



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No.LOK/INQ/14-A/46/2009-10/ ARE-4 Multi Storied Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru-560 001.
Dated 30.03.2019

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Shri G.K. Rajanna, the then Deputy Director, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysuru - reg.

- Ref:- 1) Government Order No. ಅನಾಸ 139 ಅಇಸೇ 2006 dated 08.05.2009 and 27.07.2009.
2) Nomination order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/46/2009-10 dated 29.08.2009 of Hon'ble Upalokayukta, State of Karnataka.
3) Inquiry report dated 28.03.2019 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.

~~~~~

The Government by its orders dated 08.05.2009 and 27.07.2009 initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Shri G.K. Rajanna, the then Deputy Director, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysuru [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/46/2009-10 dated 29.08.2009 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 G.K. Rajanna, the then Deputy Director, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysuru was tried for the following charge:-

“That, you DGO while working as Deputy Director, Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysore has demanded and accepted Rs. 10,000/- on 24.08.2006, from the complainant Shri K.S. Raghotham s/o Sarvotham, House No.97/3, Kalidasa Road, Jayalaxmipuram, Mysore, for showing an official favour of giving permission for retrofitting. Thereby, you DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and this act on the part of you DGO is unbecoming a Government Servant and thereby, you-DGO committed misconduct under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) r/w Rule 16(iv) of the KCS (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 G.K. Rajanna, the then Deputy

Director, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs  
Department, Mysuru.


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, the DGO - Shri G.K. Rajanna has retired from Government service on 31.08.2018 (during the pendency of inquiry).

7. Having regard to the nature of charge (demand and acceptance of bribe) '*proved*' against the DGO - Shri G.K. Rajanna, the then Deputy Director, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysuru, it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of 'permanently withholding 50% of the pension payable to DGO - Shri G.K. Rajanna.'

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.

  
(JUSTICE N. ANANDA)  
Upalokayukta,  
State of Karnataka.

30/3



**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No.LOK/INQ/14-A/36/09-10/ARE-4  
Old No.LOK/INQ/14-A/46/09-10

M.S. Building  
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Road  
Bengaluru-560 001  
Date: 28/03/2019

**:: INQUIRY REPORT ::**

**Sub:** Departmental Inquiry against,

- 1) Sri G.K. Rajanna  
Deputy Director  
Food Civil Supplies  
and Consumer Affairs  
Department, **Mysore**  
**(Now retired )**

**Ref:**

- 1) Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L  
Act, 1984 in Compt/Uplok/  
MYS/712/2008/DRE-4  
Dated:25/02/2009
- 2) Government Order. No. ಅನಾಸ 139 ಅಇಸೇ  
2006, Bengaluru dated: 08/05/2009  
and 27/07/2009
- 2) Order No.LOK/INQ/14-  
A/46/2009-10, Bengaluru  
dated:29/08/2009  
of the Hon'ble Upalokayukta

\*\*\*

This Departmental Inquiry is directed against Sri G.K. Rajanna, Deputy Director Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, **Mysore, (Now retired )** (herein after referred to as the Delinquent Government Officials 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: 29/08/2009 cited above at reference-3, nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4 of the office of the Karnataka Lokayukta as the Inquiry 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.I**  
**CHARGE**

*That, you DGO while working as Deputy Director, Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysore has demanded and accepted Rs. 10,000/- on 24/08/2006, from the complainant Sri K.S. Raghotham bin Sarvotham, House No.97/3, Kalidasa Road, Jayalaxmipuram, Mysore, for showing an official favour of giving permission for retrofitting. Thereby, you DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and this act on the part of you DGO is unbecoming a Government Servant and thereby, you-DGO committed misconduct under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) r/w Rule 16(iv) of the KCS (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

**ANNEXURE-II**  
**STATEMENT OF IMPUTATION OF MISCONDUCT**

*This is a Suo-moto investigation under Sec. 7(2) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984 on the basis of the material placed by the Police Inspector, Karnataka Lokayukta, Mysore, in the matter alleged demand and acceptance of bribe by Sri G.K. Rajanna, Deputy Director, Food and Civil Supplies Department, Mysore (hereinafter referred to as DGO) from Sri K.S. Raghotham bin Sarvotham, House No.97/3, Kalidasa Road, Jayalaxmipuram, Mysore (hereinafter referred to as complainant).*

*It was alleged that, you DGO had conducted raid on the shop named Laxmi Auto Gas Fits, of the complainant and a case was booked against the complainant and the same is pending in the court. The complainant filed an application on 09/08/2006 seeking information as to from which authority he has to obtain licence for Retrofitting. On 23/08/2006, you DGO demanded a bribe of Rs. 10,000/- from the complainant and instructed the complainant to meet him on 24/08/2006 at Ramya hotel at 5 p.m. As the complainant was not willing to pay any bribe to you DGO, he filed a complaint before Lokayukta Police, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bangalore City on 24/08/2006 and accordingly, case was registered in Crime No. 12/2006, against you DGO u/sec. 7, 13(1)(d) r/w 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988 and submitted FIR to the concerned court.*

*Thereafter, the Investigating Officer secured two pancha witnesses by name 1) Sri N. Guruprasad, bin late K. Narasimharaju, Junior Engineer o/o Assistant Executive Engineer, Quality Control Sub-division, PWD (South) Mysore,*

(2) Sri C. Devegwoda, Lecturer, Government Maharani College, Narayana Shastri Road, Mysore and after following pre-trap formalities, prepared the entrustment mahazar on 24/08/2006, trap was laid against you the DGO. On 24/08/2006, you DGO were caught red handed while accepting bribe of Rs. 10,000/- from the complainant. Thereafter, the required post-trap formalities were conducted by the I.O. and the bribe money was also recovered from you DGO. During investigation the Investigating Officer has recorded the statement of the witnesses and sent the seized articles to the chemical examiner and obtained his report, which support the case against you the DGO.

Thereafter, DGO was called upon to furnish his comments in this regard. The DGO has submitted his explanation denying the allegations and pleading ignorance.

The explanation offered by the DGO is not convincing and acceptable. On examination of the materials placed on record coupled with the unsatisfactory explanation offered by the DGO, it appears that there are materials to proceed with disciplinary proceedings against you-DGO for the misconduct committed by you.

Thus, you-DGO have failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and this act on the part of you-DGO is unbecoming of a Government Servant. Thereby, you DGO is committed misconduct u/r 3(1)(i) to (iii) r/w Rule 16(iv) of the KCs (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

5. DGO appeared before this Inquiry Authority on 02/03/2010 and on the same day 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 inquiry.

6. This inquiry has a long history being the inquiry of the year 2009. The order sheet discloses that, the DGO has appeared on 02/03/2010 and his First Oral Statement was recorded and he pleaded not guilty and he has not filed his written statement and the inquiry was posted for evidence. DGO on 30/01/2012 filed an application to drop this inquiry proceedings on the ground that he has been acquitted in the criminal case before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in Criminal Appeal No. 1227/2010. After hearing both the sides that application was rejected on 25/08/2012. Against the above said order the DGO approached the Hon'ble KAT and obtained the stay order. The Hon'ble KAT dismissed the application of DGO (Application No.4862/2013) on 06/12/2013. There after PW1 and PW2 have been examined and the DGO has not cross-examined them. Afterwards the DGO on 12/09/2014 appeared for the inquiry and submitted that he has obtained the stay order in W.P.No. 17668/2014. The records disclose that against the order of the Hon'ble KAT, the DGO preferred W.P.No. 17668/2014 before the Hon'ble High Court and that Writ Petition was dismissed on 07/07/2017 after hearing both sides. The DGO did not appear for this inquiry even after the dismissal of the Writ Petition stated above and hence notice was issued to him to appear for further proceedings of this inquiry . The DGO finally appeared on 07/09/2018 and filed an application under Rule 214 (2)(b) (II) r/w Rule 214 (6) of KCSR 1957 to drop this inquiry. After hearing both the sides on 15/10/2018 the said application was rejected. On 29/11/2018 the DGO appeared and filed an application u/Rule 19(4) of KAT Act to the effect that he has filed application No. 8044/2018 before Hon'ble KAT against the order dated: 15/10/2018 and to stop further proceedings of

this inquiry. As there was no stay of the further proceedings of this inquiry by the Hon'ble KAT and this inquiry being a very old one of the year 2009 the above said application was rejected on 29/11/2018 itself and the inquiry was proceeded and in view of the death of CW4 one Sri S.Krishnamurthy, CPC has been examined on the side of the disciplinary authority and the side of the disciplinary authority was closed.

7. The date was given for Second Oral Statement of the DGO and for defence evidence if any. On that day i.e., on 06/03/2019 the DGO remained absent and in view of inquiry being a very old one of the year 2009, the DGO was placed exparte. Subsequently also the DGO did not appear and the oral arguments of the learned Presenting Officer was heard and the inquiry has been posted for report.

8. 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 P12.

9. The Disciplinary Authority as well as the DGO have not filed written brief. Oral arguments of the Presenting Officer was heard. The points, that arise for the consideration of this inquiry authority are:-

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

10. 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 ::**

**11. Point No.1:** It is the case of the Disciplinary Authority that, the DGO while working as Deputy Director, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysore, demanded and accepted Rs. 10,000/- on 24/08/2006 from the complainant for showing an official favour (giving permission for retrofitting) and thereby he has committed the misconduct.

12. The complainant has been examined as PW1 and the copy of the complaint lodged by him is at Ex.P1. The gist of Ex.P1 is to the effect that the complainant is running Lakshmi Auto Gas Fits, in his house and gas kit being fitted to the vehicles. In February 2005, the then Assistant Director of Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysore, came to his shop and seized articles and registered the case against him and that case is pending before the Fast-track Court in Mysore. On 08/08/2005, the DGO who is working as Deputy Director, Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysore, came to his shop along with his staff and verified his shop and asked him to come to his office and to meet him. When PW1 met the DGO in his office, the DGO asked him to come on 23/08/2006 in the evening to Ramya hotel and demanded Rs. 10,000/- otherwise another case will be filed against him. The DGO also asked the complainant to contact him over phone on 24/08/2006 in the evening and to pay the amount in the place told by the DGO. The complaint is lodged on 24/08/2006 at 5 p.m.

13. PW1 has reiterated all the averments made in his complaint in his deposition. He has deposed that on 08/08/2006 (wrongly

mentioned as 08/08/2005 in Ex.P1). The DGO inspected his shop and even though no illegal activities was going on the DGO directed him to meet him in his office and on 09/08/2006 he met the DGO and DGO told that he is keeping empty tanks and enquired about the same. He has deposed that on 23/08/2006 the DGO demanded the bribe amount of Rs.10,000/- and that the same has to be paid on 24/08/2006 between 5 to 6 p.m. in Ramya hotel situated in Mysore and hence he lodged the complaint immediately.

14. PW1 has further deposed that the I.O. secured two panchas and he produced the amount of Rs. 10,000/-, 20 notes of the denomination of Rs. 500/- and the numbers of those notes were noted and phenolphthalein powder was smeared to the notes and those notes were given to the pancha witness Sri Guruprasad and he kept those notes in his shirt pocket and afterwards the hands of Sri Guruprasad were washed in the sodium carbonate solution and that solution turned to pink colour. He has deposed about instructions that were given by the I.O., to himself and to the shadow witness mentioned in the entrustment mahazar, the copy of which is at Ex.P2.

15. PW1 has further deposed that afterwards they went to Ramya hotel and at 6 p.m. himself and the shadow witness Sri Devegowda, went inside the hotel and the DGO was standing near the door of the hotel and after seeing him the DGO took him towards the toilet and asked him whether he has brought the amount, for which he told that he has brought the amount and gave the tainted currency notes and the DGO received the same with his right hand and kept the same in his right side hip pocket, afterwards he gave the pre-arranged signal and immediately the

I.O. and others came to that place and he showed the DGO and told that he has demanded and accepted the amount from him. He has deposed that the hands of the DGO were washed separately in the sodium carbonate solution and the solution used for washing the right hand turned to red colour and there was no change in the colour of the solution regarding the left hand wash. He has deposed that the tainted currency notes were in the right side hip pocket of the DGO and the same was seized. He has deposed that inside portion of the right side hip pocket of the DGO when washed in the solution, that solution also turned to pink colour. He has deposed that the DGO gave his explanation and the copy of the same is at Ex.P3 and the contents of Ex.P3 are all false. He has further deposed that Ex.P4 is the copy of the Trap Mahazar. He has deposed that Ex.P5 is the mahazar of the place of incident. Ex.P6 are the documents seized. There is no cross-examination of PW1 as the DGO remained absent.

16. PW2 is the shadow witness by name Sri Devegowda C. and he has deposed that in the year 2006 he was working in Maharani College, Mysore, and on 24/08/2006 he had been to Lokayukta police station, Mysore. He has deposed that one Sri Guruprasad, had also come to the station on the same day as another pancha witness. He has deposed that the complainant was introduced to them and he came to know about the contents of the complaint also. He has further deposed that PW1 produced the amount of Rs. 10,000/- and he has deposed about all other averments mentioned in the entrustment mahazar, the copy of which is at Ex.P2 and I feel it is not necessary to reproduce the same.

17. PW2 has further deposed that afterwards they went to the Ramya hotel and PW1 and himself were sent inside that hotel and

the remaining persons stayed outside that hotel. He has deposed that the DGO was standing near the main door of the hotel and PW1 wished him and the DGO took PW1 towards the toilet and he followed them. He has deposed that, DGO asked PW1 whether he has brought the amount for which the DGO removed the tainted currency notes and gave the same to the DGO and the DGO received the same and kept it in his pant hip pocket. He has deposed that afterwards PW1 gave the pre-arranged signal and immediately the Lokayukta Police Inspector, his staff and another pancha witness Sri Guruprasad came inside that hotel and PW1 showed the DGO and told that he has received the amount. He has deposed that the Lokayukta police introduced himself to the DGO and also informed about the case registered against him and took him in the jeep to the Lokayukta police station and sodium carbonate solution was prepared and the hands of the DGO were washed separately and the solution in respect of right hand wash turned to pink colour and there was no change in the colour in respect of the left hand wash. He has deposed that the DGO himself produced the tainted currency notes from his pant hip pocket and those notes tallied with the notes mentioned in the entrustment mahazar. He has deposed that even the pant wash (inside portion of the hip pocket) was positive. He has deposed that the DGO gave his explanation in writing and the copy of the same is at Ex.P3 and the contents of Ex.P3 are false. He has deposed that on the next day Ex.P5 mahazar was drawn in the place of the incident. As stated above, the copy of the trap mahazar is at Ex.P4 and in the same it is mentioned that in view of the place of incident being the hotel (public place) and crowded the further trap proceedings were conducted in the Lokayukta Police station. There is no cross-examination of PW2 also as the

DGO remained absent. He has further deposed that the documents pertaining to the complainant seized from the office of the DGO by writing the mahazar and the copy of the same is at Ex.P7. Ex.P6 are the copies of the documents seized. One of the document of the Ex.P6 is the letter given by the DGO to the Assistant Director to the effect that he is doing gas fitting to the vehicles and is paying the taxes and DGO has told that retrofitting is an offence and that permission has to be obtained for the same and to inform him from which department the permission has to be taken. In the same it is stated that PW1 has obtained the permission from the municipal corporation, from the Directorate of Karnataka Industrial District Industries Centre, and other departments mentioned in the same.

18. CW-4 is the I.O. and in view of his death PW3, police constable by name Sri Krishnamurthy, has been examined (copy of the death certificate of CW4 has been produced). PW3 has deposed that from 2003 to 2010 he was worked as CPC in Mysore Lokayukta police station and he has worked under CW4 Sri B. Swamy for two years and he can identify his hand writing and his signature. He has deposed that on 24/08/2006 PW1 gave the complaint as per Ex.P1. He has deposed about CW4 conducting the entrustment mahazar, the copy of which is at Ex.P2. In fact he has deposed about the contents of the complaint and also regarding the contents of the entrustment mahazar.

19. PW3 has further deposed that after the entrustment mahazar they left Lokayukta police station and went to Ramy hotel and the vehicle was stopped outside the hostel and PW1 and PW2 were sent inside that hotel by reminding them of the instructions already given to them at the time of Ex.P2. He has

further deposed that himself and others were waiting for the signal of PW1 and they were also able to see PW1 approaching the DGO and talking with him and both of them going towards the toilet side. He has deposed that afterwards PW1 gave the pre-arranged signal and immediately CW4, himself and other staff and another pancha witness went near the lavatory of the above said hotel and PW1 showed the DGO and told that he has demanded and received the amount. He has deposed that CW4 introduced himself to the DGO and told him about the case registered against him and enquired the name and address of the DGO. He has deposed that in view of that place being a public place and crowded place, the DGO was taken to the Lokayukta police station and his hands were washed. He has deposed that the DGO produced the tainted currency notes from his hip pocket. He has deposed that even the pant wash of the DGO was positive. He has deposed that Ex.P3 is the copy of the explanation given by the DGO and PW1 and PW2 denied the contents of the same. He has deposed that the service particulars of the DGO was obtained and the copy of the same is at Ex.P10. He has deposed that the copies of the photographs taken at the time of Ex.P2 and P4 are at Ex.P5. He has deposed that on the next day namely on 25/08/2006 they had been to the Ramya hotel along with the complainant and pancha witnesses and mahazar was drawn. (spot mahazar) and the copy of the same is at Ex.P5. He has deposed that the certified copies of the documents pertaining to the complainant were seized by writing the mahazar and the copy of the same is at Ex.P7. He has deposed that Ex.P6 are the copies of the documents seized. He has deposed that the seized articles were sent to the FSL and the FSL report copy is at Ex.P11. He has deposed that Ex.P12 is the copy of the sketch drawn by PWD



Engineer. Thus PW3 has given his evidence as one of the person who was present at the time of the entrustment mahazar and also at the time of the spot mahazar and even present at the time of the other mahazars Ex.P5 and P7. All the above said mahazars discloses that the PW3 has typed them and in the above said documents PW3 has identified the signature of CW4. There is no cross-examination of PW3 and the DGO remained absent.

20. PW3 has deposed that in the criminal case the DGO was convicted (S.C. No.47/2007). The records discloses that the DGO has produced the certified copy of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court Karnataka in CrL.A. No. 1227/2010 dated: 05/01/2012 and the same discloses that the DGO was convicted by the Prl. District and Session Judge, Mysore in Special Case No. 47/2007 and the DGO preferred the criminal Appeal No. 1227/2010 against the same and that appeal has been allowed and the DGO has been acquitted by giving him the benefit of doubt. Only because the DGO has been acquitted in the criminal appeal it cannot be held that, the disciplinary authority has not proved its case in this departmental inquiry. It is well established principle of law that, in the criminal case the prosecution has to prove its case beyond all reasonable doubt. Where as in the departmental inquiry the evidence has to be scrutinised on the basis of the preponderance of probabilities. In the decision reported in 1997(2) SCC 699 in case of Depot Manager, APSRTC V/S Mohammed Yosuf Miya and others, (2005)7 SCC 764 between Ajit Kumar Nag v/s General manager (P) Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Haldia and others and recent decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in (2012)13 Supreme Court Cases 142 in a case of Avinash Sadashiv Bhosale (dead) V/S Union of

India and others made out very clear that, the purpose of departmental inquiry and the prosecution are too different and distinct aspect though the two proceedings relates to the same set of facts. The nature of evidence in criminal case is entirely different from the departmental proceedings and in a criminal case the prosecution is required to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt on the touch-stone of human conduct and where as the evidence required in a departmental inquiry is not regulated by the Evidence Act. Therefore, misconduct of the DGO required to be taken into consideration on the basis of preponderance of probabilities and merely the DGO has been acquitted in the criminal case by the judgment in Crl.A.No. 1227/2010 on the file of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, by itself is not sufficient to overlook the evidence placed on record by the Disciplinary Authority.

21. As stated above, there is <sup>the</sup> unchallenged evidence of PW1 to PW3, in support of the case of the Disciplinary Authority and there are no reasons to discard the evidence of PW1 to PW3. The evidence of PW1 to PW3 and the documents marked on the side of the disciplinary authority probalbises the case of the disciplinary authority. There no evidence on the side of the DGO to prove his explanation given in Ex.P3. As stated above PW1 and PW2 have clearly deposed that the explanation given by DGO as per Ex.P3 is false.

22. Thus the DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and acted in a manner of unbecoming of Government Servant. Hence, I answer the above point No.1 in the **AFFIRMATIVE.**

**23. Point No.2:-** For the reasons discussed above, I proceed to pass the following:-

**:: ORDER ::**

*The Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily proved the charge against the DGO-Sri G.K.Rajanna, Deputy Director Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Mysore, (Now retired).*

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

Dated this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2019

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

**:: ANNEXURE ::**

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

PW-1:Sri K.S. Raghotham (complainant)  
PW-2: Sri Devegowda C. (shadow pancha witness)  
PW-3:Sri Krishna murthy (witness)

**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,b): Relevant entries in Ex.P2  
Ex.P-3: Certified copy of the explanation of DGO  
Ex.P-3(a,b): Relevant entry in Ex.P3  
Ex.P-4: Certified copy of the Amanath Mahazar dated; 24/08/2006  
Ex.P-4(a,b,c): Relevant entries in Ex.P4  
Ex.P-5: Certified copy of the spot mahazar dated; 25/08/2006  
Ex.P-5(a,b): Relevant entries in Ex.P5  
Ex.P-6: Certified copy of the file of the complainant  
Ex.P-6(a,b): Relevant entries in Ex.P6  
Ex.P-7: Certified copy of the mahazar dated: 25/08/2006  
Ex.P-7(a,b): Relevant entries in Ex.P7  
Ex.P-8: Certified copy of the FIR  
Ex.P-8(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P8  
Ex.P-9: Certified copy of the notes number and denomination  
Ex.P-9(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P9  
Ex.P-10: Certified copy of the service particulars  
Ex.P-10(a,b): Relevant entries in Ex.P10  
Ex.P-11: Certified copy of the chemical examination report with certified  
Copy of the xerox photos affixed on the white sheet  
Ex.P-11(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P11  
Ex.P-12: Certified copy of the sketch  
Ex.P-12(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P12

**LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DGO:**

NIL

Dated this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2019

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