

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No.LOK/INQ/14-A/188/2011/ARE-4

Multi Storied Buildings,
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru-560 001,
Date: **19/11/2019**

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Sri Shivaram, Grama Panchayath Secretary, Manchalapura Grama Panchayath, Raichur Taluk and District – Reg.

Ref:-1) Government Order No. ಸ್ರಾಪ/181/ಸ್ರಾಪಂ/2011, Bengaluru dated 8/8/2011.

2) Nomination order No.LOK/INQ/14-A/188/2011 Bengaluru dated 19/08/2011 of Upalokayukta-1, State of Karnataka, Bengaluru.

3) Inquiry Report dated 16/11/2019 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru

The Government by its Order dated 8/8/2011 initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Sri Shivaram, Grama Panchayath Secretary, Manchalapura Grama Panchayath, Raichur Taluk and 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/188/2011 dated 19/08/2011 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 Sri Shivaram, Grama Panchayath Secretary, Manchalapura Grama Panchayath, Raichur Taluk and District was tried for the following charge:-

“That, you Sri Shivaram, the DGO, while working as Secretary of Grama Panchayath at Manchalapur in Raichur taluk and District, the complainant namely Sri Suresh s/o Sanjeevappa resident of Hospete in Raichur taluk and district had applied for sanction of house under Indira Avas Scheme from Manchalapura Grama Panchayath and accordingly, a house was sanctioned to him and site no.9/114 was allotted on 04/04/2010 and the allotment deed was registered in the office of Sub-Registrar of Raichur on 15/04/2010 and then the complainant approached you for release of first installment subsidy amount cheque for Rs.10,000/- and then you demanded Rs.2,000/- from the complainant to show official favour, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, which act is un-becoming of a Government Servant and thus committed misconduct as enumerated U/R 3(1) (i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Services (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 DGO Sri Shivaram, Grama Panchayath Secretary, Manchalapura Grama Panchayath, Raichur Taluk and District.

5. On re-consideration of inquiry report, I do not find any reason to interfere with the findings recorded by the Inquiry


Officer. It is hereby recommended to the Government to accept the report of Inquiry Officer.

6. As per the First Oral Statement submitted by DGO Sri Shivaram, he is due to retire from service on 30/06/2021.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge (demand of bribe) proved against DGO Sri Shivaram, it is hereby recommended to the Government for imposing penalty of compulsory retirement from service on DGO Sri Shivaram, Grama Panchayath Secretary, Manchalapura Grama Panchayath, Raichur Taluk and District and also for permanently withholding 40% of the pension payable to DGO Sri Shivaram.

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.


(JUSTICE N. ANANDA)
Upalokayukta-1,
State of Karnataka,
Bengaluru

18/11

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No. LOK/ARE-4/ENQ-188/2011.

Multi Storied Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedi,
Bengaluru – 560 001,
Dated 16-11-2019.

ENQUIRY REPORT

Sub:- Departmental Enquiry against,
Sri. **Shivaram**, Grama Panchayathi
Secretary, Manchalapura Grama
Panchayath, Raichur taluk and
District – Reg.

- Ref:-** 1. Govt. Order No. ಗೌಅಪ 181 ಗೌಪಂಅ 2011,
Bengaluru dated 08.08.2011.
2. Nomination Order No. LOK/INQ/14-A
/88/2011 of Hon'ble Upalokayukta-1,
State of Karnataka.

@@@@

This Departmental Enquiry is directed against Sri. **Shivaram**, Grama Panchayath Secretary, Manchalapura Grama Panchayath, Raichur Taluk and District (herein after referred to as the Delinquent Government Official in short "DGO" respectively).

2. In view of the Government Order cited above at reference-1, the Hon'ble Upalokayukta-1, vide order dated 19.08.2011 cited above at reference No.2, nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru to frame charges

and to conduct Inquiry against the aforesaid DGO. Additional Registrar of Enquiries-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 Charge. Copies of same were issued to the DGO calling upon him to appear before this authority and to submit written statement of his defence.

3. The Articles of Charge framed by Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4 against the DGO is as under:-

ANNEXURE NO. I

CHARGE

That, you Sri. Shivaram, the DGO, while working as Secretary of Grama Panchayath at Manchalapur in Raichur taluk and District, the complainant namely Sri. Suresh S/o Sanjeevappa resident of Hospete in Raichur taluk and district had applied for sanction of house under Indira Avas Scheme from Manchalapura Grama Panchayath and accordingly, a house was sanctioned to him and site No. 9/114 was allotted on 01.04.2010 and the allotment deed was registered in the office of Sub-Registrar of Raichur on 15.04.2010 and then the complainant approached you DGO for release of first installment subsidy amount cheque of Rs. 10,000/- and then you demanded Rs. 2,000/- from the complainant to

show official favour, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, which act is un-becoming of a Government servant and thus, committed mis-conduct as enumerated under Rule 3(1) (i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

ANNEXURE NO. II

STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT

The complainant namely Sri. Suresh S/o Sanjeevappa resident of Hospete in Raichur taluk and applied for sanction of house under Indira Avas Scheme from Manchalapura Gram Panchayath. Accordingly, house and site bearing No. 9/114 was allotted to him on 01.04.2010 and allotment deed was registered in the office of Sub-Registrar of Raichur. On 15.04.2010 the complainant approached the DGO to release first installment of subsidy amount cheque for Rs. 10,000/-. Instead of saying that cheque will be issued, the DGO demanded bribe of Rs. 2,000/-. The complainant was not willing to pay bribe demanded by the DGO. Therefore, he approached the Lokayukta Police Inspector of Raichur (herein after referred to as the Investigating Officer, for short " the I.O.") and lodged a complaint. The Investigating Officer registered the complaint in Cr. No. 2/2010 for the offences punishable U/S 7, 13(1)(d) R/w 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and took up investigation. During the course of investigation into the said crime, the trap did not

materialize as the DGO was not available when attempted to trap him. But, the facts and materials of the investigation showed that the DGO being a public servant failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty. Therefore, a suo-moto investigation was taken up U/S 7(2) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act and an Observation Note was sent to the DGO calling for his explanation. The DGO failed to give reply. The materials on record prima facie showed that, the DGO has committed misconduct as enumerated U/R 3 (1) (i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966. Therefore, a report U/S 12 (3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act was sent to the Competent Authority with recommendation to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the DGO and to entrust enquiry U/R 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957 to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta. Accordingly, the Competent Authority initiated Disciplinary Proceedings against the DGO and entrusted enquiry U/R 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957 to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta, Hence, this charge.

4. The DGO appeared before this Enquiry Authority on 13.02.2012 under the same day his First Oral Statement has been recorded. The DGO denied the charge framed against him. The DGO has filed his written statement denying the charges leveled against him. The DGO has not committed any misconduct as alleged in the charge memo. He seeks the

permission to cross-examine the witnesses going to be examined in support of the charge. The DGO deserves the right to file additional written statement. The DGO has not filed any additional written statement. On the side of the Disciplinary Authority PW-1 to 4 have been examined and Ex. P-1 to 11 have been marked. After the evidence on the side of the Disciplinary Authority was closed the enquiry was posted for Second Oral Statement and the evidence of the DGO. The DGO remained absent and hence, he was placed **exparte**. In view of the same, the questioning of the DGO has been dispensed and the DGO has not produced any evidence on his side.

5. Oral arguments of the Presenting Officer was heard.

6. Upon considering of the evidence adduced and the defence of the DGO, the only points that arises for this enquiry authority is

(1) Whether the Disciplinary Authority satisfactorily proved the charge framed against the DGO?

(2) What order?

7. My findings on the above points are as follows:-

(1) In the **affirmative**

(2) As per final order for the following:-

:: REASONS ::

8. **Point No.1** :- It is the case of the Disciplinary Authority that the DGO while working as Secretary of Gram Panchayath at Manchalapura in Riachur Taluk, the complainant Sri. C. Suresh S/o Sanjeevappa had applied for sanction of house under Indira Avas Yojane and accordingly, the house was sanctioned to him for construction in his site No. 9/114 and when the complainant approached the DGO for release of 1st installment cheque for Rs. 10,000/-, the DGO demanded Rs. 2,000/- bribe amount from the complainant to show official favour and thereby, he has committed misconduct. Thus, the charge against the DGO is only regarding demand for illegal gratification to show an official favour.

9. In this departmental enquiry, the complainant has been examined as PW-1 and the copy of the complaint lodged by him before Lokayukta Police, Raichur is at **Ex. P-1**. The gist of Ex. P-1 is to the effect that, due to heavy rain the house of PW-1 fell down and hence, he applied for financial facility to construct the house under Rajeev Gandhi Rural Housing Scheme and the same was sanctioned. PW-1 is due for 1st installment of Rs. 10,000/- and in that respect he approached the DGO and prayed for issue of cheque. But, the DGO demanded bribe of Rs. 2,000/-. Not willing to pay the bribe amount on 15.04.2010 he approached Lokayukta

Police Station, Raichur and informed the matter and the Police Inspector gave him the Micro Cassette Recorder and told him to approach the DGO and to record the conversation and accordingly, on the same day PW-1 met the DGO at 4 P.M. and requested to reduce the bribe amount for which the DGO told to give Rs. 1,000/- on that day itself and to give the balance Rs. 1,000/- tomorrow and to take the cheque and he told the DGO that, he has not brought the amount and that he will pay the amount tomorrow.

10. PW-1 complainant Sri. **Suresh** in his examination-in-chief has deposed that, in Hospete village his family had an old house and it fell down due to heavy rain and the Government sanctioned the amount to construct the house in that site bearing No. 9/114 under Indira Avas Yojane. He has deposed that, for the construction of the house from Rajiv Gandhi Vasathi Nigama, the 1st installment of Rs. 10,000/- was also sanctioned and that cheque has to be given by the Gram Panchayath Secretary and hence, he approached the Gram Panchayath Secretary (DGO) and prayed for issue of cheque and the DGO demanded bribe of Rs. 2,000/- for issue of cheque for Rs. 10,000/-. He has further deposed that, not willing to pay the bribe amount he approached the Lokayukta Police Station on 15.04.2010 and told the matter orally and to confirm the same, the Police Inspector gave him a Micro Cassette Recorder and asked him to meet the DGO and to record the conversation. He has deposed that, on the same day at 4 P.M. he met the DGO and at

that time also the DGO demanded bribe of Rs. 1,000/- immediately and to pay the balance Rs. 1,000/- tomorrow and he told the DGO that he has not brought the amount and that he will pay the amount tomorrow. He has further deposed that, on 16.04.2010 he went to the Lokayukta Police Station and lodged the written complaint and the copy of the same is at Ex. P-1 and also returned the Micro Cassette Recorder.

11. PW-1 has further deposed that, the Investigating Officer secured two panchas and they were told about his complaint. He has deposed that, he produced Rs. 2,000/- (1 note of the denomination Rs. 1,000 and 2 notes of denomination of Rs. 500) and phenolphthalein powder was smeared to the notes and those notes were given to the hands of the Panch Witness Nagarajgowda and he counted the same and kept in his shirt pocket. He has deposed that, afterwards the hands of Nagaraj Gowda were washed in the Sodium Carbonate Solution and that solution turned into pink colour. He has deposed that a panchanama was also drawn in Lokayukta Police Station and the copy of the same is at **Ex. P-2**.

12. PW-1 has further deposed that, afterwards himself, panchas and the Lokayukta Police went to Gram Panchayath office of Manchalapura and the vehicle was stopped at the distance and himself and another panch witness Sri. Mohammed Shamshuddin went inside that office to meet the DGO. But, the DGO was not in

the office. He has further deposed that, afterwards they went to the house of the DGO, but the DGO was not present in his house also and hence, they returned back to Raichur Lokayukta Office. He has deposed that, in Lokayukta Office, the phenolphthalein powder smeared to the notes was removed and those notes were given back to him and in that connection a panchnama was also drawn and the copy of the same is at **Ex. P-3.**

13. PW-1 has further deposed that, on 12.05.2010 the DGO sent the 1st installment cheque of Rs. 10,000/- through one Sri. Zindappa who is the neighbor of PW-1. He has deposed that, he encashed that cheque and gave the letter to Lokayukta Police to close his complaint and the copy of that letter is at **Ex. P-4.** In Ex. P-4 is dated 12.05.2010 and in the same it is mentioned that the DGO had sent the 1st installment cheque of Rs. 10,000/- due to PW-1 through one Sri. Zindappa who is the neighbor of PW-1 and hence, the further investigation of his complaint be closed.

14. PW-1 has not been cross-examined on the day on which he was examined-in-chief. He was examined in chief on 29.07.2013 and has been cross-examined on 02.04.2018 and hence, it can be said that PW-1 has been cross-examined after 4 ½ years of his examination-in-chief. In his Cross-examination he has deposed that, the complaint was written by his uncle Sri. Anjaneya and the contents of the Ex P-1 is not read over to him. He has also deposed that, the DGO did not demand any bribe amount from him. PW-1

has been reexamined by the learned Presenting Officer and in his re-examination PW-1 has deposed that, he has studied up to 10th standard and he knows reading and writing Kannada and the evidence given by him on 27.09.2013 (Examination-in-chief) is correct. Hence, it can be only be said that, in his examination-in-chief PW-1 has deposed about the true facts which is also mentioned in his complaint Ex. P-1 and in his cross-examination which is done long after his examination-in-chief, he has tried to help the DGO at the instance of the DGO by giving evidence contrary to his examination-in-chief. Hence, the evidence given by PW-1 in his cross-examination cannot be believed.

15. PW-2 is Sri. **Nagaraj Gowda** and he has deposed that, in the year 2010 he was working as Junior Engineer in PWD Raichur. He has deposed that, on 16.04.2010 at 11 a.m. as per the instructions of his higher officer he had been to Lokayukta Police Station, Raichur and reported before the Police Inspector Sri. Shirikole. He has deposed that Sri. Mohammed Shamsuddin also reported at the same time as another panch witness and the complainant PW-1 was also present in the Police Station. He has deposed that, himself and Sri. Mohammed Shamsuddin were introduced to PW-1 and they came to know about the complaint lodged by PW-1. He has deposed that, PW-1 produced the amount of Rs. 2,000/- and he has deposed about the other contents mentioned in the Entrustment Mahazar marked as Ex. P-2. Thus, he has deposed

about all the averments mentioned in Ex. P-2. He also deposed that, the recorded conversation was played and the same was transcribed and the copy of the same is at **Ex. P-5**. He has deposed that, photos were also taken at the time of Ex. P-2 and the copies of the photographs are at **Ex. P-6**.

16. PW-2 has further deposed that, after Ex. P-2 they left Lokayukta Police Station and went to Gram Panchayath office Manchalapura and PW-1 and PW-3 Sri. Mohammed Shamsuddin went inside that Office and they returned back at 2 P.M. and told that DGO is not in the office and hence, they went to the house of the DGO situated in Raichur but, the DGO was also not present in his house and hence, they returned back to Lokayukta Police Station. He has also deposed about Ex. P-3. He has deposed that, in the conversation that was played at the time of Entrustment Mahazar there was demand for money.

17. PW-3 Sri. **Mohamed Shamsuddin** he has deposed that, in the year 2010 he was working as SDA in Co-operation department, Raichur and on 16.04.2010 as per the instruction of his higher officer he went to Lokayukta Police Station, Raichur and reported before the Police Inspector. He has deposed that PW-2 had also come to the Police Station as another Pancha Witness. He has deposed that PW-1 was also present and he was introduced to them. He has deposed that, the averments made in the complaint

was made to known to himself and PW-2 and PW-1 produced the amount of Rs. 2,000/- and himself and PW-2 noted the denomination and the numbers of those currency notes. He has deposed about the other averments made in the Entrustment Mahazar, the copy of which is at Ex. P-2. He has deposed that, photos were also taken at the time of the Entrustment Mahazar.

18. PW-3 has further deposed that, afterwards they went near Manchalapura Gram Panchayath office and himself and PW-1 went inside the office and the other persons remained outside that office. He has deposed that, the DGO was not in the office and the same was informed to the Police Inspector and afterwards they went near the house of the DGO and himself and PW-1 went to the house of DGO, but the DGO was not in his house and hence, all of them returned back to Lokayukta Police Station, Raichur. He has deposed that, the amount was returned to PW-1 by removing the phenolphthalein powder smeared to the notes and in that connection the mahazar was also drawn and the copy of the same is at Ex. P-3. He has deposed that, at the time of Entrustment Mahazar the conversation recorded in the Micro Cassette Recorder was played and it was transcribed and the copy of the same is at Ex. P-5. In his cross-examination he has deposed that, he himself read the contents of the complaint Ex. P-1 and came to know why the complaint has been filed.

19. PW-4 is Sri. **L.Y. Shirkola** and he has deposed that, from 31.01.2010 to 30.08.2010 he has worked as in charge Police Inspector of Raichur Lokayukta Police Station and at that time he was working as Police Inspector of Koppal Lokayukta Police Station. He has deposed that, on 15.04.2010 PW-1 came to the Police Station and informed that, the Secretary of Manchalapura Gram Panchayath is demanding bribe of Rs. 2,000/- to give the cheque for Rs. 10,000/- towards Indira Avas House sanctioned to him. He has deposed that, to confirm the same he gave a small tape recorder to PW-1 and asked him to meet the Secretary and request for his work and to record the conversation that takes place between PW-1 and the Secretary. He has further deposed that, on 16.04.2010 PW-1 came to the Police Station and told that he has recorded the conversation and also gave the written complaint and the copy of the same is at Ex. P-1. He has deposed that, on the basis of Ex. P-1 he registered that case and sent the FIR to the concerned court and the copy of the FIR is at **Ex.P-7**. He has deposed about securing two Panchas (PW-2 and 3), PW-1 producing the amount of Rs. 2,000/- and about all the averments mentioned in the Entrustment Panchanama., the copy of which is at Ex.P-2 and I feel it is not necessary to repeat the same. In other words PW-4 has deposed about all the proceedings that took place in Lokayukta Police Station mentioned in Ex. P-2. He has further deposed that, he played the tape recorder and the conversation recorded in the same was transcribed and the copy of the transcription is at

Ex. P-5. He has deposed that the conversation was also copied to the C.D. and that C.D. is at **Ex. P-11.** He has deposed that Ex. P-10 is the report given by him dated 31.07.2010 to Additional Director General of Police, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru to initiate departmental enquiry against the DGO for demanding bribe amount from PW-1.

20. PW-4 further deposed that, after the entrustment mahazar himself, his staff, PW-1 to 3 went to Manchalapura Gram Panchayath in the office vehicle and that vehicle was stopped at a distance from the said office and PW-1 and 3 were sent inside that office to meet the DGO and at 2 P.M. they returned back and told him that DGO is not in the office. He has deposed that, as per the request of PW-1 they went near the house of DGO situated in Raichur Town and again PW-1 and 3 were sent inside that house to meet the DGO and they went inside that house and returned back and told that the DGO is also not in his house and hence, they returned back to Lokayukta Police Station, Raichur. He has deposed about, returning back the above said amount to PW-1 after removing the phenolphthalein powder smeared to them. He has deposed that, a mahazar was also drawn in that respect and the copy of the same is at Ex. P-3.

21. PW-4 has further deposed that, on 12.05.2010 PW-1 came to Lokayukta Police Station and gave the written requisition and the copy of the same is at Ex. P-4. PW-4 has also deposed about the,

the contents of Ex. P-4. He has deposed that, PW-1 told him that, the DGO got suspicion against him and hence, he has sent the cheque due to him through one Sri. Zindappa. He has deposed that, along with Ex. P-4 PW-1 gave the copy of the cheque also and it is at **Ex. P-8**. Ex. P-8 is dated 16.04.2010 and it is in favour of PW-1 for Rs. 10,000/- and it is also signed by the DGO as the Secretary of the above said Gram Panchayath. Ex. P-8 clearly shows that, the work of PW-1 was pending with DGO on 15.04.2010. As stated above, in Ex. P-1 it is clearly mentioned that, on 15.04.2010 PW-1 had met the DGO and requested for issue of cheque and the DGO demanded the bribe amount of Rs. 2,000/- to issue the cheque. As stated above, PW-1 has deposed that, on 12.05.2010 he received the cheque through his neighbor Sri. Zindappa. Hence, there every possibility of the DGO putting anti date in the cheque Ex. P-8 as 16.04.2010 to overcome the complaint of PW-1. There is no cross-examination of PW-4 on the side of the DGO. In fact, a date had been given to the DGO for cross-examination of PW-4 but, even then PW-4 has not been cross-examined and his cross-examination has been taken as nil.

22. As stated above, Ex. P-5 is the copy of the transcription of the conversation said to have been recorded in the Micro Cassette Tape Recorder given to PW-1. There is no shara in Ex. P-5 as per section 65 (b) of the Indian Evidence Act. It is not the case of the Disciplinary Authority that, any person who was familiar with the voice of the DGO identified the voice of the DGO in the recorded

conversation stated above. Even otherwise, there is the believable evidence of PW-1 regarding the DGO demanding the bribe of Rs. 2,000/- for issue of cheque of Rs. 10,000/-. There is no ill will of any kind between PW-1 and the DGO and there is no reason to disbelieve the evidence of PW-1 given in his examination-in-chief and also the averments made in his complaint Ex. P-1. As stated above, PW-2 & 3 have also deposed that, they came to know about the averments made in the complaint Ex. P-1 and Ex. P-1 was the complaint lodged by PW-1. As stated above, PW-4 has also deposed that, on 15.04.2010 PW-1 approached him and told him about the DGO demanding the bribe amount of Rs. 2,000/- for issuing the cheque for Rs. 10,000/- due to him and that he gave Micro Cassette Recorder to PW-1 and asked him to meet the DGO again and to record the conversation. He has also deposed about, PW-1 lodging the complaint on 16.04.2010 as per Ex. P-1 which disclose about, DGO demanding for the total bribe amount of Rs. 2,000/- to issue the cheque for Rs. 10,000/- due to PW-1. I have already held that the evidence given by PW-1 in his Cross-examination by the learned counsel for the DGO is not believable. The facts and circumstances of this case stated above, clearly supports the case of the Disciplinary Authority. For all the reasons stated above, I hold that, the Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily proved the charge framed against the DGO and thereby, 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 point

No.1 in **affirmative**. Point No.2 In view of the point No.1 answered in the **affirmative** I proceed to pass the following:-

:: ORDER ::

The Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily **proved** the charge in this case that, DGO/Sri. **Shivaram**, Grama Panchayath Secretary, Manchalapura Grama Panchayath, Raichur taluk & District, has committed mis-conduct as enumerated U/R 3(1)(i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

24. Hence, this report is submitted to Hon'ble Upalokayukta-1 for kind perusal and for further action in the matter.

Dated **16th** day of November, 2019.

- Sd -
(**SOMARAJU**)

Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4,
Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bengaluru.

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

- Pw-1 :- Sri. Suresh S/o Sanjeevappa, Resident of Hospete, Raichur taluk and District (Complainant).
- PW-2 :- Sri. Nagaraja Gowda, Junior Engineer, Tungabadra Sub-Division, Bellary (Panch Witness).
- PW-3 :- Sri. Mohammed Shamsuddin, First Division Assistant, Co-operation Department, Raichur (Shadow witness).
- PW-4 :- Sri. L.Y. Shirkola, the then Police Inspector, presently Dy. Supdt. Of Police, Alagavadi, Navalgund Taluk (Investigation Officer).

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BHELAF OF THE DEFENCE

Nil

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY

- Ex. P-1 :- Certified copy of the complaint dated 16.04.2010.
- Ex. P-2 :- Certified copy of Entrustment Mahazar dated 16.04.2010.
- Ex. P-3 :- Certified copy of Trap Amount returned back to complainant Panchanama dated 16.04.2010.
- Ex. P-4 :- Certified copy of application for withdrawal of complaint of complainant dated 12.05.2010.
- Ex. P-5 :- Xerox copy of conversation.
- Ex. P-6 :- Xerox copy of photos
- Ex. P-7 :- Certified copy of FIR
- Ex. P-7(a):- Signature
- Ex. P-8 :- Xerox copy of cheque
- Ex. P-9 :- Original Service Particulars of DGO

Ex. P-10 :- Original Enquiry Report of I.O. dated 31.07.2010
Ex. P-11 :- C.D.

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DGO

Nil

LIST OF MATERIAL OBJECT MARKED ON BEHALF OF DGO:

Nil

Dated **16th** day of November, 2019.

- Sd -

(**SOMARAJU**)

Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4,
Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bengaluru.

