



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No. LOK/INQ/66/2010/ARE-4

Multi Storied Building,  
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,  
Bengaluru-560 001,  
Dated 15.12.2018

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Sriyuths:  
(1) K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer; and  
(2) K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer,  
Taluk Panchayath, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar  
District - reg.

Ref:- (1) Government Order No. ಗ್ರಾಅಪ 120 ಎಸೇಬಿ 2010  
dated 19.11.2010.  
(2) Nomination order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/66/2010  
dated 07.12.2010 of Upalokayukta, State of  
Karnataka.  
(3) Inquiry report dated 13.12.2018 of the Additional  
Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bengaluru.

~~~~~

The Government by its order dated 19.11.2010, initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Sriyuths: (1) K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer; and (2) K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayath, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District [hereinafter referred to as Delinquent Government Officials, for short as 'DGOs 1 & 2' respectively] and entrusted the departmental inquiry to this Institution.

2. This Institution by Nomination Order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/66/2010 dated 07.12.2010, nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru, as the Inquiry Officer to frame charges and to conduct departmental inquiry against DGOs 1 & 2 for the alleged charge of misconduct, said to have been committed by them.

3. The DGO1 - Shri K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer; and DGO2 - Shri K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayath, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District were tried for the following charge:-

“That you K.V. Reddappa DGO-1, K.V. Shankarachari DGO-2, while working as Executive Officer and Junior Engineer respectively at Srinivasapura Taluk Panchayath, illegally drawn and misappropriated the Government money without carrying out the work under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-05 and without getting Technical sanction from the competent authority failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty which act is unbecoming of Government servants and thus, you committed misconduct as enumerated under Rule 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 '*satisfactorily proved*' the charge '*in part*' in this case i.e., the DGO1 - Shri K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer; and DGO2 - Shri K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayath, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District, executed the works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-05 without getting the technical sanction from the competent authority and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated under Section 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

The Disciplinary Authority has '*failed to prove*' the remaining charge against DGO Nos. 1 and 2 in this case i.e., the DGO No.1 - Shri K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer; and DGO2 - Shri K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayath, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District, have illegally drawn and misappropriated the Government funds without carrying out the works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-05 and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated under Section 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966."

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 DGOs 1 & 2 furnished by the Inquiry Officer, DGO1 - Shri K.V. Reddappa has retired from service on 31.12.2018; and DGO2 - Shri K.N. Shankarachari is due for retirement on 30.06.2021.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge '*proved*' against DGO No.1 - Shri K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer; and DGO2 - Shri K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayath, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District,

- (i) it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of "withholding 10% of pension payable to the DGO1 - Shri K.V. Reddappa for a period of two years" ; and
- (ii) it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of "reducing the pay in the time scale of pay by two lower stages with cumulative effect on DGO2 - Shri K.N. Shankarachari".

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.

  
(JUSTICE N. ANANDA) 15/12  
Upalokayukta,  
State of Karnataka.



**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No.LOK/INQ/66/2010/ARE-4

M.S. Building  
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Road  
Bangalore-560 001  
Date: 13/12/2018

**:: INQUIRY REPORT ::**

**Sub:** Departmental Inquiry against,

1) Sri K.V. Reddappa  
The then Executive Officer  
Taluk Panchayathi  
Srinivasapura Taluk  
Kolar District

2) Sri K.N. Shankarachari  
The then Junior Engineer  
Taluk Panchayathi  
Srinivasapura Taluk  
Kolar District

**Ref:**

- 1) Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in Compt/Lok/BD/74/2005/ARE-5  
Dated:15/10/2010
- 2) Government Order. No. ಗ್ರಾಅಪ 120  
ಎಸೇಬಿ 2010, ದಿನಾಂಕ: 19/11/2010
- 3) Order No.LOK/INQ/14-A/66/10  
Bangalore dated:07/12/2010  
of the Hon'ble Upalokayukta

\*\*\*

This Departmental Inquiry is directed against 1) Sri K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayathi, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District 2) Sri K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayathi, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District (herein after referred to as the Delinquent

Government Officials in short "DGO No.1 and DGO No.2 or DGOs").

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 Lokayukta, vide order dated: 07/12/2010 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 DGOs. Additional Registrar Enquires-4 prepared Articles of Charge, Statement of Imputations of misconduct, 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 DGOs calling upon them to appear before this Authority and to submit written statement of their defence.

4. The Article of Charges framed by ARE-4 against the DGOs are as below:

***ANNEXURE NO.I***  
***CHARGE***

*That you K.V. Reddappa DGO-1, K.V. Shankarachari DGO-2, while working as Executive Officer and Junior Engineer respectively at Srinivasapura taluk panchayath illegally drawn and misappropriated the Government money without carrying out the work under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-05 and without getting Technical*



sanction from the competent authority failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty which act is unbecoming of Government Servants and thus, you committed misconduct 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**

One Sri K.V. Narayanaswamy s/o Venkatarreddy, Kethaganahally, Srinivasapura Taluk of Kolar District (herein after referred to as the complainant) filed complaint alleging that DGO-1 and 2 and others illegally drawn and misappropriated the Government money without carrying out any work under SGRY 2004-2005 and without getting them approved by competent authority. His complaint was referred to Technical wing of Karnataka Lokayukta for investigation and after investigation it was noticed that DGO-1 and 2 were responsible for the allegations made in the complainant. The main allegations made in the complaint are that without getting the technical sanction from the competent authority, the following works were executed by DGO-1 and 2 for the year 2003-2004

- (a) Improvement of road from Chintamani to Kolar in Chelliganahalli village of Srinivasapura Taluk
- (b) Improvement to feeder channel of Kornahalli village under Somayajanapalli village panchayath

- (c) *Improvement to feeder channel under Hodali grama panchayathi*
- (d) *Improvement to agricultural land of Muniyappa s/o Ramappa at Cheldiganahalli village panchayath*

*Investigation report along with copy of complaint were sent to DGO-1 and 2 calling for their comments, DGO-1 stated that since technical sanction plan was not produced before the Investigating Officer (for short "the I.O."). The I.O. has come to conclusion that the works were completed without getting them approved. However, he has not produced any technical sanction plan, though reasonable opportunities were given. DGO-2 did not submit comments inspite of opportunities given to him. The materials collected during the course of investigation established prima facie case against DGO-1 and DGO-2 to show misconduct committed by them as per Rule 3(i) of conduct rules. After completion of investigation a recommendation was made to competent authority u/sec. 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act 1984 to initiate disciplinary proceedings against DGO-1 and 2. Accordingly, under Government Order No. . ಗ್ರಾಅಪ 120 ಎಸೇಬಿ 2010, dated: 19/11/2010, cited above at reference No.1, the disciplinary proceedings was initiated. Hence, this proceedings.*

5. DGOs appeared before this Inquiry Authority on 11/04/2011, 03/06/2011 and on the same day their First Oral statement was recorded U/R 11(9) of KCS (CC & A) Rules 1957. The DGOs pleaded not guilty and claims to hold an inquiry.

6. DGO No.1 has filed his written statement as follows:-

The allegations made against the DGO No.1 are all false, frivolous and not admitted as true and correct. The allegation that the DGO No.1 illegally drawn and misappropriated the Government money without carrying out the work under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-05 is false and without any basis. The works were carried out in accordance with the scheme and rules prevailing at that time. DGO No.1 has not misappropriated any money. The allegation that without getting technical sanction from the competent authority the amount is drawn is also not correct. The DGO has not committed any misconduct as alleged. The road improvement work from Chintamani to Kolar was executed after getting technical sanction from the competent authority. Likewise the improvement work to feeder channel of Koranahalli village, improvement work to Feeder channel under Hodali grama panchayath and improvement of agricultural land of Muniyappa s/o Ramappa were executed after getting the technical sanction from the competent authority in accordance with law. The said works were carried out by DGO No.1 when he was the Executive Officer of Srinivasapura taluk panchayath. Hence, he has prayed to exonerate him from the charges leveled against him in this case.

7. DGO No.2 has not filed any written statement or defence statement.

8. In order to substantiate the charge leveled against the DGOs, the Disciplinary Authority examined in all two witnesses as PW1 and PW2 and got marked documents at Ex.P1 to P10. After closing the evidence of the Disciplinary

Authority, the DGO Nos.1 and 2 have been examined as DW1 and DW2 and closed their evidence. Hence, recording the answers of DGO to questionnaire u/Rule 11(18) of KCS (CC&A) Rules was dispensed with.

9. The Disciplinary Authority has not filed the written brief, but on the side of the DGOs written brief has been filed. Oral arguments of the Presenting Officer and the learned counsel for the DGOs was heard.

10. The points, that arise for the consideration of this inquiry authority are:-

Point NO.1:- Whether the Disciplinary Authority satisfactorily proved the charge framed against DGOs?

Point NO.2:- What order?

11. My finding on the above points are as follows:-

Point No.1: In the “**AFFIRMATIVE**” in respect of execution of works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005 without getting the technical sanction from the competent authority and in the “**NEGATIVE**” in respect of the remaining charge. **(PARTLY IN THE AFFIRMATIVE)**

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

**:: REASONS ::**

**12. Point No.1:** The charge framed against the DGO Nos.1 and 2 is to the effect that DGO No.1-Sri K.V. Reddappa, DGO No.2-Sri K.V. Shankarachari, while working as Executive Officer and Junior Engineer respectively in Srinivasapura

taluk panchayath illegally drawn and misappropriated the Government money without carrying out the works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005 and without getting the technical sanction from the competent authority the works were executed and thereby they have committed misconduct.

13. By going through the oral and documentary evidence adduced by the parties some facts are not in dispute and they are as follows:

14. At the relevant point of time the DGO No.1 was working as Executive Officer and DGO No.2 was working as Junior Engineer in Srinivasapura taluk panchayath. DGO Nos.1 and 2 executed the following works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005:

- 1) Improvements to road from Chintamani road to Kolar road in Cheldigenahally village of Cheldigenahalli grama panchayath, Srinivasapura taluk...estimated cost of Rs. 1,50,000/-
- 2) Improvements to feederchannel of Kornohally village under Somevovale Palli Grama Panchayath...estimated cost of Rs. 1,00,000/-
- 3) Improvements to feeder channel of Veerathimmanahally tank under Hodali grama Panchayath...estimated cost of Rs. 40,000/-
- 4) Improvements to agricultural land of Muniyappa s/o Ramappa at Meesangenahalli village under Chiddigenhalli grama panchayath...estimated cost of Rs. 95,000/-

15. The complainant has been examined as PW1. The complaint lodged by him is at Ex.P1. Ex.P2 is the Form No.1 and Ex.P3 is the Form No.2. The gist of Ex.P1 is to the effect

that the payment for the 7 works mentioned in Ex.P1 has been made for the year 2003-2004 and for the same works for the year 2004-2005 under SGRY action plan the amount has been paid and thereby there is misappropriation of Government funds for which the DGO Nos.1 and 2 are responsible. It is further stated in the complaint that the works mentioned in Ex.P1 have also not been carried out but the amount has been spent.

16. PW1 in his evidence has deposed that he has not filed any complaint against the DGO Nos.1 and 2 as per Ex.P1 to P3. He has deposed that the signatures found in Ex.P1 to P3 are similar to his signature. But he do not remember when he signed them. He has deposed that in Srinivasapura taluk there was a politician by name Sri Govindappa and he obtained his signature and he do not know the contents of Ex.P1 to P3. He has deposed that he has not lodged any complaint to the effect that the DGOs have misappropriated the amount under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005. He has been treated as hostile witness by the presenting officer and cross-examined and in his cross-examination he has deposed that he has not at all lodged the complaint in respect of the seven works mentioned in Ex.P1 against DGO Nos.1 and 2. He has deposed that in respect of the works mentioned in Ex.P1 the DGO Nos.1 and 2 have not misappropriated any amount as mentioned in Ex.P1 to P3. Thus PW1 has not at all given his evidence in accordance with Ex.P1 to P3. In his cross-examination he has deposed that the above said Sri Govindappa took his signature stating that the house will be sanctioned to him.

17. The records disclose that the complaint was referred to the Technical Audit Cell, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bangalore and Sri M.L. Ramesh, A.E.E.-I, Technical Wing has visited the spot, conducted the investigation and given his report and his report is at Ex.P10. The above said Sri M,L. Ramesh has been examined as PW2 and he has deposed that on 07/10/2005 he has inspected the works and prior to that he had given notice of inspection to the complainant and also to DGO Nos. 1 and 2. He has deposed that on that day from 11 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. he inspected the works and the mahazar drawn in that respect is at Ex.P4 and his signature is at Ex.P4(a). He has deposed that he inspected the four works mentioned in Ex.P10. He has deposed that all the four works have been executed properly and there is no misappropriation of the Government money. He has deposed as follows in his cross-examination.

“ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿದ್ದವು. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವರದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.  
ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ  
ಎಂದರೆ ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆ, ನಿಯಮ ಪಾಲನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲೋಪ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ.”

18. Even in Ex.P10 last paragraph it is mentioned as follows:-

“From the facts discussed as above it is found  
that the bills have been claimed after carrying out  
the works”.

19. Thus according to Ex.P10 and also according to the evidence of PW2 there is no misappropriation of the Government funds in carrying out the works mentioned in Ex.P10.

20. PW2 has deposed that Ex.P5 is the M.B. book. He has deposed that pre-measurement of sand (heap) should have been mentioned in the M.B. book in respect of the road work from Chintamani to Kolar road in Cheldigonahalli village and the same is not mentioned. He has deposed that the above said work is for Rs. 1,50,000/- and the technical sanction of the Executive Engineer of the Zilla Panchayath was necessary and there is no record to show that the technical sanction was obtained from the Executive Engineer, Zilla Panchayath. He has deposed that Ex.P6 is the estimate copy in respect of the above said work and Ex.P6(a) shows that it is the copy of the letter of DGO Nos.1 and 2 for technical approval of the estimate. There is no document to show that the technical approval has been given.

21. PW2 has deposed that Ex.P7 is the estimate regarding Improvement to Feeder Channel of Koranahalli village under Somevovale palli grama panchayath and Ex.P7(a) is the copy of the report signed by DGO Nos.1 and 2 for approval of the estimate. He has deposed that in respect of Ex.P7(a) the technical sanction has not been obtained. PW2 has also deposed that Ex.P8 is the estimate regarding Improvement to Feeder Channel of Veerathimmanahalli tank under Hodali Grama Panchayath and Ex.P8(a) is the copy of the report for approval of the estimate. He has deposed that even for the above said estimate (Ex.P8) technical sanction has not been obtained.

22. PW2 has deposed that Ex.P9 is the copy of the estimate in respect of the improvements to agricultural land of Sri



Muniyappa s/o Ramappa at Meesangenahalli village under Chiddigenahalli grama panchayath and the technical sanction has not been obtained for the above said work also.

23. PW2 has deposed that in respect of all the above said four works only technical sanction has not been obtained from the Zilla Panchayath Executive Engineer and hence there is misconduct by the DGO Nos.1 and 2 in executing the above said works without obtaining the technical sanction from the Executive Engineer, Zilla Panchayath.

24. DW1 is the DGO No.1 and DW2 is the DGO No.2 both of them have deposed that they have executed the works and there is no misappropriation of any amount. As stated above, Ex.P10 discloses that the works have been executed properly and there is no misappropriation of any Government amount. DW1 and DW2 have further deposed that there is no truth in the allegation of the I.O. (PW2) to the effect that there is no technical sanction for the above said works. But the DGO No.1 and DGO No.2 have not produced any documents to show that they had obtained the technical sanction for the above works for executing them. In fact DW1 and DW2 admits that in their cross-examination as follows:-

“ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮುನ್ನ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಅನುಮೋದನೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನಿಜ.”

25. DGO Nos.1 and 2 have not at all produced any documents to show that the technical sanction had been obtained from the competent authority for the works mentioned in Ex.P10. When the DGO Nos.1 and 2 have not produced any documents to prove that they had obtained

technical sanction for the works mentioned in Ex.P10 it has to be said that DGO Nos.1 and 2 have executed the works mentioned in Ex.P10 and made the payment also without obtaining the technical sanction from the competent authority namely Executive Engineer, Zilla Panchayath.

26. As stated above Ex.P6(a), P7(a), P8(a) are only the copies of the reports signed by DGO Nos.1 and 2 for technical approval of the estimates and the above said documents does not show to whom the above said reports have been addressed. As stated above, there is no documents to show the technical approval of the works stated above by the competent authority. Hence, it has to be said that the DGOs have committed the misconduct while executing the works mentioned in Ex.P10 without obtaining the technical sanction. In the written brief the DGO No.2 has contended that the DGO No.1 is the authority to give the technical sanction and DGO No.1 has given the technical sanction for the works. It is pertinent to note that it is not at all the case of DGO Nos.1 and 2 in their written statement or evidence that DGO No.1 is the competent authority to give the technical sanction. On the other hand Ex.P6(a) discloses that DGO No.1 had sought for technical sanction in respect of the road work.

27. The disciplinary authority has failed to prove that the DGO Nos.1 and 2 have misappropriated the amount in respect of the works mentioned in Ex.P10. As stated above even the investigation report is negative in respect of the misappropriation allegations made in the complaint. For all the reasons stated above, it has to be said that the disciplinary

authority has proved the charge against the DGO Nos.1 and 2 only to the effect that they have carried out the works mentioned in Ex.P10 under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005 without getting the technical sanction from the competent authority. But the disciplinary authority has failed to prove that the DGO Nos.1 and 2 have illegally drawn and misappropriated the government funds without carrying out the works mentioned in Ex.P10 under SGRY action plan. Even the report Ex.P10 shows that there is no payment for the works mentioned in Ex.P10 for the year 2003-2004 and the works mentioned in Ex.P10 have been carried out only for the year 2004-2005.

28. Thus the DGOs have failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and acted in a manner of unbecoming of Government Servants, in respect of execution of works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005 without getting the technical sanction from the competent authority and the Disciplinary Authority has failed to prove the remaining charge against DGO Nos.1 and 2. Hence, I answer this point **PARLY IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.**

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

**:: ORDER ::**

*The Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily proved the charge in part in this case that is the DGO No.1-Sri K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer, and DGO-2-Sri K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayathi, Srinivasapura*

*Taluk, Kolar District, executed the works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005 without getting the technical sanction from the competent authority and thereby committed mis-conduct as enumerated U/R 3(1) (i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

*The Disciplinary Authority has failed to prove the remaining charge against DGO Nos.1 and 2 in this case that is the DGO No.1-Sri K.V. Reddappa, the then Executive Officer, and DGO-2-Sri K.N. Shankarachari, the then Junior Engineer, Taluk Panchayathi, Srinivasapura Taluk, Kolar District have illegally drawn and misappropriated the government funds without carrying out the works under SGRY action plan for the year 2004-2005 and thereby committed mis-conduct as enumerated U/R 3(1) (i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

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

Dated this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2018

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

**:: ANNEXURE ::**

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

PW-1 : Sri Narayanaswamy (complainant)  
PW-2 : Sri M.L. Ramesh (I.O.)

**LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENCE:**

DW-1:Sri K.V. Reddappa (DGO-1)

DW-2:Sri K.N. Shankarachari (DGO-2)

**LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY**

Ex.P-1:Original complaint

Ex.P-2:Original Form No.1

Ex.P-3:Original Form No.2

Ex.P-4:Original Spot Mahazar

Ex.P-4(a to c): Relevant entry in Ex.P4

Ex.P-5:Original measurement book No. 640 containing page No.1 to 114

Ex.P-6:Certified copy of the estimate to the tune of Rs. 15,000/--(improvements to feeder channel under Somevovalle palli grama panchayath) including wrapper sheet

Ex.P-6(a): Certified copy of the sanctioned letter to the tune of Rs. 1,50,000/- with certified copy of the enclosure

Ex.P-7:Certified copy of the estimate to the tune of Rs. 1,00,000/--(improvements to feeder channel of Kornohalli village under Somevovallepalli grama panchayath)

Ex.P-7(a): Certified copy of the sanctioned letter to the tune of Rs. 1,00,000/-

Ex.P-8: Certified copy of the estimate to the tune of Rs. 40,000/--(improvements to feeder channel of Veerathimmanahalli tank under Hodali Grama Panchayath)

Ex.P-8(a): Certified copy of the sanctioned letter to the tune of Rs. 40,000/-

Ex.P-9: Certified copy of the estimate to the tune of Rs. 95,000/- (improvements to agricultural land of Sri Muniyappa s/o Ramappa at Meesangenahalli village under Chiddigenahalli grama panchayath)

Ex.P-10:Original Investigation report dated: 25/08/2006 including wrapper sheet

Ex.P-10(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P10

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

NIL

Dated this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2018

-Sd/-

(Somaraju)

Additional Registrar Enquiries-4,  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bangalore.

