HC-KAR
CNR: KAHC010319032026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

WRIT PETITION NO. 14378 OF 2026 (S-RES)

C/W

WRIT PETITION NO. 14615 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14617 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14618 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14620 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14621 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14622 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14776 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14777 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14778 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14779 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14780 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14781 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14783 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14785 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14786 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14788 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14795 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14802 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14803 OF 2026 (S-RES)

Digitally signed by VIDYA G R
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

WRIT PETITION NO. 14814 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14829 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14830 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14831 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 14838 OF 2026 (S-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 15533 OF 2026 (S-RES)

IN W.P. No. 14378/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI YOGESHA B
   S/O BHADRAIAH @ BHADRAPPA
   AGE 32 YRS
   DESIGNATION BAILIFF
   R/0 HANIYURU VILLAGE
   S.R PURA POST
   V. PURA HOBLI
   CHANNAPATNA TALUK
   BANGLORE SOUTH DISTRICT - 562 138
   WORKING IN SR. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC COURT
   MALAVALLI
   MANDYA DISTRICT -

2. SRI. MAHADEVI BOMMANAGI
   W/O HANUMANTHARAY
   AGE: 37
   R/AT 143/B, 26TH CROSS, RAJAJINAGAR,
   BANGALORE-560 010
   DESIGNATION FDA
   WORKING AT HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
   BANGALORE

3. SRI. SHYAMRAO AV
S/O VITAL RAO
AGE 33 YRS
R/0 ARALAGUPPE,
TIPTUR TALUK
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 212
DESIGNATION S.D.A
WORKING AT HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,
BENGALURU

4. SRI. SHANKARLING GADAGI
S/O YAMANAPPA
AGE 31
R/O AUSTINTOWN QUARTERS
NEELASANDRA
BENGALURU - 560 049
DESIGNATION SDA
WORKING AT CITY CIVIL COURT
BENGALURU

5. SRI. PARAPPA SURESH HUGAR
S/O SURESH
AGE-33
R/0 922 B BLOCK
HIGH COURT STAFF QUARTRES
NGEF BAIYAPPANAHALLI
BENGALURU - 560 038
DESIGNATION TYPIST
WORKING AT CITY CIVIL COURT
BENGALURU

6. SRI. GANGADHARAYYA NANDIKOLAMATH
S/O MAHALINGAYYA
AGE 42

R/O FLAT NO.910, B BLOCK,
HIGH COURT STAFF QUARTERS
TEMPLE ROAD
KRISHNAYYANAPALYA
BAYYAPPANAHALLI
BENGALURU -560 038
DESIGNATION PROCESS SERVER
WORKING AT CITY CIVIL COURT,
BENGALURU- 560 038

7. SMT. MONITHA S
W/O SHIVANNA K N
AGE 29
R/AT 13TH CROSS, CHOLANAYAKANAHALLI
BANGALORE - 560 032
DESIGNATION F.D.A
WORKING AT PRI CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC COURT,
CHINTAMANI

8. SRI. MANJUNATHA K
S/O BASAPPA K
AGE 37
R/AT 12TH WARD, KURUBARAGERI,
HARAPPANAHALLI TOWN,
VIJAYANAGAR DISTRICT- 583 131
DESIGNATION STENOGRAPHER
WORKING AT HIREKERURU COURT,
HAVERI DIST

9. SRI. BASAVARAJ JELLI
S/O MALLAPPA
AGE 38
ADDRESS DAMMURU HOUSE NO 202/A,
BAGALKOT
KARNATAKA,

PIN - 587 202
DESIGNATION PROCESS SERVER
WORKING AT DISTRICT COURT KOPPAL

10. SRI. NAGARJUNA GK
S/O KUMARASWAMY G
AGE 32
R/O 305, BLOCK 4, PHASE 2,
KOMMAGHATTA BDA FLATS,
KENGERI, BENGALURU - 560 060
DESIGNATION FDA
WORKING AT CITY CIVIL COURT,
BENGALURU

11. SRI. KIRAN B
S/O BASAPPA
AGE 34
R/0 16. MATHRU NILAYA,
1ST CROSS, NAVADEEP SCHOOL ROAD,
K R PURAM, BENGALURU -560 036
DESIGNATION PROCESS SERVER
WORKING AT FAMILY COURT,
BENGALURU
DESIGNATION: FDA

12. SRI. SUDARSHAN JB
S/O BASAVARAJ V
AGE 37
R/O JANGAMAKOTE V AND P
SIDLAGATTA TALUK,
CHIKKABALLAPUR DISTRICT-562 105
DESIGNATION PROCESS SERVER
WORKING AT FAMILY COURT BANGALORE

13. SRI. AVINASH P
S/O PRASANNA KUMAR
AGE 36
R/O 181, SRINIVASA NILAYA 1ST WARD
GANGASANDRA VILLAGE AND POST
GOURIBIDANUR TALUK
CHIKKABALLAPUR DIST PIN 561 208
DESIGNATION PROCESS SERVER
WORKING AT FAMILY COURT,
BENGALURU

14. SRI. VIJAY GOPAL S
S/O DIWAKAR S
AGE 27 YEARS,
R/O B-820, HIGH COURT STAFF QUARTERS.
NGEF LAYOUT, TEMPLE ROAD,
BAIYAPPANAHALLI,
BANGALORE-560 038
WORKING AS TYPIST,
AT CITY CIVIL COURT AT BANGALORE

15. SMT. PREETHI PM
D/O YOGESH PM
AGE 41
RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS NO. B-106,
HIGH COURT QUARTERS, BYAPPANAHALLI,
BANGLORE NORTH-560 038
DESIGNATION SDA
WORKING AT BANGALORE COURT

16. SMT. VIJAYALAKSHMI G
W/O R. DHANANJAYA KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 154/B, 4TH BLOCK,
5TH MAIN, RAJAJINAGAR,

BENGALURU-560 010
DESIGNATION FDA
WORKING AT KARNATAKA MEDIATION CENTRE,
HIGH COURT

… PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
(ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

… RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 NO. LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED

12.03.2026 (ANNX-R) IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXECUSION AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14615/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. TEJASWINI M
   W/O BHARATH
   AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT: NO. 30, 3RD CROSS,
   NAGASANDRA, BENGALURU-560 073

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
   (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14617/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT SUMA NAGESH
W/O HARISH MB
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
RESIDING AT 2563, 11TH MAIN,
E-BLOCK 2ND STAGE,
RAJAJINAGAR,
BENGALURU-560 010

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14618/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT HARSHITHA R
W/O SUDHAN GOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 247/1, 20TH CROSS,
NEAR ANANTHA STORES,
DODDAMMA TEMPLE, GEF POST,
AVALA HALLI, BENGALURU-560 026

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE - A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14620/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. SUDHA RANI R
   W/O YASHWANTH G
   AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT NO. 23,
   MADDURAMMA COLONY,
   TAVAREKEKE, BTM 1ST STAGE,
   BANGELORE-560 029

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14621/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT SWATHI PS
W/O SHIVAMURTHY S
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 21/A,
NEAR PANCHAMUKI GANESH TEMPLE,

DODDABIDARAKALLU,
NAGASANDRA PROST,
BENGALURU-560 010

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY

OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14622/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT VINUTHA KS
   W/O SUNIL KUMAR BT
   AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT C202,
   HIGH COURT STAFF QUARTERS,
   NGEF LAYOUT, BAIYAPPANAHLLI,
   BENGALURU-560 010

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN WP NO. 14776/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI RAJU DYAVAPPA
S/O DYAVAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 89, 6TH CROSS, SHIVANANDANAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 079

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE

KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 (ANNEXURE - A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14777/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT SUSHMITHA V
   D/O VASU B,
   AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT NO. 30,
   36TH CROSS, 9TH BLOCK,
   JAYANAGAR,
   BENGALURU-560 069

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
   BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14778/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT DHANUSHA MS
   W/O CHANDRA MOHAN REDDY
   AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT FLAT NO. B512,
   KARNATAKA HIGH COURT STAFF QUARTERS,
   NGE 7 LAYOUT, BAYYAPPANAHALI
   BENGALURU - 560 038

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE-A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14779/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. BHAGYASHALINI. L
W/O. GANGADHARA K. M.,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 5,
MALLESH NILAYA,

KARIOBANAHALLI,
NAGASANDRA POST,
BENGALURU-560 073.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 BEARING NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE

CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14780/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. ASHA N
   W/O. MANOHAR. R. K.,
   AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT NERNAHALLI (V),
   MUDUVATTI (P),
   KOLAR (T AND D)-563 101.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025, IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN WP NO. 14781/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT SHRUTHI S MURTHY
D/O SATHYANARAYANA MURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.63, 4TH A CROSS,
SAI RAM LAYOUT,
THOTAGUDDAHALLI,
BENGALURU-560 073.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
   BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025, IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN WP NO. 14783/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. ROHINI. G. T.
   W/O. RAGHURAM. H. R.,
   AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
   NO.2/A, 2ND CROSS, 2ND MAIN,
   SANJIVININAGAR,
   HEGGANAHALLI,
   BENGALURU-560 091.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
   BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14785/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. RAVI C. S.
   S/O. SRINIVASA,
   AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT CHIKKAMADURE,
   YEDIYUR (H),
   KUNIGAL (T), TUMKUR (D)-572 130.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14786/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT PUSHPALATHA BG
W/O VIJAY KUMAR S.
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.10/13
1ST C MAIN 5TH BLOCK

BSK 3RD STAGE,
BANGALORE - 560 085.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS

EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14788/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI ARUN KUMAR P
   S/O PUTTARAJU,
   AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT DOOR NO.10,
   BEHIND DURGAMBHA TEMPLE,
   GANDHI NAGAR,
   MYSURU-570 007.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 BEARING NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14795/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI PRADEEPU K G
S/O GANGARAJU,
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
RESIDING AT KENGAL
BAREGENHALLI POST,
SOMPURA HOBALI,
NELAMANGALA TALUK,
BENGALURU - 562 111

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
   BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14802/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. SUNITHA K
D/O KAMPLAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS,
RESIDING AT MALLANAKATTE,
MEDEHALLI POST,
CHITRADURGA-577 501

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 BEARING NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14803/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. ROJANANDAN JL
   D/O LOKARAJA NANDAN J,
   AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
   RESIDING AT FLAT NO. C908,
   HIGH COURT STAFF QUARTERS,
   BAIYAPPANAHALLI,
   BENGALURU - 560 038

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,

DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A), IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14814/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. MANJULA D J
D/O. VINOD KUMAR. L,

AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
RESIDING AT PRASHANTHNAGAR,
BENGALURU-560 079.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025, IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST

OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14829/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI THIMMARAJU M
   S/O MUNIYAPPA
   AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
   WORKING AT: OCCUPATION COURT OFFICER,
   KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
   BENGALURU-560 001

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14830/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT PREMA BT
D/O THIMMARAJU
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS,
RESIDING AT 3RD MAIN, 4TH CROSS,
NRUPATHUNGA EXTENSION,
JAYANAGARA EAST,
TUMAKURU-572 102

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
   BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 BEARING NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14831/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI BASAVA
   S/O ARJUNAPPA
   AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
   WORKING AT OCCUPATION COURT OFFICER,
   KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
   KALABURAGI-585 101

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA,
   BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
   BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 BEARING NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 14838/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SMT SUJATA HARAKE
   D/O MARUTI HARAKE
   AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
   WORKING AT OCCUPATION COURT OFFICER,
   KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
   BENGALURU-560 001

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO

GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1) LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 NO.LAW-LAC/126/2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

IN W.P. NO. 15533/2026

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. SHIVAKUMAR BASAYYA KOPPARAD
S/O BASAYYA SIDDAYYA KOPPARAD
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
RESIDING AT BASAVESWARNAGAR,
MUMMIGUTTI, NEAR MUMMIGUTTI AIRPORT,
DHARWAD HIGHWAY, DHARWAD-580 011

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VAIBHAV RAVI MALIMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY THE
   KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS
   ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ADMIN-1)
   LAW, JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001

3. HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL
   BENGALURU-560 001

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA SHETTY, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SMT. KRUTHIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING THE KARNATAKA JUDICIAL SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) (AMENDMENT) RULES OF 2025 DATED 12.03.2026 (ANNEXURE- A) IN SO FAR AS IT AMENDS RULE 4 AND THEREBY EXCLUDES IN-SERVICE CANDIDATES FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, AND ANY OTHER AMENDMENT THEREIN WITH RESPECT TO THIS EXCLUSION, AND CONSEQUENTLY RESTORE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA TO THE POST OF CIVIL JUDGE, WHICH EXISTED PRIOR TO THE IMPUGNED AMENDMENT AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

ORAL ORDER

These Writ Petitions are filed by the Court staff working in various Courts in Karnataka and have sought for setting aside of the Karnataka Judicial Service (Recruitment) (Amendment) Rules of 2025 dated 12.03.2026 (Annexure-'R') insofar as it amends Rule 4 and thereby excludes the in-service candidates from being eligible to apply to the post of Civil Judge and have sought for appropriate direction to restore the eligibility criteria to the post of Civil Judge which existed prior to the impugned amendment.

2. It is the case of the petitioners that exclusion of in-service candidates from applying and taking part in the recruitment process of Civil Judges is not legally tenable.

3. It is further submitted that the Apex Court in its decision in **All India Judges' Association and Others** v. **Union of India and Others**[1] and on the Interlocutory

[1] (2002) 4 SCC 247

Applications did not exclude the in-service candidates. It was also submitted that such was the position even after the order in **Bhumika Trust** v. **Union of India and Others**[2] ***[Bhumika Trust]*** as well.

4. It is further submitted that certain other States even after the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court have made provision for in-service candidates to take part in the recruitment process.

5. Attention is drawn to the Rules framed and notified by the Government of Telangana, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh. It is accordingly stated that appropriate directions be made to the High Court of Karnataka as well to include a provision for in-service candidates to participate.

6. It is specifically asserted that the earlier Rules framed by the Government of Karnataka in the years 2011 and 2015 had specifically included the in-service

[2] Writ Petition(C) No.1110/2025

candidates and the latest amendments have the effect of taking away the rights of in-service candidates who ought not be excluded and must be allowed to participate in the recruitment process and for such purpose, necessary orders to be passed vis-à-vis the Rules in force.

7. Ms. Kruthika Raghavan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of High Court of Karnataka would contend that the order of Apex Court and in specific, to the order passed in W.P.(C) No.1110/2025 has carved out exceptions insofar as the requirement of 'practice' and that would be an exception carved out by the Apex Court in its order of 21.08.2026 in which certain directions have been made to accommodate those Law Graduates without actual practice of three years and that upholding of such an exception cannot be enlarged beyond a plain reading of the judgment of the Apex Court.

8. Further reliance is placed on the decision of Apex Court in **Tapasmita Sutar** v. **Union of India and**

Others[3] ***[Tapasmita Sutar]*** and the case of Bench Clerk vis-à-vis the requirement of practice was examined and order passed and it is submitted that the said order would throw light on the ineligibility of in-service candidates.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioners however submits that the judgment in ***Tapasmita Sutar(supra)*** was on the aspect of actual practice and eligibility to appear in the Civil Judge examination, while the case of petitioners relates to in-service candidates with a Law Degree and may have had previous practice and hence, must be treated as being eligible.

10. Learned counsel appearing for High Court of Karnataka would also submit that Special Leave to Appeal (C) No.18019/2026 filed against the order of the Division Bench has been rejected and the Division Bench in the order impugned before the Apex Court had observed that

[3] Writ Petition (C) No.1224/2026

the petitioners were open to obtain clarification from the Apex Court in the pending proceedings.

11. It is also contended that another Miscellaneous Application Diary No.58252/2026 was filed before the Apex Court, wherein the petitioners had sought for clarification to the effect that the orders of the Apex Court did not exclude or restrict in-service candidates from being eligible for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) and for appropriate orders and such application of the petitioners was also dismissed. Accordingly, it is submitted that when Miscellaneous Application No.58252/2026 for clarification has been rejected, the petitioners cannot still seek for this Court to carve out an exception insofar as in-service candidates are concerned.

12. Learned counsel for the petitioners had further contended that in spite of the orders of Apex Court in light of power with the State to frame the Rules under Article 309 of the Constitution of India, it is always open for the

State Government to accommodate the interests of in-service candidates and the Court may pass appropriate directions to the State Government in that regard.

13. Learned counsel for petitioners further draws attention to the observations made in ***Bhumika Trust (supra)*** and in particular to paras-64 and 65 and would contend that the directions of Apex Court does not foreclose accommodation of interests of in-service categories.

14. Heard both sides.

15. It must be noticed that the Apex Court in Writ Petition(C) No.1110/2025 on 21.08.2026 had passed certain directions. The relevant paras-73 and 74 of the decision are extracted hereinbelow:-

"VII. ***DIRECTIONS AND CONCLUSION***

> *73. In light of the above discussion, we consider it appropriate to issue the following directions, which would apply to all recruitment*

notification/advertisement(s) issued to the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) in the transitional period, i.e., notification/advertisement(s) issued after the Judgement under Review up to 31.03.2027:

(i) All law graduates shall be eligible to apply, notwithstanding the three-year practice requirement. Having regard to the fact that more than one year has elapsed since the Judgment under Review was pronounced, such candidates shall, for the purposes of their applications, be deemed to have completed one year of active practice. They shall not be required to furnish a separate Certificate of Practice in support of the said deemed period;

(ii) Candidates selected pursuant to the aforesaid recruitment shall, upon appointment, be designated as "Trainee Judicial Officers" and shall undergo a compulsory period of one year of intensive training at the concerned State Judicial Academy. This period shall be treated as equivalent to one year of practice at the Bar for the purposes of the three-year requirement;

(iii) During the period of such training, the Trainee Judicial Officers shall be paid a fixed emolument equivalent to onehalf of the remuneration payable to a Judicial Magistrate First Class in the concerned State. They shall, in addition, be entitled to the facilities and other

benefits ordinarily made available to trainees at the concerned State Judicial Academy;

(iv) Upon successful completion of the aforesaid training, the Trainee Judicial Officers shall undergo a further period of one year of structured Law Clerkship. The first six months shall be spent as a Law Clerk under the supervision of the Principal District/District and Sessions Judges or Members of the Higher Judicial Services, and the remaining six months under the supervision of a sitting Judge of the concerned High Court;

(v) The aforesaid one-year period of Law Clerkship shall also be treated as equivalent to one year of practice at the Bar for the purposes of satisfying the three-year requirement;

(vi) During the period of Law Clerkship, the Trainee Judicial Officer shall be paid same emoluments as admissible during their training in State Judicial Academies, with no further allowance, etc.; and

(vii) Upon completion of the Law Clerkship, the sitting Judge of the High Court under whose supervision the Trainee Judicial Officer has served shall submit a reasoned evaluation report concerning the performance and suitability of the trainee. Upon such evaluation being found satisfactory, the Trainee

Judicial Officer shall be appointed to the regular post in the field and shall thereafter be entitled to the regular pay scale and other service benefits attached to the post.

74. *We further direct that for the period following the transition period, i.e., notification/ advertisement(s) issued on or after 01.04.2027, the following directions shall govern the recruitment to the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division):*

(i) Every candidate seeking to appear for the examination for appointment as Civil Judge (Junior Division) shall possess at least one year of actual practice from the source and certification as laid down in direction (vii) and (viii) of the Judgment under Review for now and thereafter as laid down hereinafter. Such practice shall be subject to verification through issuance of a Certificate of Practice, which shall not be issued unless the candidate's presence and participation in effective judicial proceedings, whether along with a senior member of the Bar with at least 10 years practice or otherwise, have been duly recorded in accordance with the mechanism to be prescribed by the High Courts;

(ii) The application of a candidate for recruitment to the judicial service from the aforesaid recruitment cycle shall be entertained only upon submission of the requisite certificate evidencing completion of one year of actual practice in the District Courts; and

(iii) Candidates selected pursuant to such recruitment shall, notwithstanding their one year of prior practice, undergo the same one-year period of intensive training at the State Judicial Academy followed by 6 months of Law Clerkship under the Principal District/District and Sessions Judges or Members of the Higher Judicial Services and thereafter another 6 months of Law Clerkship under a sitting Judge of the concerned High Court, in terms of directions (ii) to (vii) of Paragraph 73."

16. It must be noticed that the context in which such directions were passed was particular to the issue of those candidates who had no three years' practice requirement. Further perusal of the directions and observations made would also indicate that the Hon'ble Supreme Court did consider the case of Law Clerks who

would not have actual Court practice and had referred to their period spent under Law Clerkship as being equivalent to one year of practice at the bar. Specifically there was no observation made with respect to in-service candidates. Further, it must be noticed that the scheme evolved by the Apex Court was for a period of 5 years from the date of the order and the directions made were particular to the concept of actual practice. This would foreclose those without actual practice.

17. It is also necessary to notice that the petitioners had filed Miscellaneous Application Diary No.58252/2026 seeking clarification by the Apex Court. The prayer in the said Miscellaneous Application reads as follows:-

> *"Wherefore, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to:*
>
> *a. Allow the present application and clarify that the Judgment dated 21.08.2026 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1110 of 2025 (Bhumika Trust v. Union of India & Ors.) and*

the connected Review Petitions, read with the Judgment and Order dated 20.05.2025 passed in I.A. No. 93974 of 2019 with I.A. Nos. 72900, 73015 and 40695 of 2021 with I.A. Nos. 50269 and 201893 of 2022 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1022 of 1989 (All India Judges Association & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors.), which stands modified thereby, does not exclude or restrict in-service candidates from being eligible for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division); and

b. Issue appropriate consequential directions to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to give effect to the aforesaid clarification by permitting the Applicants and other similarly situated in-service candidates, who were eligible under the Karnataka Judicial Service (Recruitment) Rules, 2004 prior to the amendment dated 12.03.2026, to apply for and participate in the future recruitment processes for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division), subject to such conditions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper;

OR

c. Without prejudice to prayers (a) and (b) above, if this Hon'ble Court deems it fit and necessary, prescribe such conditions as may be considered appropriate for regulating. rather than

excluding, the eligibility of in-service candidates to appear in the examination for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division), including (i) a minimum period of qualifying service to be completed by such candidates before they become eligible to appear, and (ii) confining such eligibility to employees holding posts in Group 'C' (Class III) and above; and/or

d. Pass such other appropriate Order/Orders, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

18. The said Miscellaneous Application however has been dismissed on 04.11.2026 without any observation. At this stage, accordingly, it would not be open for this Court to pass any positive directions to accommodate the interests of petitioners, as the request for clarification has not been considered by the Apex Court.

19. In ***Tapasmita Sutar (supra),*** the Apex Court has rejected the case of a Bench Clerk who wanted recognition of her service in the District Judiciary as equivalent to period of practice. The Apex Court while

rejecting the contention of the employee has observed at paras-13, 14 and 15 as follows:-

"13. The requirement of minimum one year of practice is, therefore, an essential and independent component of the scheme. It is the only component that precedes the examination, and the only one through which a candidate experiences the working of courts from the side of the Bar. The treatment of other forms of experience, including Law Clerkship, at par with practice at the Bar was accepted only as a one-time measure for the transitional period, as specified in paragraph 66 of the Judgment dated 21.08.2026, and finds expression in the deemed year of practice extended to all law graduates by paragraph 73(i). For recruitment notified on or after 01.04.2027, paragraph 74 insists upon a certificate evidencing one year of "actual practice in the District Courts", and requires selected candidates to undergo training and Law Clerkship "notwithstanding their one year of prior practice".

14. The reference in paragraph 74(i) to "the source and certification as laid down in direction (vii) and (viii) of the Judgment dated 20.05.2025" must be understood in this context. It adopts, for the time being, the framework within which practice is to be undertaken, certified, and computed. It does not carry with it the separate credit earlier given to Law Clerkship within the three-year

period. To count prior clerkship towards the one year of practice would deprive a candidate of the very exposure to the Bar that the scheme deliberately secures, and would duplicate a component that the candidate must, in any event, undergo. The mandatory requirement of a minimum of one year of practice cannot, therefore, be diluted to include existing clerkship experience.

15. Second, and in any event, service as a Bench Clerk in the District Judiciary is substantially different from service as a Law Clerk in this Court or the High Courts. A Law Clerk works closely with a Judge, undertaking comprehensive legal research, analysis of pending matters, and some drafting. It is this close association with the process of adjudication that led this Court, in the Judgment dated 20.05.2025, to count experience as a Law Clerk towards the period of practice. By contrast, the duties of a Bench Clerk, though indispensable to the functioning of any court, are more ministerial in nature and do not involve such close contact with judicial decision-making. The Petitioner apprehends that she is being excluded merely on the basis of the nomenclature of her post. We hasten to clarify that such is not the case. The distinction lies in the nature and substance of the duties discharged and, examined on that very touchstone, her service cannot be equated with that of a Law Clerk."

20. Such observation made would also throw light on some of the contentions that are made out on behalf of in-service candidates.

21. Finally, while the Apex Court is seeking to evolve a uniform policy as well through directions on the Judicial side, including in exercise of power conferred under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, it would not be appropriate for this Court to intervene and carve out exception to the directions.

22. Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are ***rejected.***

23. However, taking note of the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners that the State Government has the power to frame the Rules under Article 309 though with consultation with the High Court of Karnataka, such aspect is kept open and it is for petitioners to pursue the request as may be appropriate.

24. All the pending interlocutory applications are disposed of as not calling for adjudication, in light of rejection of the main matter.

Sd/-
(S SUNIL DUTT YADAV)
JUDGE

VGR