



3. The matter was referred to Superintendent of Police, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bangalore City. Through Police Inspector, the matter was investigated and submitted a report on 8.7.2017.
4. On the basis of the complaint, comments was called from the respondent. The respondent has filed his comments stating that in the year 1989 he joined as daily wage worker in Karnataka Slum Development Board. On 1.4.1992 he was appointed as Assistant Engineer, then on 6.10.1999, he was promoted as Assistant Executive Engineer, on 3.2.2011, he was promoted as Executive Engineer. During November 1993, he married to Smt. Geetha D/o late Mallaveeraiah. During the time of his marriage, the properties were given. He has not earned any properties disproportionate to his known source of income. He has also paid the income tax. Hence prays to close the complaint.
5. Consideration of the material on record shows that :
  - i. The copy of the grant certificate shows that site No. 1753/C was granted to Smt. K.M. Geetha D/o late Mallaveeraiah, site No. 1753/B was granted to Sri. K M Shashikumar S/o late Mallaveeraiah. Subsequently, sale deeds were executed in favour of Smt. K M Geetha and Sri. K M Shashikumar in respect of property No. 1753/B and C.
  - ii. The partition deed dated 14.12.2001 shows that the property bearing No. 1753/B also was given to the share of Smt Geetha W/o Sri. C. K. Ravikumar, the respondent. These facts clearly show that the BDA allotted these sites for residential purpose.

*N. Srinivas*

But the copy of the agreement shows that Smt. Geetha R Ravikumar entered into an agreement with Janahitha Credit Cooperative Society and borrowed loan of Rs. 10 lakhs by mortgaging her both properties.


- iii. The respondent has not produced any documents on record to show that he has declared his assets and liabilities in his assets and liabilities statement and there are no documents to show that the respondent obtained prior permission from Competent Authority to borrow the loan in the name of his wife.
- iv. The copies of rental agreement show that Smt. R. Geetha has let out this property in favour of Sri. Vasanth and Smt. R Kavitha to run a paying guest instead of residential purpose.
- v. Respondent through his wife has let out the property for commercial purpose.
- vi. The respondent has not denied the loan amount borrowed from Janahitha Credit Cooperative Society, mortgaging the properties of his wife and running commercial activities in the house of his wife.

6. In view of the facts stated above and on consideration of the material on record, reply of the respondent has not been found satisfactory to drop the proceedings.



7. The facts supported by the material on record prima facie show that the respondent, being a public/Government servant, has failed to maintain absolute integrity besides devotion to duty and also acted in a manner unbecoming of a public/ Government servant and thereby committed misconduct and made himself liable for disciplinary action.
8. Since said facts and material on record prima-facie show that the respondent has committed misconduct under Rule 3(1) of KCS (Conduct) Rules, 1966, now, acting under section 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, recommendation is made to the Competent Authority to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the respondent and to entrust the inquiry to this Authority under Rule 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957.
9. Further, as per U/s 12(4) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984, the Competent Authority is required to intimate this Authority within one month from the date of receipt of this report, the action taken or proposed to be taken on this report.

Connected records are enclosed.

  
(Justice N. Ananda) 14/11  
Upalokayukta-I  
State of Karnataka