

**GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA**



**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No.UPLOK-1/DE/129/2015/ARE-8

Multi Storied Buildings,  
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Veedhi,  
Bengaluru-560 001,  
Date: **27/11/2020**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against;

- 1) Sri H. Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru.
- 2) Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru - Reg.

- Ref:-1) Government Order No.ನಅಇ 14 ಎಂಎನ್ಯು 2015 Bengaluru dated 06/03/2015.
- 2) Nomination order No.UPLOK-1/DE/129/2015 Bengaluru dated 12/03/2015 of Upalokayukta-1, State of Karnataka, Bengaluru.
  - 3) Inquiry Report dated 26/11/2020 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-8, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru

The Government by its Order dated 06/03/2015 initiated the disciplinary proceedings against (1) Sri H. Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru and (2) Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru (hereinafter referred to as Delinquent Government Official's for short as 'DGO-1 and DGO-2 respectively') and entrusted the Departmental Inquiry to this Institution.

2. This Institution by Nomination Order No.UPLOK-1/DE/129/2015 dated 12/03/2015 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-8, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru, as the Inquiry

Officer to frame charges and to conduct Departmental Inquiry against DGOs 1 and 2 for the alleged charge of misconduct, said to have been committed by them.

3. The DGO-1 Sri H. Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru and DGO-2 Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru were tried for the following charge:-

- a) That, you - DGO No.1 Sri.H. Ravi Kumar - Assistant Executive Engineer and you - DGO No.2 Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah - Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhath Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru have failed to ascertain whether the owner of the building had obtained permission to use the Cellar/Parking place as office, so also the terrace as lunch spot/canteen to the labourers.
- b) You - DGO Nos. 1 and 2 though were working in Yeshwanthpur Division, have not ascertained the result of the said petition said to have been filed by the owner before ಅಕ್ರಮ-ಸಕ್ರಮ committee in respect of building No.62.
- c) You - DGO Nos.1 and 2 failed to ascertain about permission obtained from B.B.M.P., for building No.96.
- d) You - DGO Nos.1 and 2 have not taken further action as required under K.M.C. Act 1976, against the buildings or owners of said buildings and thereby you - DGO Nos. 1 and 2 being Government servants failed to maintain absolute devotion to duty, the act of which is un-becoming of Government Servants and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated U/R 3(1)(ii) and (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules 1966.

3

4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries-8) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that the Disciplinary Authority has proved the above charge against DGO-1 Sri H. Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru and DGO-2 Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru.

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 DGOs 1 and 2;
- i) DGO-1 Sri H. Ravikumar is due to retire from service on 31/03/2030.
  - ii) DGO-2 Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah has retired from service on 31/05/2018 (during the pendency of inquiry).


7. Having regard to the nature of charge proved against DGO-1 Sri H. Ravikumar and DGO-2 Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah;

- i) it is hereby recommended to the Government for imposing penalty of withholding four annual increments payable to DGO-1 Sri H. Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru with cumulative effect and also for deferring the promotion of DGO-1 Sri H. Ravikumar by four years whenever he becomes due for promotion.

ii) it is hereby recommended to the Government for imposing penalty of withholding 10% of pension payable to DGO-2 Sri L.K. Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru, for a period of 10 years.

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

27/11

**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No; UPLOK-1/DE/129/2015/ARE - 8

M.S.Building  
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Veedhi  
Bengaluru - 560001  
Dated: 26<sup>th</sup> November, 2020.

**ENQUIRY REPORT**

Sub: Departmental Enquiry against;

1). Sri.H.Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, BBMP, Bengaluru.

2).Sri.L.K.Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, BBMP, Bengaluru - Reg.

Ref: 1. G.O.No; Na.Aa.E /14/MNU/2015, Bengaluru, Dated; 06.03.2015.

2. Nomination Order No. UPLOK - 1/ DE / 129 / 2015, Bengaluru, dated;12.03.2015 of Hon'ble Upalokayukta-1.

\*\*\*\*\*


The Departmental Enquiry is initiated against 1. Sri. H.Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, 2. Sri.L.K.Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, BBMP, Bengaluru (hereinafter referred to as the Delinquent Government Officials in short DGO 1 and 2).

  
26/11

2. In view of Government Order cited at reference No.1 the Hon'ble Upalokayukta - 1 vide Order cited at reference No.2 has nominated Additional Registrar Enquiries - 8 to frame Articles of Charge and to conduct enquiry against DGO.1 and 2.

3. The Substance of Imputations of misconduct against the Delinquent Government Officials 1 and 2 are as follows.

i). The Delinquent Government Officials 1 and 2 were working in the Sub-Division, BBMP, Yeshwanthpura, Bengaluru as Assistant Executive Engineers. The complainant alleged that the owner of the Site No.62 situated in 1<sup>st</sup> main road, 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of Industrial Suburb, Yeshwanthpura, Bengaluru has constructed a building in the said site in violation of sanctioned plan. So also the owner of property No.96, 2<sup>nd</sup> stage, Industrial Suburb, Yeshwanthpura has violated the sanctioned plan by converting parking space into office room and terrace into canteen. The action was not taken against the said owners by the Government Officials who were on duty inspite of complaint filed before them. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Yeshwanthpura Sub-Division, BBMP has obtained report from Assistant Engineer on 22.10.2008 on the complaint lodged by the complainant. Based on the report he has issued provisional order on 24.02.2009 to the owner of building No.62 under K.M.C.Act, 1976 for having constructed said building in violation of sanctioned plan. The owner of building No.62 gave

  
26/11

reply admitting the unauthorized construction and sought time to regularize the same and undertook to stop further construction.

ii). The then Assistant Executive Engineer gave reply to the complainant on 03.12.2008 that at the time of spot inspection it was disclosed that the owner of the building No.96 had obtained permission to use the cellar/parking place as office and terrace as lunch spot/canteen to the labourers. The DGO.1 and 2 have not ascertained the result of the petition said to have been filed before Akrama-Sakrama committee in respect of building No.62. Further the DGO.1 and 2 have not ascertained about the permission obtained by the owner of the building No.96 from BBMP. The DGO.1 and 2 did not take any action against the owners of the said buildings as per the provisions of KMC Act, 1976. The DGO.2 did not give information to the complainant nor to his predecessors in office. The DGO.1 and 2 are said to be at fault for having not taken action under KMC Act, 1976 against the owners of both buildings. Thus DGO.1 and 2 alleged to have committed misconduct and made themselves liable for disciplinary action.

4. Additional Registrar Enquiries-8 has prepared Articles of Charge, Statement of Imputations of misconduct, List of witnesses and List of documents and copies of the same were sent to DGO.1 and 2 for their appearance and to submit their written statement of defence. The Delinquent Government Officials.1 and 2 appeared on 22.04.2015 before this authority pursuant to service of Articles of Charge. The Plea was recorded, the DGO.1 and 2 pleaded not guilty

WAS  
26/11

and claimed enquiry into the charges. The Articles of Charge framed against DGO.1 and 2 is as follows.

a). You DGO No.1 Sri.H.Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer and You DGO No.2 Sri.L.K.Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer - Bruhath Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Bengaluru have failed to ascertain whether the owner of the building had obtained permission to use the cellar/parking place as office, so also the terrace as lunch spot/canteen to the labourers.

b). You DGO.1 & 2 though working in Yeshwanthpura Division, have not ascertained the result of the said petition said to have been filed by the owner before Akrama-Sakrama committee in respect of building No.62.

c). You DGO.1 & 2 failed to ascertain about the permission obtained from BBMP for building No.96.

d). You DGO.1 & 2 have not taken further action as required under KMC Act, 1976 against the owners of said buildings and thereby you DGO No's.1 and 2 being Government servants have committed misconduct as enumerated under rule 3 (1) (ii) and (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules 1966.

5. The DGO No.1 filed written statement of defence. It is stated in his written statement that he has received charge memo and categorically denied the same. The charge leveled against him is

AS  
26/11



vague and have not committed any misconduct. He is innocent and maintained absolute integrity and devotion to duty and prays to drop the proceedings against him.

6. The DGO No.2 filed written statement of defence. It is stated in his written statement that the charge against him is extremely vague and does not contain any particulars. The articles of charge is in violation of the provisions of KCS (CCA) Rule 11 (3) and against to the principles of natural justice. He denied all the allegations made against him. Further stated that he worked in the said sub-division from 21.02.2012 to 31.08.2013 for a period of 1 year six months. His predecessor in office did not furnish the details of the complaint filed by the complainant. The disciplinary authority to place regulations, circulars fixing responsibilities on AEE'S of Sub-Division to ascertain the result of the applications before committees. The obtaining of permission by the owner of building No.96 is not during his tenure and the same is of 4 years earlier to assuming charge by him. It is no where mentioned as to when the owner submitted application for Akrama-Sakrama and when it was taken up by the committee. The complaint is of 22.10.2008 or 3.12.2008 in respect of building No.62 and 96 and do not pertain to the period of both of them. No written information about the complaint was given to him nor brought to his notice by the predecessors in office. It is required to ascertain as to what action had been taken by the earlier six officers who held the charge of Sub Division and whether the concerned file was transferred to him. On these grounds prays to drop the proceedings against him.

HS  
26/11

10

7. The Presenting officer to prove the misconduct of the Delinquent Government Officials 1 and 2 has examined 2 witnesses PW1 and PW2 and got marked Ex.P1 to Ex.P47. PW1 Sri.P.S.Santhosh Kumar is the complainant. PW2 Sri.Suresh B Turumuri the then Additional Registrar Enquiries-2, Karnatka Lokayukta. The second oral statement of the Delinquent Government officials 1 and 2 was recorded under Rule 11 (18) C.C.A.Rules. The Delinquent Government Officials 1 and 2 denied the evidence appears against them.

8. The DGO.1 & 2 examined themselves as DW1 and DW2 in support of their defence and got marked documents Ex.D1 to Ex.D7.

9. Heard the arguments of Presenting Officer for disciplinary authority. Perused the written arguments submitted by the DGO.1 and 2.

10. The point that arises for my consideration is as follows.

“Whether the Disciplinary Authority proves the charges leveled against DGO 1 - Sri. H.Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer and DGO 2- Sri.L.K. Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, BBMP, Bengaluru.”

11. My answer to the above point is in the 'Affirmative' for the following reasons.

HAS  
26/11

## REASONS

12. It is an admitted fact that the Delinquent Government Official No.1 worked as Assistant Executive Engineer from 24.07.2010 till 31.01.2012 and Delinquent Government Official No.2 worked as Assistant Executive Engineer from 21.02.2012 to 31.08.2013 in BBMP, Yeshwanthpura Sub-Division, Bengaluru. It is not in dispute that the owner of site No.62 constructed a building by violating the sanctioned plan situated at 2<sup>nd</sup> stage, Industrial Suburb, Yeshwanthpura. It is also not in dispute that the owner of the building No.96 situated at 2<sup>nd</sup> stage, Industrial Suburb, Yeshwanthpura had violated the sanctioned plan by converting parking space into office room and terrace into canteen. It is abundantly clear that the permission was not granted to the owners of both the buildings by BBMP. It is apparent from record that part of the construction made in site No.62 is unauthorized.

13. Let me peruse the evidence placed on record by the disciplinary authority able to prove that DGO.1 and 2 have failed to ascertain whether the owner of the building had obtained permission to use the cellar/parking place as office, so also the terrace as lunch spot/canteen to the labourers. PW1-P.S.Santhosh Kumar speaks in his evidence that building No.96 is in Industrial Area 2<sup>nd</sup> Stage, the parking place in the said building is converted into office room and terrace into canteen in violation to sanctioned plan. He further speaks that one Mahesh Kumar was the Assistant Engineer and one M.Srinivas was the Assistant Executive Engineer

WAS  
26/11

12

in Ward-11 and he lodged complaint to Mahesh Kumar. The evidence of PW1 is specific that permission was not obtained by the owner of the building to convert parking place into office room and terrace into canteen. PW1 speaks about the documents Ex.P1 to Ex.P9.

14. PW2-Suresh B Turamari the Scrutiny Officer has reiterated the evidence of PW1 in respect of the building No.96. Further his evidence is to the effect that DGO.1 and 2 not ascertained whether the owner of the building No.96 obtained permission to use the parking place as office and terrace as canteen. PW2 further speaks that DGO.1 and 2 have not taken further action in the matter under Karnataka Municipalities Act. The DGO.1 and 2 cross examined PW1 and PW2 to discredit their evidence. PW1 admits that he has not lodged any complaint against DGO.1 and 2 and their names is not mentioned in the complaint Ex.P3 and in FORM No.1 and 2. The non-mentioning of names of DGO.1 and 2 in Ex.P1 to Ex.P3 will be of no consequence on the case of the disciplinary authority, for the reason that it is the case of the disciplinary authority that the DGO.1 and DGO2 who succeeded subsequently had failed to ascertain whether the owner of building No.96 had obtained permission from the BBMP to use the cellar/parking place as office and terrace as lunch spot/canteen to the labourers.

15. Looking to the cross-examination of DW1 and DW2 it is clear that the DGOs had failed to know whether the owner of building No.96 had converted the cellar/parking place as office and terrace

68  
26/11

as canteen to the labourers by obtaining permission. Ex.P4 discloses that DGOs instructed the owner of the building No.96 to stop using the premises in violation to plan approved by the BBMP. Giving oral instruction by DGOs without initiating stringent action amounts to irresponsible approach, and they don't want to know the violations committed therein by the building owner. Thus the disciplinary authority proved the fact that the DGO 1 & 2 have failed to ascertain whether the owner of building No.96 had obtained permission to use the cellar/parking place as office and terrace as canteen.

16. Let me go through the evidence on record to know whether the DGO.1 and 2 have not ascertained the result of the petition said to have been filed by the owner before Akrama-Sakrama Committee in respect of building No.62. Admittedly the owner of Site No.62 constructed the building by violating the sanctioned plan situated at 2<sup>nd</sup> stage, Industrial Suburb, Yeshwanthpura. It is apparent from record that part of the construction made in Site No.62 is unauthorized. DGO.1 and 2 who came to know about the unauthorized construction ought to have taken action for removal of unauthorized construction. DW1 and DW2 in their cross examination denied the suggestion that the construction made by the owner of the building No.62 is against to the sketch approved by the BBMP. Ex.P4 the report submitted by the AEE of BBMP dated; 13.05.2009 would indicate that the owner of building No.62 after receiving notice from BBMP had given undertaking to get the unauthorized construction regularized. That being the case the

GS  
26/11

DGOs who took charge of the posts subsequently could have gone through the files of unauthorized construction made within the limits of BBMP, Yeshwanthapura. The oral evidence of DW1 and DW2 would indicate that the DGOs not cared to refer the unauthorized construction files available in their office. Looking to the cross-examination of DW1 and DW2, they had gone to the extent of saying that the construction was not made during their period. Looking to the cross-examination of PW1 and PW2, it is seen that the DGOs tried to justify their untenable defence. Thus the version of DW1 and DW2 goes to show that DGO.1 and 2 have shirked their responsibilities and failed to ascertain the result of the petition said to have been filed by the owner of the building No.62 before the Akrama-Sakrama Committee.

17. According to disciplinary authority the DGO 1 & 2 failed to ascertain about the permission obtained from BBMP for use of cellar/parking place into office and terrace into canteen in building No.96 and not taken action to demolish an unauthorized construction of building No.62 and use of premises of building No.96 against to the sanction plan as required u/s 321 of Karnataka Municipalities Act. Ex.P12 evident that the complainant approached BBMP to direct the concerned engineers to take action against the owner of building No.62 to remove the unauthorized construction. Ex.P10 & 11 evident that the AEEs, BBMP gave information to the complainant that a direction was issued to the owner to furnish the approved sketch. Ex.P13 to 15 evident that the construction of building No. 62 is in violation to the byelaws.

~~AS~~  
26/11

Ex.P16- P17 evident that the DGO 1 & 2 made submissions that the alleged construction of building No.62 and use of premises of building No.96 in violation to byelaws took place not during their tenure. There is nothing to indicate that the DGO 1 & 2 initiated action against the said owners during their tenure under the provisions of Karnataka Municipalities Act. The writing of Ex.P16 & 17 by DGO 1 & 2 could be construed that they are shirking their responsibility by putting blame on others who worked earlier.

18. Ex.P18 to 20 evident that C.R. Mahesh Kumar who was Assistant Engineer during 2009 issued notice to the owners of both the buildings to remove unauthorized construction and use of premises against to the plan. The said C.R. Mahesh Kumar with the permission of AEE granted time to both the owners to regularize the unauthorized construction and use on their request and he transferred from the place. The Ex.P22 evident that the AEE issued show cause notice on 29-09-2009 to Mahalaxmi Metal Industries in property No. 62 to remove the unauthorized construction within 7 days. There is nothing on record to indicate that AEE taken further action after 7 days of notice Ex.P22 to demolish the unauthorized construction. Ex.P24 to P29 is the office correspondence and nothing to do with the proceedings. Ex.P32 & 33 are the letters indicates that the DGOs have not shown their responsibility and duties during their tenure in removing the unauthorized construction and use of premises. Ex.P39 evident that the property No.62 is not situated in ward No. 17 where Mr. N.R. Mahesh AE was working.

AS  
26/11

16

19. On going through the oral evidence of DW1 & 2 does not disclose that DGO 1 & 2 have taken responsibility to look in to the files regarding property No. 62 & 96 despite bringing the same to their knowledge by the complainant Mr. P.S. Santhosh Kumar. The oral evidence of DW1 & 2 have no overriding effect of the evidence both oral and documentary placed by the disciplinary authority. Ex.D1 to D6 speaks about the transfer of DGO 1 & 2 and Mr. Mahesh Kumar, AE. It is to be noted that the disciplinary authority have not challenged the transfer proceedings of DGO 1 & 2. Thus the oral evidence of DW1 & 2 and the documentary evidence Ex.D1 to D6 will not enure to the case of the DGO 1 & 2.

20. Looking to the overall evidence both oral and documentary placed by the disciplinary authority and DGO 1 & 2 it is crystal clear that the DGO 1 & 2 during their tenure has failed to ascertain whether the owner of building No.96 had obtained permission to use the cellar/parking place as office and the terrace as canteen to the labourers. Further the DGO 1 & 2 failed to ascertain whether the owner of property No.62 got the unauthorized construction regularized before Akrama-Sakrama Committee. Further the DGO 1 & 2 has failed to take action against DGO 1 & 2 u/s 321 of KMC Act during their tenure. The DGO 1 & 2 acted by forgetting their responsibilities. Thereby the DGO 1 & 2 have failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, the act of which is unbecoming of public/government servant and liable for professional misconduct under Rule 3 (1) (ii) & (iii) of Karnataka

AS  
26/11



Civil Service (Conduct) Rules 1966. Hence I answered the above point in the 'Affirmative' and proceed to pass the following.

### **ORDER**

The disciplinary authority proved the charges leveled against the Delinquent Government Officials 1). Sri.H.Ravikumar, Assistant Executive Engineer, 2). Sri.L.K.Puttashamaiah, Assistant Executive Engineer, BBMP, Bengaluru.

Submitted to His Lordship Hon'ble Upalokayukta-1 for further action in the matter.

  
26/11/2020  
(AMARANARAYANA.K)

Additional Registrar Enquiries-8  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bengaluru.

### **ANNEXURES**

#### **I) LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF D.A:**

PW1	Sri. P.S.Santosh Kumar, Contractor, Vijayanagar, Bangalore dated 31/10/2015
PW2	Sri. Suresh B Turumuri, the then ARE-11, Bangalore, dated 27/4/2018

#### **II) LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF DGO:**

DW1	Sri. Ravi Kumar H, Assistant Executive Engineer, Duda, Chikkamagaluru, dated 14/8/2018
DW2	Sri. L.K.Puttaswamaiah, Retired Assistant Executive

  
26/11

	Engineer, Saraswathipuram, Tumakuru, dated 14/8/2018
--	--

### III) LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED ON BEHALF OF D.A:

Ex.P1	FORM No.1 (Complaint)
Ex.P2	FORM No.2 (Complainant's Affidavit)
Ex.P3	Letter of complainant C.R. Mahesh Kumar, dated:18.07.2013 addressed to ARE-11
Ex.P4	Comments of AEE, Yashwantapura Sub-Division, BBMP, (Original) dated:13-05-2009
Ex.P5	Copy of office note of BBMP, Mahalaxmipuram Sub-Division.
Ex.P6	Copy of Notice to C.R. Mahesh Kumar, AE by DRE-5 dated:30.03.2009/08-04-2009.
Ex.P7	Copy of the letter by AEE, Mahalaxmipura Sub-Division, BBMP to complainant P.S. Santhosh Kumar dated: 03-12-2008
Ex.P8	Copy of letter dated: 24-11-2008 by the complainant P.S. Santhosh Kumar to AEE, Mahalaxmipuram Sub division, BBMP, Bengaluru.
Ex.P9	Copy of letter dated: 24-09-2008 by the complainant P.S. Santhosh Kumar to AEE, Mahalaxmipuram Sub division, BBMP, Bengaluru
Ex.P10	Copy of letter dated:01-12-2008 by AEE, Mahalaxmipuram Sub division, BBMP to the complainant.
Ex.P11	Copy of office note dated: 29-11-2008 of EE, Mahalaxmipuram Sub division, BBMP to AEE, Mahalaxmipuram Sub division, BBMP.
Ex.P12	Copy of letter dated:24-11-2008 addressed to the Public Information Officer, EE, Mahalaxmipuram Sub division, BBMP by the complainant
Ex.P13	Copy of request letter by Mahalakshmi Metal Industries & Rolling Mills.
Ex.P14	Copy of order passed u/s 321 (1) of KMC Act, 1976 by BBMP, dated: 24-02-2009.

AS  
26/11

Ex.P15	Copy of sketch of property No.62.
Ex.P16	Comments of DGO 1 dated:13-10-2014 submitted to ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P16(a)	Signature.
Ex.P17	Comments of DGO 2 dated: 7-8-2014 submitted to ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru
Ex.P17(a)	Signature.
Ex.P18	Comments of C.R. Mahesh Kumar, AE, dated:29-07-2013 submitted to ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P18(a)	Signature.
Ex.P19	Revised Master Plan 2015 Bengaluru-2007 Vol-3, Table -8.
Ex.P19(a)	Signature.
Ex.P20	Comments of C.R. Mahesh Kumar, AE dated:4-09-2013 submitted to ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P20(a)	Signature
Ex.P21	Comments of AEE, Yashwanthapura Sub division, BBMP dated:26-10- submitted to DRE-5, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P21(a)	Signature
Ex.P22	Copy of Order passed u/s 321 (3) of KMC Act, 1976 by AEE, Yashwanthapura Sub division, BBMP, dated: 29-09-2009 directing the owner of property No.62 to remove unauthorized construction.
Ex.P23	Rejoinder submitted.
Ex.P23(a)	Signature.
Ex.P24	Copy of the duty assignment order of DC, Tumkur, dated:10-04-2015
Ex.P25	Comments of K.R.Ramesh, AEE, dated: 10-11-2014 submitted to ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P25(a)	Signature.
Ex.P26	Letter of G.K.Sarvottham, AE, BBMP, Bengaluru, dated:05-11-2014.
Ex.P26(a)	Signature.
Ex.P27	Copy of endorsement dated:25-08-2014 of ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P28	Copy of office order of Commissioner (Administrative) BBMP, Bengaluru dated:13-12-2013.

*[Handwritten Signature]*  
26/11

Ex.P29	Copy of endorsement dated:30-10-2014 of ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru to G.K.Sarvottama, JE.
Ex.P30	The letter of Chief Engineer, Bengaluru forwarding service record of Sri. G.K.Sarvottama.
Ex.P31	The extract showing the details of G.K.Sarvottama
Ex.P32	Comments of DGO 2, dated:16-07-2014
Ex.P32(a)	Signature.
Ex.P33	Comments of D. Ranganath, AEE, Chamarajapete, Sub-Division, BBMP, dated:01-09-2014.
Ex.P34	Comments of Mr. Vishwas I.K. AE, in charge AEE, Yashwanthapura Sub-division, BBMP dated: 01-08-2014.
Ex.P34(a)	Signature.
Ex.P35	Comments of G.R. Kumar AE, Housing Department dated:03-07-2014.
Ex.P35(a)	Signature.
Ex.P36	Copy of memorandum dated:05-05-2010 by AEE, Yashwanthapura Sub-Division, BBMP.
Ex.P37	Copy of the memorandum dated:28-06-2007 by AEE, Yashwanthapura Sub-Division, BBMP for transfer of G.R. Kumar, AEE.
Ex.P38	Comments of T. Narayanaswami, AE, KRIDL, Ramanagara, dated: 20-08-2014 submitted to ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P38(a)	Signature.
Ex.P39	Comments of N.R. Mahesh, AE, BBMP, Bengaluru dated:30-07-2014
Ex.P39(a)	Signature.
Ex.P40	Extract of attendance register for the moth August 2010.
Ex.P41	The letter by H. Chandrappa, AEE, Ward No. 89, BBMP, Bengaluru dated: 30-07-2014.
Ex.P41(a)	Signature.
Ex.P42	The letter dated:30-06-2014 of AE, Basic Infrastructure Sub-division, Bengaluru.
Ex.P42(a)	Signature
Ex.P43	Comments of Sri. N. Mahesh Kumar, AE,dated:03-07-2014
Ex.P44	Copy of Sketch

  
 26/11

Ex.P45	Work details of AEE, EE, JE, Yashwanthapura Sub-Division,
Ex.P46	Comments of C.R. Mahesh Kumar, Special Technical Sub-Division, dated: 04-01-2014 submitted to ARE-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.
Ex.P47	Copy of the letter of ARE-11 to DGO 1 to furnish the documents dated:11-07-2013.

**IV) LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DGO:**

Ex.D1	Copy of the office order dated:09-03-2009 of AEE, Mahalaxmipura Sub-Division, BBMP
Ex.D2	Copy of Official Memorandum dated:09-03-2009 of AEE, Yashwanthapura Sub-Division, BBMP.
Ex.D3	Copy of Official Memorandum dated:15-09-2009 of AEE, Yashwanthapura Sub-Division, BBMP
Ex.D4	Copy of Official Memorandum dated:16-09-2009 of AEE, Panchayath Raj Engineering Sub-Division, Sira.
Ex.D5	Copy of CTC of DGO 2 dated:21-02-2013
Ex.D6	Copy of the office order dated:30-08-2013 of BBMP,
Ex.D7	Copy of CTC dated: 31-08-2013 of DGO 2.

  
26/11/2020

(AMARANARAYANA.K)

Additional Registrar Enquiries-8  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bengaluru.

