



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No: LOK/ARE-4/12/2011

Multi Storied Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru-560 001.
Dated 29.09.2018

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Shri M.Raghushetty,
the then Second Division Surveyor, Survey
Division, Office of the Tahsildar, Virajpet Taluk,
Kodagu District - reg.

- Ref:- 1) Government Order No. ಕಂಇ 9 ಭೂದಾಸೇ(3) 2011
dated 31.01.2011.
2) Nomination order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/12/2011
dated 05.02.2011 of Upalokayukta, State of
Karnataka.
3) Inquiry Report dated 27.09.2018 of Additional
Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bengaluru.

The Government by its order dated 31.01.2011 initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Shri M.Raghushetty, the then Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Office of the Tahsildar, Virajpet Taluk, Kodagu District [hereinafter referred to as Delinquent Government Official, for short as 'DGO'] and entrusted the Departmental Inquiry to this Institution.

2. This Institution by Nomination Order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/12/2011 dated 05.02.2011 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru, as the Inquiry

Officer to frame charges and to conduct departmental inquiry against DGO for the alleged charge of misconduct, said to have been committed by him.

3. The DGO - Shri M.Raghushetty, the then Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Office of the Tahsildar, Virajpet Taluk, Kodagu District was tried for the following charge:-

“That, you M. Raghushetty, the DGO while working as the Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Tahasildar Office, Virajpet, Kodagu district and on 24/10/2007 demanded and accepted bribe of Rs. 1,000/- from the complainant namely Shri H.P. Lava s/o Shri H.P. Babu, Arji Vilalge, Virajpet Taluk in Kodagu District to conduct “Haddabastu” of the land in Sy.No. 46 of Arijji Village and thus committed dereliction of duty failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated under Section 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.”

4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries- 4) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that, the Disciplinary Authority has ‘*proved*’ the above charge against the DGO - Shri M.Raghushetty, the then Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Office of the Tahsildar, Virajpet Taluk, Kodagu District.


5. On re-consideration of report of inquiry, I do not find any reason to interfere with the findings recorded by the Inquiry Officer. Therefore, it is hereby recommended to the Government to accept the report of Inquiry Officer.

6. As per the First Oral Statement of DGO furnished by the Inquiry Officer, DGO - Shri M.Raghushetty has retired from service on 31.01.2015.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge (demand and acceptance of bribe) 'proved' against Shri M.Raghushetty, the then Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Office of the Tahsildar, Virajpet Taluk, Kodagu District, it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of 'permanently withholding 50% of the pension payable to the DGO - Shri M.Raghushetty'.

8. Action taken in the matter shall be intimated to this Authority.

Connected records are enclosed herewith.


(JUSTICE N. ANANDA)
Upalokayukta,
State of Karnataka. 29/9

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No. LOK/ARE-4/ENQ/12/2011

M.S.Building,
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Road
Bangalore-560 001
Date: 27/09/2018

ENQUIRY REPORT

Sub: Departmental Enquiry against,

Sri M. Raghu Shetty
Second Division Surveyor
Department of Survey Settlement
and Land Records (the then Second
Division Surveyor
Survey Division
Office of the Tahasildar
Virajpet Taluk,
Kodagu District) **(Now retired)**

- Ref:**
- 1) Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in Compt/Uplok/MYS/245/2009/ARLO-1 dated: 01/01/2011
 - 2) Govt. Order. No.ಕಂಇ 9 ಭೂದಾಸೇ (3) 2011, Bangalore dated:31/01/2011
 - 3) Order No.LOK/INQ/12/2011 Dtd.05/02/2011 of the Hon'ble Upalokayukta

1. This Departmental Enquiry is directed against Sri M. Raghu Shetty, Second Division Surveyor, Department of Survey Settlement and Land Records (the then Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Office of the Tahasildar, Virajpet Taluk, Kodagu District) **(Now retired)** (herein after

referred to as the Delinquent Government Official in short "DGO")

2. After completion of the investigation a report u/sec. 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act was sent to the Government as per Reference No.1.

3. In view of the Government Order cited above at reference-2, the Hon'ble Upalokayukta, vide order dated: 05/02/2011 cited above at reference-3, nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4 of the office of the Karnataka Lokayukta as the Enquiry Officer to frame charges and to conduct Inquiry against the aforesaid DGO. Additional Registrar Enquires-4 prepared Articles of Charge, Statement of Imputations of mis-conduct, list of documents proposed to be relied and list of witnesses proposed to be examined in support of Article of Charges. Copies of same were issued to the DGO calling upon him to appear before this Authority and to submit written statement of his defence.

4. The Articles of Charges framed by ARE-4 against the DGO is as below;

ANNEXURE NO.1

CHARGE

That, you M. Raghushetty, the DGO while working as the Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Tahasildar Office, Virajpet, Kodagu district and on 24/10/2007 demanded and accepted bribe of Rs. 1,000/- from the complainant namely Sri H.P. Lava s/o H.P. Babu, Arji Vilalge, Virajpet Taluk in Kodagu District to conduct "Haddabastu" of the land in sy.No. 46 of Arijj

Village and thus committed dereliction of duty failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated u/sec. 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

ANNEXURE NO.II
STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT

The father and uncle of the complainant namely, Sri H.P. Lava s/o H.P. Papu of Ariji village Virajpet taluk of Kodagu district intended to conduct Hadubastu of the land bearing sy.No. 46 of Ariji Village. In that regard, the father and uncle of the complainant had jointly submitted application before the Tahasildar. On 20/09/2007 the complainant visited the survey section namely, the section of the DGO and paid the survey fees. Thereafter, the complainant visited the office of the DGO on several occasions and requested the DGO to conduct "Hadubast" survey. When the complainant visited the office of DGO on 22/10/2007 and requested to conduct "Hadubastu" the DGO demanded an illegal gratification of Rs. 3,000/-. Then the DGO asked the complainant to pay Rs. 1,000/- on 24/10/2007 and the balance amount on the date of survey. The complainant was not ready to pay bribe amount. Then, he approached Lokayukta Police Inspector of Madikeri (hereinafter referred to as the Investigating Officer, for short "the I.O.") on 24/10/2007 and he lodged complaint. The I.O. registered the complaint in Cr. No. 5/2007 for the offences u/sec. 7,13(1)(d) r/w sec. 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act 1988. The I.O. submitted FIR to the concerned court. On 24/10/2007 itself the I.O. followed pre-trap formalities and went to the office of the DGO along with the complainant and witnesses. The I.O.

trapped the DGO in his office after he accepted illegal gratification of Rs. 1,000/- from the complainant on demand in the presence of shadow witness. Afterward the I.O. completed post-trap formalities and bribe amount was recovered from the pant pocket of the DGO. During the course of investigation the I.O. recorded statements of the complainant, the panch witnesses and other witnesses. The I.O. sent articles seized during the pre-trap and post-trap formalities to the chemical examiner. The report of the chemical examiner was positive to support the case against the DGO. On the basis of the available materials and after taking up investigation u/sec. 7(2) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, an observation note was sent to the DGO calling for his explanation. The DGO submitted explanation denying the allegations against him. But, the explanation was not satisfactory and not convincing. The materials collected by the I.O. during the course of investigation showed prima facie case for demand and acceptance of bribe of Rs. 1,000/- from the complainant. Thus, the DGO failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty unbecoming of a Government Servant. As there was sufficient materials on record against the DGO, a recommendation u/sec. 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act was made to competent authority to initiate departmental proceedings against the DGO. Accordingly, the Competent Authority initiated departmental proceedings and entrusted the same u/Rule 14-A of CCA Rules for enquiry. Hence, this charge.

5. DGO appeared before this Enquiry Authority on 18/06/2011 and on 02/07/2011 his First Oral statement was

recorded U/R 11(9) of KCS (CC & A) Rules 1957. The DGO pleaded not guilty and claims to hold an enquiry.

6. DGO has filed the written statement contending that he denies the charges and imputations made against him and claims for trial. Hence he has prayed to discharge him from the charges framed against him.

7. In order to substantiate the charge leveled against the DGO, the Disciplinary Authority examined in all three witnesses as PW1 to PW3 and got marked documents at Ex.P1 to P10. On the side of DGO, Ex.D1 to D4 marked. After closing the evidence of the Disciplinary Authority, the Second Oral Statement of DGO was recorded as required u/Rule 11(16) of KCS (CC & A) Rules, 1957. In spite of giving sufficient time the DGO did not adduce his evidence and the DGO was questioned as per Rule 11(18) of KCS (CC&A) Rules.

8. The Disciplinary Authority has not filed the written brief, but on the side of the DGO written brief has been filed. Oral arguments of the Presenting Officer and the learned counsel for the DGO was heard. The points, that arise for the consideration of this enquiry authority are:-

- 1) Whether the Disciplinary Authority satisfactorily proved the charge framed against DGO?
- 2) What order?

9. My finding on the above points are as follows

Point No.1: In the “ **AFFIRMATIVE**”

Point No.2: As per the final order for the following:

:: REASONS ::

10. **Point NO.1:** It is the case of the disciplinary authority that the DGO while working as Second Division Surveyor, Survey division, Tahasildar office, Virajpete, Kodagu district on 24/10/2007 demanded and accepted bribe of Rs. 1,000/- from the complainant by name Sri H.P.Lava s/o H.P. Bapu to conduct Hadubastu survey of the land bearing sy.No. 46 of Ariji village and thereby committed dereliction of duty and failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty.

11. The complainant has been examined as PW1 and the copy of the complaint lodged by him is at Ex.P1. The gist of the Ex.P1 is to the effect that the father and uncles of PW1 had given application to Tahasildar Virajpet taluk to measure and fix the boundaries of sy.No. 46/1 measuring 3 acre 2 guntas of Ariji village and as per the instructions of his father on 20/09/2007 PW1 deposited the survey fee of Rs. 90 and on 22/10/2007 he met the DGO and requested for survey for which the DGO told that his work will be done only if Rs. 3,000/- is given and PW1 told his inability to pay the said amount and the DGO asked him to pay Rs. 1,000/- after two days and to pay the balance amount of Rs. 2,000/- at the time of the survey and refused to reduce the bribe amount. In the same it is further stated that he informed the same to his father and uncles and they instructed him to lodge the complaint and accordingly he has lodged the complaint on 24/10/2007 at 9.15 a.m. in Lokayukta police station, Madikere.

12. PW1 has deposed about the averments made in his complaint stated above. He has deposed that after he lodged the complaint Lokayukta police secured two panchas and he told them about his complaint. He has deposed that he produced 10 notes of the denomination of Rs. 100/- and the Lokayukta Inspector with the help of his staff got smeared some powder to the notes and those notes were given to the pancha witness by name Sri Mahesh and the said Sri Mahesh kept them in his shirt pocket and afterwards the hands of Sri Mahesh when washed in the solution, that solution turned to red colour. He has deposed that the Lokayukta Inspector instructed him that he should not touch the notes kept in his shirt pocket and after the DGO receiving the amount he should give the signal by cleaning his face. He has also deposed that prior to that the serial number of the currency notes were also noted. He has deposed that Ex.P2 is the copy of the entrustment mahazar and he has also signed the same.

13. PW1 further deposed that afterwards himself, the panchas, the I.O. and his staff went to Viraj pete and only himself and one of the pancha witness went to meet the DGO and the remaining persons remained outside. He has deposed that he met the DGO and DGO asked him for the money and he gave the tainted currency notes and the DGO received the money and kept the same in his pant watch pocket and afterwards he gave the signal and Lokayukta police came there and he showed the DGO and told the I.O. what happened. He has deposed that the Lokayukta police washed the hands of the DGO in the solution and that solution turned to red colour. He has deposed that Lokayukta police got removed the

amount which was in the pant pocket of the DGO and those notes were the same notes mentioned in the entrustment mahazar. He has deposed that the Lokayukta police also seized the file concerning the application given for survey by his father and the brothers of his father. He has deposed that the copies of those documents are all Ex.P3. He has deposed that Ex.P4 is the copy of the trap mahazar. Thus PW1 has deposed about the DGO demanding for the bribe amount of Rs. 1,000/- and accepting the same.

14. In his cross-examination PW1 has deposed that he was not knowing about the procedures in respect of Government works and hence he had taken with him one Sri Madan to the Government office for helping him. He has deposed that he was not knowing at what stage the application given for survey was pending on 24/10/2007. He has deposed that he informed Sri Madan that the surveyor is demanding the bribe amount of Rs. 3,000/- and Sri Madan had also accompanied him to Lokayukta police station when he lodged the complaint. He has deposed that Sri Madan wrote the complaint and I feel only on the ground that PW1 had taken the assistant of Sri Madan for lodging the complaint, the evidence of PW1 cannot be discarded. He has deposed that Sri Madan had also accompanied them to the office of the DGO when they went to the office of the DGO for trap. He has deposed that the office of the DGO is in the upstairs and the pancha witness Sri Mahesh had come along with him. He had deposed that he had also approached one Sri Sanjay working in the office of the DGO and enquired about his file and he told him that the file will be given to the DGO. He has deposed that afterwards

he met the DGO and the DGO asked him to give money and hence he gave the tainted currency notes to the DGO. He has deposed that the concerned file was seized from Sri Sanjay. He has deposed that the staff who smeared phenolphthalein powder to the currency notes, got the hands of the DGO washed in the solution. As stated above Ex.P2 is the copy of the entrustment mahazar in which it is clearly stated that before leaving the Lokayukta police station, the staff who had smeared phenolphthalein powder to the notes got washed their hands with water and soap. Hence the above evidence given by PW1 is not of much help to the DGO. He has denied the suggestion of the learned counsel for the DGO to the effect that the trap mahazar was made in the Lokayukta police station. In his re-examination he has clearly deposed that he knows only reading and to put his signature and he does not know writing. Hence it can be said that PW1 has taken the assistance of his friend Sri Madan to prepare the complaint and it will not come in the way of the case of the disciplinary authority.

15. PW2 is Sri A.G. Mahesh, and he has deposed that in the year 2007 he was working as FDA in the office of the Joint Director of Agriculture, Madikeri and on 24/10/2007 he had been to the Lokayukta police station, Madikeri and one Sri Somashekhar had also come from Health and Family Welfare Department, Madikeri. He has deposed that the complainant was also present along with the police inspector. He has deposed that he came to know the contents of the complaint lodged by the complainant. He has also deposed about PW1 producing Rs. 1,000/- (Rs. 100x10) and the denomination and

the numbers of those notes were noted. He has deposed that the notes were given to him and he kept the same in the pocket of PW1 and afterwards his hands were washed in sodium carbonate solution and that solution turned to pink colour. He has deposed about the instructions given to the complainant and himself by the police inspector which is mentioned in Ex.P2. He has deposed that afterwards they left the Lokayukta police station and went to Virajpete and stopped their vehicle near the car stand and PW1 and Sri Somashekar were sent to the office of the DGO. He has deposed that after some time PW1 and CW3 (Somashekar) came out of the office of the DGO and PW1 gave the pre-arranged signal and immediately the Lokayukta inspector, his staff and himself went to the office of the DGO and PW1 showed the DGO and told that he has received the amount and kept the same in the watch pocket of his pant. He has deposed that Lokayukta Inspector introduced himself to the DGO and got the hands of the DGO washed in sodium carbonate solution and that solution turned to pink colour. He has deposed that when the Lokayukta Inspector asked the DGO about the amount received by him from PW1 the DGO produced the amount from the secret (watch) pocket of the pant and those notes were the same notes mentioned in the entrustment mahazar. He has deposed that the certified copies of the file of the father of the complainant, attendance register and other documents were seized and the DGO gave his statement by way of writing and copy of the same is at Ex.P5. He has deposed that Ex.P4 is the copy of the entrustment mahazar.

16. In his cross-examination he has deposed that the staff who had smeared phenolphthalein powder to the notes at the time of the Ex.P2 washed the hands of the DGO. But as stated above in Ex.P2 it is clearly mentioned that before leaving Lokayukta police station, the staff who smeared phenolphthalein powder to the notes had washed their hands with water and soap and there is no cross-examination of PW2 in that regard.

17. In his cross-examination he has admitted that in the photo marked as Ex.D1 Sri Madan is also seen and he was in the Lokayukta office at the time of the entrustment mahazar. As stated above PW1 also admits that the above said Sri Madan had accompanied him to Lokayukta police when he lodged the complaint and that he got his complaint prepared through the above said Sri Madan as he cannot write in Kannada. Hence the above said Sri Madan being seen in Ex.D1 (one of the photo) taken at the time of the entrustment mahazar in no way help the DGO and it does not go against the case of the disciplinary authority.

18. In this case the disciplinary authority could not examine the shadow witness by name Sri Somashekar (CW3). The order sheet dated: 15/11/2014 discloses that the witness summons issued to CW3 was returned unserved on the ground that CW3 is dead along with the copy of the death certificate. Hence no adverse inference can be drawn against the disciplinary authority for not examining CW3, the shadow witness.

19. PW3 is the Police Inspector by name Sri R.V. Gangadharappa and he has deposed that from 2007 to 2012 he was working as police inspector in Karnataka Lokayukta, Madikeri and on 24/10/2007 at 9.15 a.m. PW1 came to the station and gave the written complaint as per Ex.P1 and on the basis of the same he registered the case in Crime No. 5/2007 and sent the FIR to the court and the copy of the same is at Ex.P6. He has deposed about securing two panchas and conducting entrustment mahazar in the Lokayukta police station as per Ex.P2. He has given his evidence in accordance with the averments made in Ex.P2.

20. He has further deposed that his staff who smeared the phenolphthalein powder to the notes got washed their hands apart from himself, the panchas and complainant and afterwards they left Lokayukta police station and came near Viraja pete survey office at about 12.45 p.m. He has deposed that the vehicles were stopped at a little distance from the said office and PW1 and the shadow witness were sent inside the survey office by reminding them the instructions given to them mentioned in Ex.P2. He has deposed that the survey office was in the second floor and at about 1.10 p.m. PW1 came out and gave the pre-arranged signal and immediately himself, his staff and PW2 went to the second floor and enquired PW1 and PW1 showed the DGO and told that the DGO received the amount with his right hand, counted the notes by using both his hands and kept the same in his pant watch pocket. He has deposed that he introduced himself to the DGO and told him about the complaint registered against him and got prepared the sodium carbonate solution in two bowels and washed the

hands of the DGO separately. He has deposed that both the solutions turned to pink colour. He has deposed that when the DGO was asked to produce the amount received by him from PW1, the DGO produced 10 notes of the denomination of Rs. 100/- from his pant watch pocket and those notes were the same notes mentioned in the entrustment mahazar and he seized those notes and also the pant. He has deposed that even the pant wash was positive and the DGO gave his explanation in writing and the copy of the same is at Ex.P5. He has further deposed that PW1 and pancha witness denied the contents of Ex.P5.

21. In Ex.P5 it is stated that the file of the father of the complainant had not come to him and every month supervisor will allot the work and PW1 by force gave the amount to his hands and told him to keep the same and that he will come afterwards and intentionally got the DGO trapped and the file of the complainant is with Sri Sanjay kumar. Thus in Ex.P5 the DGO admits that he was having the tainted currency notes but PW1 gave the same to him by force and the DGO has not been examined to prove his above said stand taken in Ex.P5 nor there is any cross-examination of PW1 in that respect and hence it has to be said that the DGO has not adduced any evidence to prove his stand taken by him in Ex.P5.

22. PW3 has further deposed that he sent the seized articles to chemical examination and Ex.P10 is the copy of the chemical examination report. He has deposed that he got the sketch of the scene of occurrence through PWD Engineer and the copy of the same is at Ex.P9. He has deposed that he has also prepared the rough sketch of the scene of occurrence and

the copy of the same is at Ex.P8. Ex.P8 and P9 shows that the shadow witness was by the side of PW1 when PW1 met the DGO in the office of the DGO.

23. As stated above in Ex.P5 the DGO has stated that the file is with the official by name Sri Sanjay and not with him. PW1 has deposed that the file was seized from one Sanjay. PW2 has denied the suggestion of the learned counsel for the DGO to the effect that the concerned file was seized from Sri Sanjay. PW3 has deposed that he got the file of the father of the complainant from the DGO himself and seized certified copies of the same. In his cross-examination he has deposed that Ex.D2 is the copy of the statement of the above said Sri Sanjay kumar recorded by him. In Ex.D2 it is stated that on the date of the trap namely on 24/10/2007 at 1.15 p.m. the DGO received the file but did not sign the register but told that he will sign the register afterwards. In the same it is also stated that even earlier to 24/10/2007 Sri Sanjaykumar wanted to give the file of the complainant to the DGO but the DGO told to keep the same with him. As stated above trap mahazar is made from 1.40 p.m. to 3.40 p.m. on 24/10/2007 as per Ex.P4. Hence it has to be said that just prior to the trap DGO had received the file from the complainant as per the statement of Sri Sanjay the copy which is at Ex.D2. As stated above Ex.D2 shows that even though the DGO had received the file he had not signed the register for having received the file by telling that he will sign the register afterwards. Ex.D3 is the copy of the property form. Ex.D4 are the copies of the same of the photographs and PW3 has deposed that in Ex.D4 there is no photo showing the DGO removing the tainted

currency notes from his pant watch pocket but on that ground only the evidence of PW1 to PW3 stated above cannot be discarded.

24. Admittedly there is no ill-will between the PW1 to PW3 and the DGO. There is no reason to discard the evidence given by PW1 to PW3. PW3 in his cross-examination has deposed that in the entrustment mahazar-Ex.P2 by mistake the name of Sri R.T. Anthar Dhani has been mentioned and the learned counsel for the DGO has produced the certified copy of the deposition of the above said Sri R.T. Anthar Dhani in Special Case No. 5/2009 but by mistake in para No.3 of page No.3 of Ex.P2 the name of Sri R.T. Anthar Dhani is mentioned as panch witness No.2 which cannot be given much importance.

25. Government Order in No. ಕಂಇ 174 ಭೂದಾಸೇ (3) 2016, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, dated:17/07/2018 has been sent to this enquiring authority which discloses that in the criminal case filed against the DGO bearing Special Case No. 2/2009 for the offences punishable under sec. 7, 13(1)(d) r/w 13(2) of the P.C. Act 1988 the DGO has been convicted and by that time the DGO had retired on superannuation and hence the entire pension of the DGO has been permanently withheld. Hence it can be said that in the criminal case itself the charge against the DGO stated above has been proved, beyond reasonable doubt.

26. For all the reasons stated above it has to be said that the DGO has demanded and accepted the bribe amount for showing the official favour and the contention of the DGO that

the work was not pending with him cannot be accepted. As stated earlier PW1 has clearly deposed about the DGO demanding for the bribe amount and accepting the same to show official favour and there is no reasons to discard his evidence.

27. Thus the DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and acted in a manner of unbecoming of a Government Servant. Hence, I answer this point in the **AFFIRMATIVE**.

28. Point NO.2:- For the reasons discussed above, I proceed to pass the following:-

:: ORDER ::

*The Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily proved the charge in this case that, DGO- Sri M. Raghu Shetty, Second Division Surveyor, Department of Survey Settlement and Land Records (the then Second Division Surveyor, Survey Division, Office of the Tahasildar, Virajpet Taluk, Kodagu District) **(Now retired)** committed mis-conduct as enumerated U/R 3(1) (i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

29. Hence this report is submitted to Hon'ble Upalokayukta -2 for kind perusal and for further action in the matter.

Dated this the 27th day of September, 2018

-Sd/-
(Somaraju)
Additional Registrar Enquiries-4,
Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bangalore.

ANNEXURE**LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY:**

- PW-1 :Sri H.P. Lava (complainant)
 PW-2:Sri A.G. Mahesh (pancha witness)
 PW-3:Sri R.V.Gangadharappa (I.O.)

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENCE:

NIL

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY

- Ex.P-1: Certified copy of the complaint
 Ex.P-1(a):Relevant entry in Ex.P1
 Ex.P-2:Certified copy of the Entrustment Mahazar
 Ex.P-2(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P2
 Ex.P-3:Certified copy of the file of the complainant (containing 7 sheets)
 Ex.P-4: Certified copy of the trap mahazar
 Ex.P-4(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P4
 Ex.P-5: Certified copy of the explanation of DGO
 Ex.P-5(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P5
 Ex.P-6: Certified copy of the FIR
 Ex.P-6(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P6
 Ex.P-7: Certified copy of the notes denomination mentioned sheet
 Ex.P-7(a):Relevant entry in Ex.P7
 Ex.P-8:Certified copy of the sketch
 Ex.P8(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P8
 Ex.P-9:Certified copy of the sketch prepared by A.E.E., PWD, Viraja pete
 Ex.P9(a); Relevant entry in Ex.P9
 Ex.P10:Certified copy of the letter of Superintendent Engineer, Karnataka Lokayukta, Mysore dated: 13/02/2008 addressed to Sri R.V.Gangadharappa, Police Inspector, Karnataka Lokayukta, Madikere with certified copy of chemical examination report

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DGO:

- Ex.D-1:Certified copy of the xerox photos on the white sheet
 Ex.D-2:Certified copy of the statement of Sri S. Sanjay kumar dated: 24/10/2007
 Ex.D-3:Certified copy of the property form
 Ex.D-4: Certified copy of the xerox photos on the white sheet

Dated this the 27th day of September, 2018

-Sd-

(Somaraju)

Additional Registrar Enquiries-4,
 Karnataka Lokayukta,
 Bangalore.

