IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

WRIT PETITION NO. 19477 OF 2025 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

SHRI. K.M NARENDRA KUMAR
S/O MUNIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
WORKING AS SURVEYOR SUPERVISOR,
SLAO-1, KIADB, BENGALURU

R./AT NO.177
8TH MAIN, CQAL LAYOUT,
SAHAKARANAGAR
BENGALURU - 560 092

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ARUN SHYAM, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. D.M. MANJUNATH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

Digitally signed by PANKAJA S
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY
THE SPECIAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
BY LOKAYUKTHA POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. SRI. V. RAVI
SON OF LATE VENKATESHAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.297,
2ND MAIN ROAD, 10TH CROSS,
VIJAYA BANK LAYOUT,
BILEKAHALLI,
BANNERGHATTA ROAD

BENGALURU - 560 076

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. VENKATESH S ARABATTI, SPL.PP FOR R1,
SRI. KUSHAL GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. ABHINAY Y.T, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE COMPLAINT, DATED 21.04.2025 FILED BY THE SECOND RESPONDENT I.E. ANNEXURE- B AND CONSEQUENTLY ALL PROCEEDINGS IN LOKAYUKTHA CRIME NO.18/2024 PENDING BEFORE THE HON'BLE 23 ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE CUM SPECIAL COURT (PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION ACT), BANGALORE, AS AGAINST THE PETITIONER ANNX-G.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON 05.11.2026 COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

CAV ORDER

This writ petition is filed seeking following reliefs:

> *"a) To Quash the complaint, Dated: 21.04.2025 filed by the Second Respondent i.e, ANNEXURE-B and consequently all proceedings in Lokayuktha Crime No.18/2024 pending before the Hon'ble 23rd Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge Cum Special Court (Prevention of Corruption Act), Bangalore, as against the Petitioner. ANNEXUAE.G.*
>
> *b) To Quash the First Information Report registered as Lokayuktha Crime No.18/2025 in pursuance to the complaint, Dated: 21.04.2025*

filed by the Second Respondent i.e, ANNEXURE-A and consequently all proceedings in Lokayuktha Crime No.18/2024 pending before the Hon'ble 23rd Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge Cum Special Court (Prevention of Corruption Act), Bangalore, as against the Petitioner.

c) Order to call for Records in Lokayuktha Crime No.18/2025 pending Hon'ble 23rd Additional city Civil & Sessions Judge Cum Special Court (Prevention of Corruption Act), Bangalore.

d) To pass such other orders as may be deemed expedient in the circumstance of the case and in the interest of justice."

2. The brief facts of the case which are necessary for the disposal of this petition are that the petitioner is working as a Surveyor Supervisor in the office of the Special Land Acquisition Officer-I, Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board (for short, "the KIADB"), Bengaluru.

3. The allegations against the petitioner arise out of a complaint lodged by respondent No.2 on 21.04.2025 before respondent No.1, alleging demand of illegal gratification for furnishing a survey sketch in respect of the lands belonging to one Smt.Shakuntalamma i.e., the mother-in-law of respondent No.2, situated at Bilekahalli Village, Bengaluru South Taluk. It

is alleged that, pursuant to an application submitted by respondent No.2 on behalf of Smt.Shakuntalamma for fixation of boundaries, one Nethravathi, acting on the directions of the SLAO, had visited the property, conducted a mahazar and prepared a sketch. However, the said sketch was not handed over to respondent No.2 as it required the approval and signature of the superior authority. Respondent No.2 was allegedly informed by Smt.Nethravathi that the petitioner would hand over the copy of the survey sketch. Accordingly, she furnished the petitioner's mobile number 9845154426 to respondent No.2 and advised him to meet the petitioner in that regard.

4. It is further alleged that respondent No.2 contacted the petitioner on several occasions, during which the petitioner demanded different sums of money, initially Rs.50,000/-, subsequently Rs.1,50,000/-, which was later reduced to Rs.1,00,000/-, and again demanded Rs.1,50,000/- for handing over the survey sketch. Respondent No.2 claims to have recorded the conversations relating to the alleged demands and lodged a complaint before respondent No.1. On the basis of the said complaint, a case came to be registered in Crime

No.18/2025 for the offence punishable under Section 7(a) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (for short, "the PC Act").

5. Pursuant to the said complaint, on 05.06.2025, respondent No.1 laid a trap and apprehended the petitioner-accused on the allegation that he had received the tainted money from respondent No.2. Thereafter, the petitioner was produced before the jurisdictional Court and remanded to judicial custody. Being aggrieved by the initiation of criminal proceedings against him, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

6. Heard the learned Senior counsel Sri. Arun Shyam, for the petitioner, the learned Spl.PP Sri. Venkatesh S Arabatti for respondent No.1-Lokayuktha and the learned counsel Sri. Kushal Gowda for respondent No.2.

7. Apart from raising various other contentions, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner primarily contended that respondent No.2 was set up by the petitioner's brother-in-law, who is allegedly harbouring vengeance against the petitioner on account of a property dispute between them. He further submitted that the petitioner has been working as a Surveyor Supervisor under the surveyors of the KIADB,

Bengaluru since 2021. Drawing the attention of this Court to the complaint averments, learned Senior Counsel contended that respondent No.2 had approached the office of the Special Land Acquisition Officer at V.V. Towers, Bengaluru, in connection with the survey and phodi work of his mother-in-law's property situated at Bilekahalli Village, where he met one Nethravathi, a surveyor, who allegedly furnished the petitioner's mobile number and informed him to contact the petitioner. However, the petitioner had no connection with the survey work of respondent No.2 or the work entrusted to said Nethravathi. Further, neither the complaint nor the FIR discloses any material indicating a conspiracy between the petitioner and said surveyor.

8. Learned Senior Counsel further contended that, when the petitioner was working at Kolar, there was no occasion for respondent No.2 to approach him in connection with the survey work at Bengaluru, much less any occasion for him to demand illegal gratification. He also submitted that no work pertaining to respondent No.2 was pending before the petitioner and that the alleged telephone conversations do not *prima facie* disclose any demand for illegal gratification. Further, immediately after the alleged trap, the petitioner had

explained that the tainted currency notes were thrown into his car and that he had not voluntarily received the same. It is also contended that the trap mahazar was drawn at the police station instead of the alleged place of incident, without any satisfactory explanation. Hence, learned Senior Counsel submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and that the essential ingredients of Section 7(a) of the PC Act, particularly the demand and acceptance of illegal gratification in connection with any official work, are not *prima facie* made out. Accordingly, he prays to allow the petition.

9. *Per contra*, learned Spl.PP appearing for respondent No.1-Lokayukta contended that, as could be gathered from the complaint averments, respondent No.2, on the advice of one Nethravathi, a surveyor at V.V. Tower, Bengaluru contacted the petitioner and met him near Maharani's College canteen on 20.08.2024, where the petitioner allegedly demanded Rs.50,000/- for furnishing the survey sketch. Subsequently, on 24.09.2024, the petitioner allegedly demanded Rs.1,50,000/-, which was later reduced to Rs.1,00,000/-. Again, on 19.04.2025, the petitioner allegedly demanded Rs.1,50,000/-, which compelled respondent No.2 to lodge the complaint. He

further contended that the alleged demand is clearly reflected in the mobile phone recordings of respondent No.2.

10. Learned Spl.PP further submitted that the pre-trap and trap mahazars *prima facie* disclose that the tainted currency notes were handed over by respondent No.2 to the petitioner pursuant to his demand and that the petitioner received the same. Further, the right-hand wash of the petitioner, when tested with sodium carbonate solution, turned pink, thereby *prima facie* establishing the demand and acceptance of illegal gratification. As regards the contention relating to the absence of pending official work, learned Spl.PP submitted that the alleged act of the petitioner would fall within the ambit of Explanation 2(i) to Section 7 of the PC Act, as the illegal gratification was allegedly obtained for another person.

11. He further contended that the investigation is still at a nascent stage and respondent No.1-Lokayukta are required to investigate the matter to ascertain the involvement of other persons named in the complaint and any other persons connected with the alleged offence. Accordingly, he prays to dismiss the petition.

12. The learned counsel for respondent No.2 also opposed the petition by adopting the contentions urged by the learned Spl.PP for respondent No.1-Lokayuktha.

13. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the entire materials on record.

14. Before adverting to the merits of the case, it is appropriate to refer to the findings of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***STATE BY LOKAYUKTHA POLICE V. K. RANGAYYA AND ANOTHER*** - ***2026 SCC OnLine SC 963***, wherein, at paragraphs 18 to 22, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held as follows:

> ***"18****. In order to appreciate the contention of the Appellant, it is necessary to advert to the relevant provisions of the PC Act. Section 7(a) of the PC Act reads as follows:*
>
> > *"7.* ***Offence relating to public servant being bribed****.—Any public servant who,— (a) obtains or accepts or attempts to obtain from any person, an undue advantage, with the intention to perform or cause performance of public duty improperly or dishonestly or to forbear or*

> *cause forbearance to perform such duty either by himself or by another public servant''*

Section 7 is further clarified by Explanation 2, which provides that,

> *"**Explanation 2**.—For the purpose of this section,—*
>
> *(i) the expressions "obtains" or "accepts" or "attempts to obtain" shall cover cases where a person being a public servant, obtains or "accepts" or attempts to obtain, any undue advantage for himself or for another person, by abusing his position as a public servant or by using his personal influence over another public servant; or by any other corrupt or illegal means; (ii) it shall be immaterial whether such person being a public servant obtains or accepts, or attempts to obtain the undue advantage directly or through a third party.*

***19**. As we proceed to examine the issue at hand, it would be necessary ascertain the ingredients of Section 7(a) of the PC Act under which the Respondent No.1 has been charged.*

When we split Section 7(a) of the PC Act, it consists of the following parts:

(i) The charged person must be a public servant;

(ii) Such a public servant should be charged of obtaining or accepting or attempting to obtain an undue advantage;

(iii) from any person;

(iv) with the intention to

(a) perform or cause performance of public duty;

(b) improperly or dishonestly or to forbear or cause forbearance to perform such duty;

(v) such act of performance or forbearance is to be done either

(a) by himself; or

(b) by another public servant.

If the aforesaid parts or ingredients are disclosed, such a public servant can be charged of committing offence contemplated under Section 7(a) of the PC Act.

***20**. Reading of Section 7(a) of the PC Act, however, would indicate that it will apply when the public servant himself obtains or accepts or attempts to obtain the undue advantage, by doing such acts with the intention as mentioned in the aforesaid Clause (a).*

However, it appears that the Explanation 2(i) to Section 7 has enlarged the scope of the offence by not restricting the beneficiaries to the public servant himself only but to "another person" also. Explanation 2 (i) to Section 7 expands the scope of the beneficiaries by not confining only to the public servant who obtains, accepts or attempts to obtain an undue advantage, but also in favour of "another person" who may or may not be a "public servant" as there is no qualification to the words "another person". Thus, Explanation 2(i) clearly mentions that for the purpose of Section 7, the expressions "obtains" or "accepts" or "attempts to obtain" shall cover cases where a person being a public servant, obtains or accepts or attempts to obtain, any undue advantage for himself or for another person, by abusing his position as a public servant or by using his personal influence over another public servant; or by any other corrupt or illegal means.

Further, Explanation 2(ii) provides that it shall be immaterial whether such person being a public servant obtains or accepts, or attempts to obtain the undue advantage directly or through a third party.

***21**. Therefore, it is clear from Section 7(a) read with Explanation 2(i) that it is not necessary that the public servant himself has to obtain or accept or attempt to obtain undue advantage for himself only, but such undue advantage can be obtained or accepted or attempted to be obtained for "another person" also.*

Further, as per Explanation 2(i) such obtaining/accepting/attempting to obtain undue advantages can be by way of abusing the position of public servant himself but also by using the personal influence over "another public servant". Therefore, Explanation 2 clearly provides that the aforesaid act of performing the public duty improperly/dishonestly or refraining to perform the public duty can be by himself or by another public servant by using influence by the concerned public servant.

***22**. Thus, such an offending act can be done by "another public servant" also under the personal influence of the concerned public servant. What we, therefore, understand from the reading of Section 7 (a) of the PC Act read with Explanation 2, is that, it is not necessary that the public servant who has been charged of the offence under Section 7 of the PC Act has to obtain the undue benefit for himself, but*

it also covers cases where he does the offensive act for obtaining undue advantages for "another person", and this act may be done by himself by abusing his position, or may be executed through another public servant by using his personal influence over the other public servant.

Therefore, in the light of the above provision, a public servant may not be directly a recipient or the executor of the offensive act and thus, may not be in the limelight and remain in the background. Nevertheless, he can be instrumental in ensuring obtaining, accepting or attempting to obtain from another person the undue advantage for "another person" by taking the help of "another public servant". Such public servant who has been charged of offence under Section 7(a) may be the main instrumentality, through whom undue advantage is obtained and/or arranged through other public servant.

Keeping the aforesaid broad scope of Section 7(a) read with Explanation 2, we must consider the issue on hand."

15. Applying the aforesaid findings of the Hon'ble Apex Court to the facts and circumstances of the present case, the contention urged by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner

does not merit acceptance. No doubt, the petitioner was not working in the office where the survey work of respondent No.2 was pending, nor had respondent No.2 initially approached the petitioner directly. It is also the contention of the petitioner that his office was situated far away from the office of the Special Land Acquisition Officer at V.V. Towers, Bengaluru. However, the fact remains that the petitioner was working as a Surveyor Supervisor in KIADB, Bengaluru in connection with the work of Kolar division and the complaint averments disclose that respondent No.2 had approached one Nethravathi, a Surveyor, at V.V. Towers, Bengaluru, in connection with the survey and phodi work of his land and that said Smt.Nethravathi informed him to approach the petitioner by furnishing his mobile number.

16. Further, the complaint averments disclose successive demands of illegal gratification allegedly made by the petitioner, initially for a sum of Rs.50,000/-, thereafter Rs.1,50,000/-, which was subsequently reduced to Rs.1,00,000/-, and finally again for Rs.1,50,000/-. In this background, the enlarged scope of Explanation 2(i) to Section 7 of the PC Act, as explained by the Hon'ble Apex Court at paragraph No.20 of the aforesaid judgment, makes it clear that

the act of a public servant demanding or accepting illegal gratification, either for himself or for another person, by abusing his position as a public servant, exercising personal influence over another public servant or by any other corrupt or illegal means, attracts the provisions of Section 7(a) of the PC Act.

(**emphasis supplied**)

17. In the instant case, the complaint, pre-trap mahazar and trap mahazar, *prima facie* disclose the demand and acceptance of illegal gratification by the petitioner to the tune of Rs.50,000/-. The said circumstance also finds support from the chemical analysis report. Further, in his explanation, the petitioner has admitted that the tainted currency notes were seized from his car. Whether the said currency notes were deliberately thrown into the petitioner's car by respondent No.2, as contended by the petitioner, or were received by the petitioner pursuant to the alleged demand, is a matter of evidence to be established during trial. The said disputed question of fact cannot be examined by this Court at this stage while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

18. The other contention urged by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that, if the petitioner had demanded or accepted illegal gratification on behalf of the officers before whom the work of respondent No.2 was pending, there ought to have been an allegation of conspiracy between the petitioner and the said officers, and that no such allegation is forthcoming in the complaint, is concerned, the complaint averments disclose that respondent No.2 had initially approached one Nethravathi, a Surveyor at V.V. Towers, Bengaluru, in connection with his work. However, except informing respondent No.2 to approach the petitioner and furnishing his mobile number, no specific allegation of demand of illegal gratification is forthcoming against said Nethravathi. Further, the investigation is still at the nascent stage, and respondent No.1-Lokayukta are yet to collect the necessary material to ascertain the involvement, if any, of said Nethravathi or other persons in the alleged offence. Learned Spl.PP appearing for respondent No.1 has also fairly submitted in this regard. Hence, the absence of specific allegations of conspiracy at this stage, by itself, cannot be a ground to quash the proceedings against the petitioner.

19. The entire matter is at pre-mature stage and the investigation has not proceeded with, except some preliminary effort taken on the date of registration of the case. The evidence has to be gathered after a thorough investigation and placed before the Court on the basis of which alone, Court can come to a conclusion one way or other. If the allegations are bereft of truth and are malicious, the investigation will reveal the same. At this stage, when there are only allegations and recriminations but no evidence, this Court cannot anticipate the result of the investigation and render a finding on the materials available at present. Even assuming that the complaint has filed on account of personal animosity, that by itself will not be a ground to discard the complaint containing serious allegations, which have to be tested and weighed after the evidence is collected.

20. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***ANIL BHAVARLAL JAIN AND ANOTHER VS. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS*** in ***SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRL.)NO.10078/2023 AND 12776/2023*** held that, in a case registered under the special statute i.e., P.C Act, a quashing of the offences under the said act would have a grave and

substantial impact not just on the parties involved, but also on the society at large.

21. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of ***STATE OF ORISSA AND ANOTHER VS. SAROJ KUMAR SAHOO***, reported in ***(2005) 13 SCC 540***, held in paragraph Nos.8 and 9 as follows:

> *"8. Exercise of power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. in a case of this nature is the exception and not the rule. The Section does not confer any new powers on the High Court. It only saves the inherent power which the Court possessed before the enactment of the Cr.P.C. I envisages three circumstances under which the inherent jurisdiction may be exercised, namely, (i) to give effect to an order under the Cr.P.C., (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of court, and (iii) to otherwise secure the ends of justice. It is neither possible nor desirable to lay down any inflexible rule which would govern the exercise of inherent jurisdiction. No legislative enactment dealing with procedure can provide for all cases that may possibly arise. Courts, therefore, have inherent powers apart from express provisions of law which are necessary for proper discharge of functions*

and duties imposed upon them by law. That is the doctrine which finds expression in the section which merely recognizes and preserves inherent powers of the High Courts. All courts, whether civil or criminal possess, in the absence of any express provision, as inherent in their constitution, all such powers as are necessary to do the right and to undo a wrong in course of administration of justice on the principle "quando lex aliquid alicui concedit, concedere videtur et id sine quo res ipsae esse non potest" (when the law gives a person anything it gives him that without which it cannot exist). While exercising powers under the section, the court does not function as a court of appeal or revision. Inherent jurisdiction under the section though wide has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the section itself. It is to be exercised ex debito justitiae to do real and substantial justice for the administration of which alone courts exist. Authority of the court exists for advancement of justice and if any attempt is made to abuse that authority so as to produce injustice, the court has power to prevent abuse. It would be an abuse of process of the court to allow any action which

would result in injustice and prevent promotion of justice. In exercise of the powers court would be justified to quash any proceeding if it finds that initiation/continuance of it amounts to abuse of the process of court or quashing of these proceedings would otherwise serve the ends of justice. When no offence is disclosed by the report, the court may examine the question of fact. When a report is sought to be quashed, it is permissible to look into the materials to assess what the report has alleged and whether any offence is made out even if the allegations are accepted in toto.

> *11. As noted above, the powers possessed by the High Court under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. are very wide and the very plenitude of the power requires great caution in its exercise. Court must be careful to see that its decision in exercise of this power is based on sound principles. The inherent power should not be exercised to stifle a legitimate prosecution. The High Court being the highest court of a State should normally refrain from giving a prima facie decision in a case*

where the entire facts are incomplete and hazy, more so when the evidence has not been collected and produced before the Court and the issues involved, whether factual or legal, are of magnitude and cannot be seen in their true perspective without sufficient material. Of course, no hard and fast rule can be laid down in regard to cases in which the High Court will exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction of quashing the proceeding at any stage. (See: Janata Dal v. H. S. Chowdhary, [1992] 4 SCC 305, and Raghubir Saran (Dr.) v. State of Bihar, AIR (1964) SC 1). It would not be proper for the High Court to analyse the case of the complainant in the light of all probabilities in order to determine whether a conviction would be sustainable and on such premises arrive at a conclusion that the proceedings are to be quashed. It would be erroneous to assess the material before it and conclude that the complaint cannot be

proceeded with. When an information is lodged at the police station and an offence is registered, then the mala fides of the informant would be of secondary importance. It is the material collected during the investigation and evidence led in court which decides the fate of the accused person. The allegations of mala fides against the informant are of no consequence and cannot by themselves be the basis for quashing the proceedings. (See: Dhanalakshmi v. R. Prasanna Kumar, [1990] Supp SCC 686, State of Bihar v. P. P. Sharma, AIR (1996) SC 309, Rupan Deol Bajaj v. Kanwar Pal Singh Gill, [1995] 6 SCC 194, State of Kerala v. O.C. Kuttan, AIR (1999) SC 1044, State of U.P. v. O.P. Sharma, [1996] 7 SCC 705, Rashmi Kumar v. Mahesh Kumar Bhada, [1997] 2 SCC 397, Satvinder Kaur v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi, AIR (1996) SC 2983 and Rajesh Bajaj v. State NCT of Delhil, [1999] 3 SCC 259). 14. It is to be noted that the investigation

was not complete and at that stage it was impermissible for the High Court to look into materials, the acceptability of which is essentially a matter for trial. While exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., it is not permissible for the Court to act as if it was a trial Court. Even when charge is framed at that stage, the Court has to only prima facie be satisfied about existence of sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused. For that limited purpose, the Court can evaluate material and documents on records but it cannot appreciate evidence. The Court is not required to appreciate evidence to conclude whether the materials produced are sufficient or not for convicting the accused. In Chand Dhawan (Smt.) v. Jawahar Lal and Ors., [1992] 3 SCC 317, it was observed that when the materials relied upon by a party are required to be proved, no inference can be drawn on the basis of those materials to conclude the complaint to be

> unacceptable. The Court should not act on annexures to the petitions under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., which cannot be termed as evidence without being tested and proved." (Emphasis supplied)
>
> *9. The above decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court make it abundantly clear that the Courts should be slow in exercising the power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. especially where serious allegations of Corruption by public servants are made."*

22. In the instant case, as discussed supra, the primary ingredients of the offences punishable under Sections 7(a) of P.C. Act are made out by the prosecution against the petitioner. The question as to whether the complaint is motivated by mala fides is itself a matter of evidence and trial and this Court cannot conduct a mini trial, at this stage. On an entire perusal of charge sheet materials especially in light of the presence of recordings of conversation between the petitioner and respondent No.2 and in view of the ratio laid down in the aforesaid judgments, which observed that the Courts should be slow in exercising the power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. especially where serious allegations of corruption by public

servants are made, I am of the view that, continuation of criminal proceedings against the petitioner will not amount to abuse of process of Court. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petition is ***dismissed***.

SD/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE

PKS/K