for such

appointments. Under the said Recruitment Notifications, the KPCL has not fixed any minimum service for elevation. However, while issuing Recruitment Notification commencing from the year 2014 i.e., in the Notification dated 01.12.2014, the 1st respondent - KPCL has made a provision to consider the minimum service under the Head - Probation/Minimum service/Postings, to the effect that "*if the candidate possessing higher qualification than the prescribed qualification are recruited, their claim for higher post based on higher qualification will not be considered till completion of 05 years of service*", whereas, in the Notification dated 03.08.2017, the KPCL has made a provision to consider the minimum service under the Head - Probation/Minimum service/Postings, to the effect that "*the candidates selected for the post of Junior Engineers and Chemical Supervisors who possess higher qualification than the prescribed qualification,*

their claim for higher post will not be considered for elevation under the elevation scheme upto 05 years as per existing C & R Rules", i.e., the KPCL used to elevate the employees who were serving as Junior Engineers with higher qualification suitable to the post of Assistant Engineers after completion of their probationary period by applying the elevation scheme as per Standing Rule SR062 dated 04.03.2003, by recruiting them in the post of Assistant Engineers, however, their seniority would be below the employees who were directly recruited as on the date of their elevation. There are several orders of such nature being passed by the KPCL at different intervals as and when recruitments are made for different cadres from 2004 onwards.

12. The petitioners are the employees who were elevated as Assistant Engineers at different intervals since 2004-05, a tabulation form showing the date of entry into service as Junior Engineer, date of entry as

Assistant Engineer by elevation as per Elevation Scheme under SR062 referred above and subsequent changes made are annexed to the petitions. Hence, prays to allow the writ petitions.

13. Respondent/KPCL has filed its objections denying the averments made in the writ petitions and raised several other grounds seeking the dismissal of the writ petitions.

14. It is contended by the respondents that the KPCL had introduced a scheme *"Elevation of employees to higher position of acquiring multi-tasking/ITI/Engineer diploma/ Engineer degree qualification".* According to which, an employee possessing requisite higher qualification could be elevated to the post of Junior Engineer / Assistant Engineer. The seniority of such employees, who were elevated was fixed by virtue of Annexure A. Therefore, the writ petitions assailing the provisional

list would become premature. It is contended that the KPCL has rightly implemented the scheme uniformly across the KPCL. It is contended that even before the respondents could act on the objections submitted by the petitioners and other employees, the petitioners have filed these writ petitions. It is contended that the instant petitions is nothing but an attempt to seek review of the order in W.P. No.11925 of 2012. Accordingly, prays to dismiss the writ petitions.

15. Heard Sri. M.R.Rajapogal, learned Senior Counsel and Sri.Vikram Huilgol, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners and Sri.Shashikiran Shetty, Learned Advocate general for the respondents-State.

16. Learned Senior Counsels for the petitioners would submit that there was no occasion for the KPCL to revise the seniority list dated 01.09.2025. The

second provisional list is without any rationale and basis. It is submitted that the scope of order passed in W.P. No.11925 of 2012 dated 04.12.2024 is limited to the issue of seniority and confined to Junior Engineers and Assistant Engineers only and by no amount of imagination, it could be stretched beyond that. It is submitted that the case of the petitioners falls completely outside the scope of the order passed in writ petition and the writ appeals. It is submitted that the order in W.P. No.11925 of 2012 protects the interest of the employees who were elevated like petitioners and the said order being confirmed in W.A. No.548 of 2025, the Assistant Engineers who had already assumed the office by virtue of previous orders prior to 2014-15, are required to be protected by not applying the minimum service of 5 years before assuming the post of Assistant Engineers. There is no direction in any of the decisions of this Court as to fix the

minimum service of 5 years for elevation retrospectively. It is submitted that the petitioners possess Bachelor of Engineering much before they were appointed under the compassionate ground. It is submitted that the act of the respondents in making changes to the seniority list and implementing it retrospectively violates fundamental rights of the petitioners. He submits that it is settled principle that the change in service conditions has to be applied prospectively and cannot be applied retrospectively to the disadvantage of the employees who have already been elevated under valid applicable Rules as on the date of their elevation. Accordingly, on these grounds, prays to allow the writ petitions.

17. Sri.M.S.Bhagwat, learned Senior Counsel, appearing for the other petitioners submits that the petitioners were recruited as Junior Engineers and served as Junior Engineers for more than 8 years before being

transferred to the cadre of Assistant Engineer through appointment by transfer in the KPCL on different dates. Upon completion of their graduation, petitioner Nos.1 to 125 were appointed as Junior Engineers on different dates and promoted to Assistant Engineers after 1 year of service by respondent No.1 by fixing a minimum 5 years service for Elevation Scheme of Assistant Engineers i.e., petitioner Nos.1 to 25. Objections filed by respondent No.4 comparing himself with the direct recruit i.e., Mahesh B. (i.e., Token No.2610) and by respondent No.5 comparing himself with the direct recruit Mahesh M. (i.e., Token No.2479).

18. He also submits that respondent Nos.4 to 6 filed objections questioning the final seniority list dated 12.06.2026, on the ground that the date of entry into Assistant Engineer cadre has been altered without any basis, that service weightage has not been considered while determining the eligibility for

the next promotion to the post of Assistant Executive Engineer, contrary to the directions issued in W.P. No.11925 of 2012.

19. The final seniority list vide Annexure – L was published pursuant to the judgment in W.P. No.11925 of 2012. The Co-ordinate Bench has directed respondent No.1 to (a) review all such promotions in the light of ***K.Narayanan and others*** and ***P.Sudhakar Rao and others***; (b) 1/3rd weightage of past service in the post of Junior Engineer to be given for the limited purpose of eligibility to the next promotion of Assistant Executive Engineer; (c) Minimum qualifying Junior Engineer service before promotion under Elevation Scheme shall be fixed to Elevation of Engineers.

20. He also submits that the Co-ordinate Bench has not issued any direction to alter the date of transfer of Junior Engineer to Assistant Engineer. The directions

were confined to revisiting the seniority based on the date of entry into Assistant Engineer cadre and 1/3rd weightage of Junior Engineer service for eligibility to promotion as Assistant Executive Engineer was not obliterated. The change of entry date of respondent Nos.4, 5 and 6 in the final seniority list is unsustainable and amounts to overreach of the order passed in W.P. No.11925 of 2012.

21. He submits that flaw in the seniority list is the absence of clarity on service weightage of Appointment By Transfer (ABT) / Assistant Engineers as an eligibility criteria as recognized in the cases of ***K.Narayanan and others v. State of Karnataka and others*** and ***P.Sudhakar Rao and others v. U.Govinda Rao,*** which is applied in W.P. No.11925 of 2012.

22. The KPCL has in fact allowed 1/3rd service weightage as eligibility for Assistant Engineer promotion to

certain Appointment By Transfer (ABT) candidates but denied the same to respondent Nos.4, 5 and 6. Hence, he submitted that respondent Nos.4, 5 and 6 prays to reject the claim of the petitioners in relation to final seniority list as per Annexure-L and quash the final seniority list to the extent the same relates to ranking assigned to respondent Nos.4, 5 and 6, and direct respondent No.1 to correct the date of entry of respondent Nos.4 to 6 into Assistant Engineer cadre as on the date of graduation.

23. *Per contra,* Sri.Shashikiran Shetty, learned Senior counsel for the KPCL submits that the impugned exercise is in implementation of the judgment dated 04.12.2024 as affirmed by the Division Bench. He submits that paragraph 20(c) of the judgment expressly requires minimum qualifying service before elevation to the post of Assistant Engineer and that the five-year period is supported by SR-044 dated 31.03.1992 and the subsequent recruitment

notifications. He submits that unless the five-year requirement is applied, employees elevated under the Elevation Scheme would obtain an advantage over other employees who were required to render the prescribed qualifying service before promotion. He therefore submits that the petitioners are, in substance, seeking to reopen issues which already stand concluded by the judgment dated 04.12.2024 and the judgment of the Division Bench dated 13.11.2025. Further, he also submits that since the provisional seniority list is in question, the petitions would become premature. Accordingly, on these grounds, prays to dismiss the writ petitions.

24. The authorities and the relevant paragraphs therein relied upon by the learned counsels for the respective parties are extracted as follows:

A. Learned Senior Counsel, Sri.Rajagopal, appearing for the petitioners in W.P. No.3603 of

2026 has relied upon the following decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court:

(a) ***C.Navaneeshwara Reddy v. Government of Andhra Pradesh and others- (1998) 3 SCC 240*** [paragraph Nos.6, 7]:

"6. We find force in the argument of the learned counsel appearing for the contesting unofficial respondents in all these appeals and without going into the correctness or otherwise of the reasons given by the Tribunal for quashing the impugned GO, we are satisfied from a careful reading of the impugned GO that the Government have not applied its mind before rejecting the objections raised by the contesting unofficial respondents. As a matter of fact, the objections, raising points both on law and on facts, were dealt with by the Government in the impugned GO by observing as follows:

> "In view of the above position, the Government see no reason to uphold the objections raised by the affected persons and hereby reject them as untenable."

7. Beyond this, there was no discussion regarding the objections raised by the contesting unofficial respondents. Therefore, we find

substance in the argument of the learned counsel for the contesting unofficial respondents. Accordingly, we confirm the judgment and order of the Tribunal challenged in these appeals. We direct the Government to take further steps in the light of the directions given by the Tribunal within a period of four months and in the meanwhile the appellant's seniority and promotion shall not be disturbed till the Government passes orders in the light of the directions given by the Tribunal. The appeals are accordingly dismissed. However, there will be no order as to costs."

(b) ***K.Narayan and others v. State of Karnataka and others – (1994) Supp. (1) SCC 44***

[Paragraph No.7]:

> **"7.** Rules operate prospectively. Retrospectivity is an exception. Even where the statute permits framing of rule with retrospective effect the exercise of power must not operate discriminately or in violation of any constitutional right so as to affect vested right. The rule-making authority should not be permitted normally to act in the past. The impugned rule made in 1985 permitting

appointment by transfer and making it operative from 1976 subject to availability of vacancy in effect results in appointing a Junior Engineer in 1986 with effect from 1976. Retrospectivity of the rules is a camouflage for appointment of Junior Engineers from a back date. In our opinion the rule operates viciously against all those Assistant Engineers who were appointed between 1976 to 1985.

In ***Ex-Capt. K.C. Arora* v. *State of Haryana*** [(1984) 3 SCC 281 : 1984 SCC (L&S) 520] and ***P.D. Aggarwal* v. *State of U.P.*** [(1987) 3 SCC 622 : 1987 SCC (L&S) 310 : (1987) 4 ATC 272] it was held by this Court that the President or Governor cannot make such retrospective rules under Article 309 of the Constitution as contravene Articles 14, 16 or 311 and affect vested right of an employee.

Even in ***B.S. Yadav* v. *State of Haryana*** [1980 Supp SCC 524 : 1981 SCC (L&S) 343 : (1981) 1 SCR 1024] where the power to frame rules retrospectively was upheld it was observed: (SCC p. 557, para 76)

> "Since the Governor exercises a legislative power under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution, it is open to him to give retrospective operation to the

> rules made under that provision. But the date from which the rules are made to operate must be shown to bear, either from the face of the rules or by extrinsic evidence, reasonable nexus with the provisions contained in the rules, especially when the retrospective effect extends over a long period as in this case."

As seen earlier there is no nexus between framing a rule permitting appointment by transfer and making it retrospective with effect from 1976. Appointing a person to a higher post in a different cadre in which he has never worked is violative of constitutional guarantee of those who are working in the cadre. It is against basic principle of recruitment to any service.

(c) ***Ajay Kumar Shukla and others v. Arvind Rai and others – (2022) 12 SCC 579*** [Paragraph Nos.23, 40, 42, 44]:

23. The appointing authority, in fact, committed an error in the manner in which the seniority list was prepared by placing the three select lists forwarded by the Commission on different dates one after the other en bloc as per the date of receipt of three select lists. It is not the case either of the private respondents, the State or

the Commission that appointment letters have been issued separately as and when the select lists were received. In fact, the appointment letters of all the three streams were issued in October 2001, after about 10 to 11 months of the receipt of the third list i.e. of the Civil stream in November 2000. Apparently by an oversight, the appointing authority failed to prepare the combined seniority list as required under the 1991 Seniority Rules, be it Rule 5 or Rule 8 with respect to the selection of the appellants and private respondents.

x x x

40. It is also admitted by the parties that the next promotion of Junior Engineers in the higher grade is to the post of Assistant Engineer. In the cadre of Assistant Engineer, there are no separate streams but only one cadre of Assistant Engineers. It is the seniority list of the cadre of Junior Engineers which would be the feeder cadre for the post of Assistant Engineers. The Junior Engineers of Agricultural stream of the selection of the year 2001, would have direct march over the Junior Engineers selected in the same selection of the Mechanical and Civil streams, even though the overall merit of some or many of Agricultural stream Junior Engineers

could be lower than some or many of the Engineers of the Mechanical and Civil streams. The appointing authority ought to have prepared a combined merit list based upon the performance or the proficiency on the basis of the marks received in the selection test as prepared by the Commission. Otherwise, it would amount to denial of the right of consideration for promotion to a more meritorious candidate as against a candidate having lesser merit. Right to promotion is not considered to be a fundamental right but consideration for promotion has now been evolved as a fundamental right.

x x x

42. A Constitution Bench in ***Ajit Singh (2)*** **v.** ***State of Punjab*** **[*Ajit Singh (2)* v. *State of Punjab*,** (1999) 7 SCC 209 : 1999 SCC (L&S) 1239] , laying emphasis on Article 14 and Article 16(1) of the Constitution of India held that if a person who satisfies the eligibility and the criteria for promotion but still is not considered for promotion, then there will be clear violation of his/her's fundamental right. Jagannadha Rao, J. speaking for himself and Anand, C.J., Venkataswami, Pattanaik, Kurdukar, JJ., observed the same as follows in paras 22 and 27 : (SCC pp. 227-28)

"*Articles 14 and 16(1) : is right to be considered for promotion a fundamental right*

22. Article 14 and Article 16(1) are closely connected. They deal with individual rights of the person. Article 14 demands that the 'State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws'. Article 16(1) issues a positive command that:

'there shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State'.

It has been held repeatedly by this Court that clause (1) of Article 16 is a facet of Article 14 and that it takes its roots from Article 14. The said clause particularises the generality in Article 14 and identifies, in a constitutional sense "equality of opportunity" in matters of employment and appointment to any office under the State. The word "employment" being wider, there is no dispute that it takes within its fold, the aspect of promotions to posts above the stage of initial level of recruitment. Article 16(1) provides to every employee otherwise eligible for promotion or who comes within the zone of consideration, a fundamental right to be "considered" for promotion. Equal opportunity here means the right to be "considered" for promotion. If a person satisfies the eligibility and zone criteria but is not considered for promotion, then there will be a clear infraction of his fundamental right to be "considered" for promotion, which is his personal right.

"Promotion" based on equal opportunity and seniority attached to such promotion are facets of fundamental right under Article 16(1)

***

> *27*. In our opinion, the above view expressed in *Ashok Kumar Gupta* [*Ashok Kumar Gupta* v. *State of U.P.*, (1997) 5 SCC 201 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 1299] and followed in *Jagdish Lal* [*Jagdish Lal* v. *State of Haryana*, (1997) 6 SCC 538 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 1550] and other cases, if it is intended to lay down that the right guaranteed to employees for being "considered" for promotion according to relevant rules of recruitment by promotion (i.e. whether on the basis of seniority or merit) is only a *statutory right* and not a *fundamental right*, we cannot accept the proposition. We have already stated earlier that the right to equal opportunity in the matter of promotion in the sense of a right to be "considered" for promotion is indeed a fundamental right guaranteed under Article 16(1) and this has never been doubted in any other case before *Ashok Kumar Gupta* [*Ashok Kumar Gupta* v. *State of U.P.*, (1997) 5 SCC 201 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 1299] right from 1950."
>
> (emphasis in original)

44. If the seniority list is allowed to be sustained then the Engineers who are more meritorious in the Mechanical and Civil streams than the Junior Engineers of the Agricultural stream would be deprived of their right of being considered for promotion and in fact their right would accrue only after all the Junior Engineers of the Agricultural stream selected in the same selection are granted promotion. For these

reasons also the seniority list in question must go.

(d) ***P.Sudhakar Rao and others v. I.Govinda Rao and others***, ***(2013) 8 SCC 693***, [paragraph Nos.44, 45, 46, 50 and 51]:

"Answering the questions

44. As far as the impact of the retrospective operation of the executive instructions or statutory rules on the seniority of employees is concerned (including the Junior Engineers before us), this issue is now settled by a few recent decisions of this Court. There is no doubt that retrospective operation can be given to statutory rules such as the Andhra Pradesh Engineering Service Rules. But, the retroactivity must still meet the test of Article 14 and Article 16 of the Constitution and must not adversely trench upon the entitlement of seniority of others.

45. Without intending to multiply precedents on this subject, reference may be made to a decision rendered by this Court more than two decades ago. In *State of Bihar* v. *Akhouri Sachindra Nath* [1991 Supp (1) SCC 334 : 1991 SCC (L&S) 1070 : (1991) 16 ATC 936] it was held that retrospective seniority cannot be given

to an employee from a date when he was not even borne in the cadre. So also, seniority cannot be given with retrospective effect so as to adversely affect others. Seniority amongst members of the same grade must be counted from the date of their initial entry into the grade. It was held: (SCC pp. 342-43, para 12)

> "*12.* In the instant case, the promotee Respondents 6 to 23 were not born in the cadre of Assistant Engineer in the Bihar Engineering Service, Class II at the time when Respondents 1 to 5 were directly recruited to the post of Assistant Engineer and as such they cannot be given seniority in the service of Assistant Engineers over Respondents 1 to 5. It is well settled that no person can be promoted with retrospective effect from a date when he was not borne in the cadre so as to adversely affect others. It is well settled by several decisions of this Court that amongst members of the same grade seniority is reckoned from the date of their initial entry into the service. In other words, seniority inter se amongst the Assistant Engineers in Bihar Engineering Service, Class II will be considered from the date of the length of service rendered as Assistant Engineers. This being the position in law Respondents 6 to 23 cannot be made senior to Respondents 1 to 5 by the impugned government orders as they entered into the said service by promotion after Respondents 1 to 5 were directly recruited in the quota of direct recruits. The judgment of the High

> Court quashing the impugned government orders made in Annexures 8, 9 and 10 is unexceptionable."

46. This decision was cited with approval, a few years ago, along with the decision rendered in *Keshav Chandra Joshi* v. *Union of India* [1992 Supp (1) SCC 272 : 1993 SCC (L&S) 694 : (1993) 24 ATC 545] . This Court held that when a quota is provided for, then the seniority of the employee would be reckoned from the date when the vacancy arises in his/her quota and not from any anterior date of promotion or subsequent date of confirmation. It was observed that injustice ought not to be done to one set of employees in order to do justice to another set. It was said in *Uttaranchal Forest Rangers' Assn. (Direct Recruit)* v. *State of U.P.* [(2006) 10 SCC 346 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 116] , on referring to these judgments that: (SCC p. 364, paras 37-38)

> "*37.* We are also of the view that no retrospective promotion or seniority can be granted from a date when an employee has not even been borne in the cadre so as to adversely affect the direct recruits appointed validly in the meantime, as decided by this Court in *Keshav Chandra Joshi* v. *Union of India* [1992 Supp (1) SCC 272 : 1993 SCC (L&S) 694 : (1993) 24 ATC 545] held that when promotion is outside the quota, seniority would be reckoned from the date of the

> vacancy within the quota rendering the previous service fortuitous. The previous promotion would be regular only from the date of the vacancy within the quota and seniority shall be counted from that date and not from the date of his earlier promotion or subsequent confirmation. In order to do justice to the promotees, it would not be proper to do injustice to the direct recruits. …
>
> *38.* This Court has consistently held that no retrospective promotion can be granted nor can any seniority be given on retrospective basis from a date when an employee has not even been borne in the cadre particularly when this would adversely affect the direct recruits who have been appointed validly in the meantime."

x x x

50. The facts of the appeals before us show that at least some of the Supervisors were given retrospective seniority on the date when they were not even eligible for appointment as Junior Engineers. The precedents referred to above show that this is impermissible. In addition as pointed out by the High Court, there is no indication of the vacancy position, that is, whether the Supervisors could be adjusted in the grade of Junior Engineers from the date on which they were given notional retrospective seniority. There is also no indication whether the quota of vacancies for Supervisors was adhered to as on

the date on which they were given notional retrospective seniority. The case law suggests that this is an important factor to be considered. Finally, it is quite clear that the grant of retrospective seniority to the Supervisors has adversely impacted on the promotion chances of the Junior Engineers by bringing them down in seniority. This too is impermissible.

51. From the various decisions referred to and from the facts of the case, it is clear that to pass the scrutiny of Article 14 of the Constitution, the seniority of the Supervisors should be reckoned only from the date on which they satisfied all the real and objective procedural requirements of the Andhra Pradesh Engineering Service Rules and the law laid down by this Court. This has not happened in the present appeals creating a situation of unreasonableness and unfairness."

(e) ***The State of Assam and another v. Raghava Rajagopalachari – (1972) 7 SLR 44*** – [Paragraph No.13]:

13. The learned counsel for the State sought to argue before us that the date '16th Match 1954' occurring in the order dated January 28, 1964, was mentioned due to mistake and the

proper date which should have been mentioned was the date of superannuation, namely, June 30, 1953. He says that the order dated July 23 1953 continuing the services of the petitioner after the date of superannuation was bad in view of the ruling of this court in *State of Assam* v. *Padma Ram Borth*, AIR 1965 SC 473. But we are unable to appreciate how he is entitled to raise the point. The Writ was brought to challenge this order; No such petition even if it be competent, was filed by the State itself. The respondent to a Writ Petition cannot be allowed to attack its own order as a respondent.

(f) ***Govind Prasad v. R.G.Prasad and others – (1994) 1 SCC 437 –*** [paragraph No.11]:

11. Para 3 of the memorandum gives deeming effect — from July 1, 1978 — to the provisions in paras 1 and 2 of the memorandum. It is settled law that an executive order of the Government cannot be made operative with retrospective effect. It is, thus, clear that the memorandum contained various proposals which were to be incorporated in the statutory rules.

B. Learned counsel Sri.M.Subramanaya Bhat, appearing for respondent Nos.4 to 6, has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case ***of P.Mohan Reddy v. E.A.A. Charles and others, (2001) 4 SCC 433*** [paragraph No.17]:

> "**17.** A conspectus of the aforesaid decisions of this Court would indicate that even though an employee cannot claim to have a vested right to have a particular position in any grade, but all the same he has the right of his seniority being determined in accordance with the Rules which remained in force at the time when he was borne in the cadre. The question of re-determination of the seniority in the cadre on the basis of any amended criteria or rules would arise only when the amendment in question is given a retrospective effect. If the retrospectivity of the Rule is assailed by any person then the court would be entitled to examine the same and decide the matter in accordance with the law. If the retrospectivity of the Rule is ultimately struck down, necessarily the question of redrawing of the seniority list under the

> amended provisions would not arise, but if, however, the retrospectivity is upheld by a court then the seniority could be redrawn in accordance with the amended provisions of the employees who are still in the cadre and not those who have already got promotion to some other cadre by that date. Further, a particular rule of seniority having been considered by the Court and some directions in relation thereto having been given, that direction has to be followed in the matter of drawing up of the seniority list until and unless a valid rule by the rule-making authority comes into existence and requires otherwise, as was done in *Bola case* [(1997) 8 SCC 522] . It may be further stated that if any rule or administrative instruction mandates drawing up of seniority list or determination of inter se seniority within any specified period then the same must be adhered to unless any valid reason is indicated for non-compliance with the same."

C. Learned Advocate General, Sri.Shashikiran Shetty appearing for respondent No.1 in W.P. No.3603 of 2026 has relied upon the following authorities:

(a) ***S.Sarala Vandanam and another v. State of Andhra Pradesh and others – SLP (Civil) Nos.5843/2018*** decided on 20.01.2022;

"The present batch of Special Leave Petitions have been filed assailing the judgment and order of the Division Bench of the High Court impugned dated 31st January, 2018.

The Post of Deputy Tehsildar is included in the Schedule appended to the Andhra Pradesh Revenue Subordinate Service Rules (hereinafter being referred to as the "Rules") and so far as the rules regarding the seniority is concerned, has undergone a change after a spell of time on two or three occasions and that is one of the reason for which the employees working in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar recruited either as direct recruits/promotees had to question their determination of inter se seniority which has been once assigned by the competent authority.

It has come on record that, in the first instance, Rule 4(e) of the Rules came to be amended with retrospective effect from 12th

October, 1961 by G.O. dated 1st October, 1980 that came to be examined by
this Court in ***K.V. Subba Rao Vs. Government of Andhra Pradesh*** (1988) 2 SCC 201 wherein it was held that Rule 4(e) will apply prospectively to those who are appointed after 1st October, 1980.

Before the Government would proceed with determination of inter se seniority of direct recruits/promotees in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar, Rule 4(e) of the Rules was further amended by G.O. No. 990 dated 24th September, 1992 and the ratio of direct recruits/promotes undergone a change from 1:1 to 30:70. Thereafter, the final seniority list came to be published of the employees working in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar on 31st May, 1995, that became the subject matter of challenge earlier before the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, which finally travelled to this Court and taking into consideration the past history of the seniority list of Deputy Tehsildar, this Court in the case of ***P. Mohan Reddy vs. E.A.A. Charles and Others (2001) 4 SCC 433*** finally settled and laid down the principles according to which the inter se seniority of direct recruits/promotees

in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar was to be determined. Based on the principles laid down by this Court, the authorities proceeded to finalize the seniority list of the employees working in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar, but it took almost ten years and final seniority list of Deputy Tehsildar came be published on 6th August, 2010 followed with the seniority list of Tehsildars on 11th November, 2010.

Indisputedly, the revised seniority list dated 6th August, 2010 was never the subject matter of challenge. However, the G.O. No. 502, dated 16th September, 2013 came to be challenged by the persons effected and the Division Bench of the High Court, after taking into consideration the whole matrix of the matter and the inter se seniority of the direct recruits/promotees in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar in
particular, and taking note of the scheme of rules and the amendments which were given effect to from time to time, of which a reference has been made, finally arrived to a conclusion that looking to the past history, it would not have been possible to serve an individual notice and once there was a judgment of this Court, the authorities were under an obligation to finalize

the seniority list of Deputy Tehsildar in terms of the principles laid down and either of the affected parties who approached the High Court failed to question/point out as to what was the error been committed by the authority in determining the inter se seniority of direct recruits/promotees in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar.

However, the objection was that before there was a revision of seniority list, notice was not served and those who were directly affected, at least, right of opportunity would have been afforded to them. On principles, the High Court also agreed on the submissions made and we do find substance that if there is any revision in the seniority list prejudicial to the interest of the individual employee has been given effect to, opportunity of hearing has to be afforded. But the reason for which it was not possible to follow has been noted by the High Court in paragraph 54 of the judgment and we do find that once the seniority list has been revised of the employees working in the

cadre of Deputy Tehsildar pursuant to the judgment of this Court giving any further individual notice to the employees will certainly

be a useless formality and particularly when either of the affected employee who approached the High Court has failed to justify as to what was the error been committed in regard to his/her placement in the final seniority list published pursuant thereto.

We have heard the learned Counsel for the parties for quite some time and taking into consideration the material on record and the series of litigations which has undergone in determining the inter se seniority of direct recruits/promotees in the cadre of Deputy Tehsildar, we find no error has been committed by the High Court in the impugned judgment which may call for our interference and it is high time to put final quietus to this dispute.

Consequently, the petitions fail and accordingly dismissed."

(b) ***S.Sarala Vandanam v. State of Telangana - W.P. No.37770 of 2016 and connected cases, decided on 31.01.2018*** – [Paragraph No.54] (High Court of

Judicature at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana and the State of Andhra Pradesh):

"54. Normally we would have agreed with the above submission. Whenever objections are invited to a provisional seniority list, it is the duty of the concerned, to deal with the objections and provide reasons for overruling the objections. But, in the case on hand, we are unable to apply the said rule in view of (1) the magnitude of the exercise; and (2) the long history of this litigation. As a matter of fact, a Two Member Committee appointed under G.O.Ms.No.69 dated 11-02-2016 and an Advisory Panel constituted under G.O.Rt.No.1088 dated 07-1112016 had also gone into the matter. Therefore, the non-consideration of the objections of each and every individual and the recording of the reasons for the rejection of every one of them, in a case of this magnitude is not feasible. Moreover the objections are not individualistic. The whole litigation revolved around the ratio between direct recruits and promotees and the method of fixation of their inter-se seniority. Therefore, the contention regarding the non- consideration of the individual objections, cannot be accepted."

(c) ***Sri.R.Rudresh and others v. The State of Karnataka and others – WP No.1482 of 2021 [S-Pro] – decided on 25.01.2021*** –

by High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru:

"Petitioners are before this Court, challenging the provisional seniority list dated 27.10.2022 of the cadre of Teachers and Principals.

2. The petitioners said to have filed their objections by way of representations dated 16.05.2022 and 24.06.2022 vide Annexures-K and L. It is stated that, during the pendency of the writ petition, the provisional seniority list is finalized and final seniority list is published. Learned counsel for the petitioners also would submit that during the pendency of the writ petition, promotions have taken place on the basis of provisional seniority list.

3. During the pendency of the writ petition, final seniority list is published and promotions are said to have been given on the basis of provisional seniority list. Hence, it is open for the petitioners to challenge the final seniority list as also the promotions accorded on the basis of provisional

seniority list. No writ would be maintainable challenging the provisional seniority list, since it gives an opportunity to file objection before finalizing such provisional seniority list.

4. With the above, the writ petition stands disposed of,
with liberty to the petitioners to challenge the final seniority list as well as promotions given on the basis of provisional seniority list."

(d) ***Sri.Mahadevaswamy and others v. the State of Karantaka and others – in WP No.13988 of 2022 [S-RES]*** – by High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru:

"The petitioners in this writ petition have called in question a provisional seniority list notified by the second respondents insofar it pertains to the cadre of First Division Assistant.

2. Heard Sri Chandrakanth R. Goulay, learned counsel appearing for petitioners and perused the material on record.

3. It is the submission of learned counsel for petitioners, Sri Chandrakanth R. Goulay, that the petitioners are being shown as seniors in the

year 2019, despite their appointment being long before the appointment of the persons who are shown above the petitioners in the provisional seniority list.

4. He further submits that they have filed their objections to the provisional seniority list on 02/03.06.2020, 15.06.2020 and 09.09.2020 and have approached this Court with an apprehension that their objections would not be considered and the petitioners who have been placed below the persons who were appointed later may be considered for further promotions.

5. The apprehension of the petitioners is unfounded as the respondent - Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike is bound to consider the objections as their ranking is brought down in the provisional seniority list. It is also needless to observe that no promotions can be granted in terms of the provisional seniority list. The respondent – Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike is directed to consider the objections filed by the petitioners to the provisional seniority list and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

6. With the above observations, the writ petition is disposed.”

E. Learned Senior Counsel, Sri.M.S.Bhagwat, appearing for respondent Nos.7 to 21 in W.P. No.38357 of 2025 has relied upon the following judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court:

(a) ***Aligarh Muslim University and others v. Mansoor Ali Khan*** – ***(2000) 7 SCC 529*** [paragraph Nos.25 and 26]:

> **"25.** The "useless formality" theory, it must be noted, is an exception. Apart from the class of cases of "admitted or indisputable facts leading only to one conclusion" referred to above, there has been considerable debate on the application of that theory in other cases. The divergent views expressed in regard to this theory have been elaborately considered by this Court in *M.C. Mehta* [(1999) 6 SCC 237] referred to above. This Court surveyed the views expressed in various judgments in England by Lord Reid, Lord Wilberforce, Lord Woolf, Lord Bingham, Megarry, J. and Straughton, L.J. etc. in various cases and also views expressed by leading writers like Profs. Garner, Craig, de Smith, Wade, D.H. Clark

etc. Some of them have said that orders passed in violation must always be quashed for otherwise the court will be prejudging the issue. Some others have said that there is no such absolute rule and prejudice must be shown. Yet, some others have applied via media rules. We do not think it necessary in this case to go deeper into these issues. In the ultimate analysis, it may depend on the facts of a particular case.

26. It will be sufficient, for the purpose of the case of Mr Mansoor Ali Khan to show that his case will fall within the exceptions stated by Chinnappa Reddy, J. in *S.L. Kapoor* v. *Jagmohan* [(1980) 4 SCC 379] , namely, that on the admitted or indisputable facts, only one view is possible. In that event no prejudice can be said to have been caused to Mr Mansoor Ali Khan though notice has not been issued.

27. Our reasons for saying that the case of Mr Mansoor Ali Khan falls within the exception can be stated as follows:

Admittedly, leave was sanctioned only for 2 years from 18-4-1979. When before the

expiry of the period, Mr Mansoor Ali Khan applied on 18-4-1981 for extension of leave by 3 more years, the University wrote to him on 17-9-1981/23-9-1981 granting extension only for one year from 18-4-1981 and also stated that he was required to resume duties by 18-4-1982. It did not stop there. It further *forewarned* Mr.Khan as follows:

> "Please note that no further extension in the period of your leave will be possible and you are advised to make preparation for resuming duty positively by 18-4-1982."

In other words, he was put on advance notice that it would not be possible to give any further extension i.e. beyond one year on the ground of continuance in the job at Libya and he was to resume duty by 18-4-1982. In fact, thereafter some special consideration was still shown in his favour by way of granting him joining time up to 1-7-1982. It was clearly said that otherwise he would be deemed to have vacated the post. If he had, in spite of this warning, gone ahead by accepting a further contract in Libya, it was, in our view, his own unilateral act in the teeth of the advance warning given. That conduct, the learned Single Judge thought and in our view

rightly to be sufficient to deny relief under Article 226."

(b) Dharanpal Satyapal Limited v. Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise, Gauhati and others – (2015) 8 SCC 519 – [Paragraph Nos.42 to 48]:

"42. So far so good. However, an important question posed by Mr Sorabjee is as to whether it is open to the authority, which has to take a decision, to dispense with the requirement of the principles of natural justice on the ground that affording such an opportunity will not make any difference? To put it otherwise, can the administrative authority dispense with the requirement of issuing notice by itself deciding that no prejudice will be caused to the person against whom the action is contemplated? Answer has to be in the negative. It is not permissible for the authority to jump over the compliance of the principles of natural justice on the ground that even if hearing had been provided it would have served no useful purpose. The opportunity of hearing will serve the purpose or not has to be considered at a later stage and such things cannot be presumed by the

authority. This was so held by the English Court way back in the year 1943 in *General Medical Council* v. *Spackman* [1943 AC 627 : (1943) 2 All ER 337 (HL)] . This Court also spoke in the same language in *Board of High School and Intermediate Education* v. *Chitra Srivastava* [(1970) 1 SCC 121 : AIR 1970 SC 1039] , as is apparent from the following words : (SCC p. 123, para 7)

> "*7.* The learned counsel for the appellant, Mr C.B. Agarwala, contends that the facts are not in dispute and it is further clear that no useful purpose would have been served if the Board had served a show-cause notice on the petitioner. He says that in view of these circumstances it was not necessary for the Board to have issued a show-cause notice. We are unable to accept this contention. Whether a duty arises in a particular case to issue a show-cause notice before inflicting a penalty does not depend on the authority's satisfaction that the person to be penalised has no defence but on the nature of the order proposed to be passed."

43. In view of the aforesaid enunciation of law, Mr Sorabjee may also be right in his submission that it was not open for the authority to dispense with the requirement of principles of natural justice on the

presumption that no prejudice is going to be caused to the appellant since the judgment in *R.C. Tobacco* [(2005) 7 SCC 725] had closed all the windows for the appellant.

44. At the same time, it cannot be denied that as far as courts are concerned, they are empowered to consider as to whether any purpose would be served in remanding the case keeping in mind whether any prejudice is caused to the person against whom the action is taken. This was so clarified in *ECIL* [(1993) 4 SCC 727 : 1993 SCC (L&S) 1184 : (1993) 25 ATC 704] itself in the following words : (SCC p. 758, para 31)

> "*31.* Hence, in all cases where the enquiry officer's report is not furnished to the delinquent employee in the disciplinary proceedings, the courts and tribunals should cause the copy of the report to be furnished to the aggrieved employee if he has not already secured it before coming to the court/tribunal and given the employee an opportunity to show how his or her case was prejudiced because of the non-supply of the report. If after hearing the parties, the court/tribunal comes to the conclusion that the non-supply of the report would have made no difference to the ultimate findings and the punishment given, the court/tribunal should not interfere with the order of

> punishment. The court/tribunal should not mechanically set aside the order of punishment on the ground that the report was not furnished as is regrettably being done at present. The courts should avoid resorting to short cuts. Since it is the courts/tribunals which will apply their judicial mind to the question and give their reasons for setting aside or not setting aside the order of punishment, (and not any internal appellate or revisional authority), there would be neither a breach of the principles of natural justice nor a denial of the reasonable opportunity. It is only if the court/tribunal finds that the furnishing of the report would have made a difference to the result in the case that it should set aside the order of punishment."

45. Keeping in view the aforesaid principles in mind, even when we find that there is an infraction of principles of natural justice, we have to address a further question as to whether any purpose would be served in remitting the case to the authority to make fresh demand of amount recoverable, only after issuing notice to show cause to the appellant. In the facts of the present case, we find that such an exercise would be totally futile having regard to the law laid down by this Court in *R.C. Tobacco* [(2005) 7 SCC 725]

.

46. To recapitulate the events, the appellant was accorded certain benefits under the Notification dated 8-7-1999. This Notification stands nullified by Section 154 of the 2003 Act, which has been given retrospective effect. The legal consequence of the aforesaid statutory provision is that the amount with which the appellant was benefited under the aforesaid Notification becomes refundable. Even after the notice is issued, the appellant cannot take any plea to retain the said amount on any ground whatsoever as it is bound by the dicta in *R.C. Tobacco* [(2005) 7 SCC 725] . Likewise, even the officer who passed the order has no choice but to follow the dicta in *R.C. Tobacco* [(2005) 7 SCC 725] . It is important to note that as far as quantification of the amount is concerned, it is not disputed at all. In such a situation, issuance of notice would be an empty formality and we are of the firm opinion that the case stands covered by "*useless formality theory*".

47. In *Escorts Farms Ltd.* v. *Commr.* [(2004) 4 SCC 281] , this Court, while reiterating the position that rules of natural justice are to be

followed for doing substantial justice, held that, at the same time, it would be of no use if it amounts to completing a mere ritual of hearing without possibility of any change in the decision of the case on merits. It was so explained in the following terms : (SCC pp. 309-10, para 64)

> "*64.* Right of hearing to a necessary party is a valuable right. Denial of such right is serious breach of statutory procedure prescribed and violation of rules of natural justice. In these appeals preferred by the holder of lands and some other transferees, we have found that the terms of government grant did not permit transfers of land without permission of the State as grantor. Remand of cases of a group of transferees who were not heard, would, therefore, be of no legal consequence, more so, when on this legal question all affected parties have got full opportunity of hearing before the High Court and in this appeal before this Court. Rules of natural justice are to be followed for doing substantial justice and not for completing a mere ritual of hearing without possibility of any change in the decision of the case on merits. In view of the legal position explained by us above, we, therefore, refrain from remanding these cases in exercise of our discretionary powers under Article 136 of the Constitution of India."

> **48.** Therefore, on the facts of this case, we are of the opinion that non-issuance of notice before sending communication dated 23-6-2003 has not resulted in any prejudice to the appellant and it may not be feasible to direct the respondents to take fresh action after issuing notice as that would be a mere formality."

25. Perused the records and considered the submissions and the authorities relied upon by the learned counsel for the respective parties.

26. It is undisputed that the petitioners in W.P. No.3603 of 2026 have been appointed on compassionate grounds under the scheme dated 14.05.2003 and the petitioners in W.P. No.38357 of 2025 joined as Junior Engineers and subsequently elevated to the post next higher post of Asst. Engineer as per SR.62 dated 04.03.2003 under *KPCL (Cadre, Recruitment, Probation and Seniority) Rules, 1997* based on their educational qualifications. According to SR062, there can be elevation based on educational qualification.

On 20.04.2003, the Tripartite Agreement was entered into under Sections 12(3) and 18(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between respondent No.2 Employees' Union and the Labour Department. On 14.05.2003 new Compassionate Appointment Scheme was introduced by the KPCL, according to which only the persons with requisite qualification would be appointed under Compassionate Appointment Scheme. Thereafter, the petitioners herein were appointed as helpers on compassionate ground and further as per SR.62, they were elevated as Asst. Engineers and now, they are working in different posts at the KPCL. Thereafter, some of the employees of the KPCL have filed the writ petition in W.P. No.11925 of 2012 challenging the 3 year additional service benefit given to certain Junior Engineers transferred to the post of Asst. Engineers. The said writ petition came to be disposed of vide order dated 04.12.2024. It was observed therein that

for implementation of the elevation scheme, a Junior Engineer shall have a minimum qualifying service in the post before being promoted to the post of Assistant Engineer. Further, in cases of Appointment By Transfer or under a ladder scheme, Junior Engineers promoted to the post of Assistant Engineers were to be placed below directly recruited Assistant Engineers based upon their respective dates of entry into service.

27. Being aggrieved, the KPCL assailed the same in writ appeal in W.A. No.548 of 2025 and connected matters. However, same came to be dismissed by confirming the order dated 04.12.2024.

28. Pursuant to the judgment dated 04.12.2024, the KPCL issued the Provisional Seniority List dated 01.09.2025 bearing No.A1P1A/1661. According to the petitioners, the said list removed the benefit of one-third weightage for purposes of seniority and

placed the Assistant Engineers, who had entered the cadre through the Elevation Scheme, below directly recruited Assistant Engineers with reference to their actual dates of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre. Thereafter, upon receipt of objections, the KPCL issued the impugned Provisional Revised Seniority List-II dated 01.12.2025 bearing No.A1P1A/2449.

29. The petitioners resisted the same by filing their objections. Now, it is the contention of the petitioners that being aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the respondents, they have filed the instant petitions.

30. Admittedly, paragraph 20(c) of the order dated 04.12.2024 expressly directs that, for implementation of the Elevation Scheme, a Junior Engineer shall have minimum qualifying service in the post before being promoted to the post of

Assistant Engineer. The said direction was not interfered with by the Division Bench. The controversy, however, lies in the manner in which that direction has been implemented.

31. The direction to prescribe minimum qualifying service and the retrospective invalidation of an elevation already completed are two different matters. The former concerns the eligibility condition governing elevation under the Scheme. The latter concerns the legal consequence of an elevation which has already taken place pursuant to an order issued by the KPCL and under the service conditions applicable at the relevant time. A third and distinct matter is the fixation of seniority after the employee enters the Assistant Engineer cadre. No employee can claim seniority in the Assistant Engineer cadre from a date anterior to his or her actual entry into that cadre. The Division Bench has affirmed that principle. Equally, the benefit of one-third of past service in the

feeder cadre, wherever permissible, cannot be converted into a notional date of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre. However, correction of seniority cannot automatically be equated with cancellation of an elevation.

32. The distinction is evident from paragraph 20(i) of the order dated 04.12.2024, wherein this Court specifically recorded that the orders of appointment of the concerned employees as Assistant Engineers by Appointment By Transfer (ABT) or by applying the Elevation Scheme were not disturbed, subject to the directions issued therein. The direction contained in paragraph 20(c) must therefore be read harmoniously with the remaining directions in paragraph. It cannot be isolated from the express protection accorded to the orders of appointment/elevation. The judgment requires the KPCL to ensure that the Elevation Scheme operates with a minimum qualifying period. It does not,

however, expressly direct that every employee already elevated without such period is to be treated as having been illegally appointed or as having entered the Assistant Engineer cadre only upon completion of an additional period of five years. Nor does paragraph 20(c) itself prescribe the period of five years. The question whether the qualifying period to be applied in a particular case is five years must therefore be answered by reference to the applicable Service Rules, Standing Regulations and the Notification governing the relevant elevation.

33. The KPCL relies upon SR-044 dated 31.03.1992, which, according to the KPCL, prescribes five years as the minimum qualifying service for promotion from one cadre to the next higher cadre. The existence of such a provision does not, by itself, establish that the same provision retrospectively governed every elevation made under SR-062. The petitioners' case is that their elevations were made

under SR-062 dated 04.03.2003 and under the notifications applicable to their respective cases. The record further indicates that the five-year condition was expressly incorporated in subsequent notifications, including those issued from the year 2014 onwards.

34. The applicability of the five-year requirement must therefore be determined with reference to the service instrument governing the particular elevation. Where a notification governing a particular elevation expressly prescribed five years' qualifying service, the KPCL is bound to give effect to that condition. Conversely, where an employee was elevated under an earlier notification which did not contain such a condition, a subsequent notification cannot, merely by reason of its subsequent operation, be read retrospectively into the earlier completed elevation unless such retrospective operation is otherwise authorized by the governing Service Rules.

35. The principle is particularly important where retrospective application would not merely regulate future eligibility but would alter the legal consequences of an elevation already completed. A subsequent service condition cannot ordinarily be employed retrospectively to deprive an employee of the legal consequences of an appointment or promotion validly made under the conditions then applicable, unless the competent authority possesses lawful power to give such provision retrospective effect.

36. The Division Bench order dated 13.11.2025 is principally concerned with the impermissibility of assigning seniority in the Assistant Engineer cadre from a date anterior to actual entry into that cadre. It does not direct that an employee already elevated as Assistant Engineer must notionally be treated as having entered the cadre only five years after the date of such elevation.

37. Consequently, the KPCL cannot treat the direction to prescribe minimum qualifying service as an unrestricted authority to retrospectively rewrite the conditions governing every completed elevation.

38. The distinction between seniority and substantive elevation assumes significance in the present case. If an employee entered the Assistant Engineer cadre on a particular date, the employee cannot claim seniority in that cadre from an earlier date merely by relying upon service rendered as Junior Engineer. The appropriate consequence in such a case is correction of the seniority position. It would be a different matter if the KPCL were to hold that the employee had no right to occupy the post of Assistant Engineer at all until a later date because the employee had not completed five years of service. Such a conclusion would amount, in substance, to postponing the employee's entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre and would have

consequences substantially different from the correction of seniority directed by this Court. The KPCL must therefore keep the two exercises separate. The first is the correction of seniority in accordance with the judgments of this Court. The second is determination of eligibility for elevation with reference to the minimum qualifying service prescribed under the applicable service instrument. The latter cannot be used as a means of retrospectively creating an anterior or deferred date of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre unless such consequence is expressly authorised by the governing law.

39. The contention that the present petitions amount to an impermissible review of W.P. No.11925 of 2012 cannot be accepted. Admittedly, the petitioners do not challenge the judgment dated 04.12.2024. They do not seek to revive any notional seniority anterior to their actual entry into the Assistant Engineer

cadre. They accept the binding principle that the seniority of an Assistant Engineer cannot commence from a date anterior to actual entry into the cadre. Their grievance is against the administrative implementation of the said judgments, particularly the application of the five-year requirement to completed elevations. An administrative authority implementing a judicial decision must act within the scope of the decision and in accordance with the governing service rules. The finality of the earlier judgment does not prevent judicial review of an administrative action which is alleged to travel beyond the judgment or the applicable service rules.

40. The record indicates that different notifications operated at different points of time. The significance of this cannot be overlooked. An employee whose elevation was governed by a notification expressly prescribing five years' qualifying service stands on a different footing from an employee whose elevation

was completed under an earlier notification which did not contain such condition. The KPCL must therefore identify the applicable notification or service instrument before determining the consequence of the minimum qualifying service requirement in each case. A generalised approach treating every historical elevation under SR-062 as though it had been made under the same notification would fail to take into account the temporal operation of the service conditions. The final seniority exercise must consequently be undertaken with reference to the actual date of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre, the source under which the employee was elevated and the service conditions applicable to that elevation.

41. The petitioners have also questioned the opportunity afforded by the KPCL before issuance of the impugned Seniority list. From the material placed before the Court, it appears that objections were

invited to the provisional seniority list dated 01.09.2025 and objections were submitted by the affected employees. In that view of the matter, the impugned provisional seniority list cannot be interfered with solely on the ground that no opportunity whatsoever was afforded. Nevertheless, since the list remains provisional, the KPCL shall, before finalization, ensure that an employee, whose seniority is proposed to be altered on the basis of the applicability of the minimum qualifying service requirement, is afforded an effective opportunity to place on record the relevant appointment/elevation order and the notification or service instrument governing such elevation.

42. Therefore, this Court would hold that the judgment dated 04.12.2024 in W.P. No.11925 of 2012, as affirmed by the Division Bench on 13.11.2025, is binding upon the KPCL. The KPCL is required to prescribe and implement minimum qualifying service

for the Elevation Scheme in terms of paragraph 20(c) of the judgment dated 04.12.2024. No employee can claim seniority in the Assistant Engineer cadre from a date anterior to his or her actual entry into that cadre. One-third weightage of service rendered in the feeder cadre, wherever otherwise permissible, cannot be utilised to confer retrospective seniority in the Assistant Engineer cadre. The requirement of minimum qualifying service for implementation of the Elevation Scheme is distinct from the question whether an elevation already completed under an earlier governing service instrument can retrospectively be treated as invalid. The judgment dated 04.12.2024 does not, by itself, direct cancellation of completed elevations under the Elevation Scheme or postponement of the actual date of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre by five years. Where the five-year qualifying service requirement was expressly applicable to the service

rule or notification governing a particular elevation, the same shall be given effect to in accordance with law. Where the applicable service instrument did not prescribe the five-year requirement, a subsequent notification cannot, merely by reason of its subsequent operation, be retrospectively applied to invalidate or defer a completed elevation unless such retrospective operation is otherwise specifically authorized by the governing service rules or mandated by a binding judicial direction. The final seniority exercise must therefore be undertaken with reference to the actual date of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre and the Service Rules, Standing Regulations and notifications applicable to the particular employee or batch of employees at the relevant point of time.

43. Having observed thus, this Court proceeds to pass the following order:

ORDER

(I) The writ petitions in W.P. No.3603 of 2026 and W.P. No.38357 of 2025 are ***allowed*** with the following directions:

(a) The impugned provisional revised seniority list-2 dated 01.12.2025 issued by the respondent – Karnataka Power Corporation Limited vide Annexure-A in both the cases **and**, the final seniority list in No.A1P1A/1021 dated 12.06.2026 issued by respondent No.1 vide Annexure-L in W.P. No.38357 of 2025 are hereby ***quashed***.

(b) The Karnataka Power Corporation Limited shall undertake the exercise of finalizing the seniority of Assistant Engineers afresh,

strictly in conformity with the judgment dated 04.12.2024 passed in W.P. No.11925 of 2012 and the judgment dated 13.11.2025 passed in W.A. No.548 of 2025 and connected matters.

(c) Any benefit of service rendered in the cadre of Junior Engineer, including one-third weightage wherever otherwise permissible, shall be confined to the purpose for which such benefit is legally available and shall not be utilised to confer retrospective seniority in the Assistant Engineer cadre.

(d) The direction contained in paragraph 20(c) of the judgment dated 04.12.2024 regarding minimum qualifying service for implementation of the Elevation Scheme shall be given effect to.

(e) While determining the applicability and consequences of the minimum qualifying service requirement, the KPCL shall examine the Service Rules, Standing Regulations and the Recruitment / Elevation Notifications governing the relevant elevation.

(f) The KPCL shall not mechanically apply a uniform five-year qualifying service requirement retrospectively to every employee elevated under SR-062 without first establishing that such requirement governed the particular elevation or that retrospective application is otherwise specifically authorized by the governing service Rule. Where the five-year requirement was expressly applicable to the recruitment / elevation notification governing a particular employee or batch,

the KPCL shall give effect to the same in accordance with law. Where an employee was already elevated under a service instrument which did not prescribe the five-year requirement, the subsequent introduction of such requirement shall not, by itself, operate retrospectively to cancel or invalidate the completed elevation or to postpone the employee's actual date of entry into the Assistant Engineer cadre.

(II) It is made clear that this Court has neither reopened nor modified the judgment dated 04.12.2024 passed in W.P. No.11925 of 2012 and the judgment dated 13.11.2025 passed in W.A. No.548 of 2025 and connected

matters. The said judgments shall be implemented in letter and spirit.

(III) The pending interlocutory applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(IV) No order as to the costs;

Sd/-
(ASHOK S. KINAGI)
JUDGE

RK [online]
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 32
Ct:pk