

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

217/16

No. UPLOK-1/DE/217/2016/ARE-13

Multi Storied Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru-560 001
Date: **29/01/2020**


RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against
Sri K.Y. Bidari, Special Tahsildar, Bagalkot Taluk,
Bagalkot – Reg.

Ref:- 1) Government Order No. RD 32 ADE 2016, Bengaluru
dated 09/06/2016

2) Nomination order No. UPLOK-1/DE/217/2016,
Bengaluru dated 04/07/2016 of Upalokayukta-1,
State of Karnataka, Bengaluru

3) Inquiry Report dated 27/01/2020 of Additional
Registrar of Enquiries-13, Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bengaluru

The Government by its Order dated 09/06/2016, initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Sri K.Y. Bidari, Special Tahsildar, Bagalkot Taluk, Bagalkot (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. UPLOK-1/DE/217/ 2016, Bengaluru dated 04/07/2016 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-6, 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. Subsequently, by Order No. UPLOK-1/DE/2016 dated 3/8/2016, the Additional

Registrar of Enquiries-9, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru was re-nominated as inquiry officer to conduct departmental inquiry against DGO. Further, as per Orders dated 16/9/2016, the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru was re-nominated as inquiry officer. Again, by order No. UPLOK-1 & 2/DE/Transfers/2018 dated 6/8/2018, the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-13 was re-nominated as Inquiry officer to conduct Departmental Inquiry against DGO.

3. The DGO Sri K.Y. Bidari, Special Tahsildar, Bagalkot Taluk, Bagalkot was tried for the following charge:-

“That, you -DGO / Sri K.Y. Bidari, the then FDA, Court case worker of the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot, now working as Special Tahsildar, Bagalkot had responsible for sending the copy of stay order passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in Revision No. RTS/Respondent/38/2003-04 dated 05/09/2003 immediately to the Tahsildar of office Bagalkot and you - DGO intentionally failed to communicate the said order till 30/09/2003 which was received by the office of Tahsildar on 01/10/2003 in order to favour the other party Sri Tirupathi B. Hadagali and to facilitate the Tahsildar, Bagalkot to pass an order for rectification and to approve the mutation entry No.2592. Thereby, you - DGO being a Government Servant failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty, the act of which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated u/Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1966.”

4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries-13) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that the Disciplinary Authority has proved the above charge against DGO Sri K.Y. Bidari, Special Tahsildar, Bagalkot Taluk, Bagalkot. 217/16


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, he is due to retire from service on 31/03/2026.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge proved against DGO Sri K.Y. Bidari, it is hereby recommended to the Government for imposing penalty of withholding two annual increments payable to DGO Sri K.Y. Bidari, Special Tahsildar, Bagalkot Taluk, Bagalkot with cumulative effect.

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 23/11

11/17/10

Dear Mr. [Name],

I am writing to you regarding the [Topic] that we discussed previously. I have reviewed the information you provided and I am pleased to hear that you are interested in [Topic].

The [Topic] is a very important part of our business and we are looking for someone who is passionate about it. I believe that you have the skills and experience that we are looking for.

I would like to schedule a meeting with you to discuss the details of the [Topic] and to see if you would be interested in [Topic].

Please let me know if you are available for a meeting on [Date] at [Time]. I will be happy to discuss the [Topic] with you and to answer any questions that you may have.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

[Handwritten Signature]
[Name]
[Title]
[Company]

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No.UPLOK-1/DE/217/2016/ARE-13

M.S. Building,
Dr. B.R.Ambedkar Road,
Bangalore-56001,
Date: 27/01/2020.**: Present:****Patil Mohankumar Bhimanagouda**
Additional Registrar Enquiries-13,
Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bangalore.**:: ENQUIRY REPORT ::****Sub:-** Departmental Enquiry against,
Sri K.Y. Bidari, Special Tahasildar,
Bagalkot.

- Ref :**
- 1) Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in
-
- Compt/Uplok/BGM-246/2005/ARE-5,
-
- dated.23/03/2016.
-
- 2) Govt. Order No.RD 32 ADE 2016.
-
- Bengaluru, dated:09/06/2016.
-
- 3) Nomination Order No.UPLOK-1/
-
- DE/217/2016, Bengaluru dated
-
- 04/07/2016.

1. This Departmental Enquiry is directed against Sri K.Y. Bidari, Special Tahasildar, Bagalkot (herein after referred to as the Delinquent Government Official in short "DGO").

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

3. In view of the Government Order cited above at reference-2, the Hon'ble Upa Lokayukta-1, vide order dated: 04/07/2016 cited above at reference-3, nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-6 of the office of the Karnataka Lokayukta as the Enquiry Officer to frame charges and to conduct Enquiry against the aforesaid DGO. The file was transferred from ARE-6 to ARE-9. Thereafter the file was transferred from ARE-9 to ARE-4. The Additional Registrar 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 Articles 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. The AOC was duly served on the DGO. Initially the DGO appeared and his FOS was recorded on 07/01/2017. However, later on he remained absent, hence he was placed Ex-parte.

4. As per order of Hon'ble UPLOK-1 & 2/DE/Transfers/2018, dated 06/08/2018 this enquiry file was transferred from ARE-4 to ARE-13.

217/16

5. The Article of Charges framed by ARE-4 against the DGO is as below:

ANNEXURE NO-1

CHARGE

6. That, you-DGO/Sri K.Y. Bidari, the then FDA, Court Case Worker of the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot, now working as Special Tahasildar, Bagalkot had responsible for sending the copy of stay order passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in Revision No.RTS/Respondent/38/2003-04 dated 05/09/2003 immediately to the Tahasildar, of office Bagalkot and you-DGO intentionally failed to communicate the said order till 30/09/2003 which was received by the office of Tahasildar on 01/10/2003 in order to favour the other party Sri Tirupathi B. Hadagali and to facilitate the Tahasildar, Bagalkot to pass an order for rectification and to approve the mutation entry No.2592. Thereby you-DGO being a Government Servant failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to the duty, the act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated U/R 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules 1966.

ANNEXURE No-II
STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT

7. The complainant by name Sri Siddarmappa Lakshmappa Jakkannavar, Gaddanakere, Bagalkot, filed a complaint against 1) Tahasildar, Bagalkot, 2) Sheristedar, Computer Section, Taluk Office, Bagalkot and 3) Village Accountant, Kesanur Village, Bagalkot Taluk, being the public servant and also against one Sri. Tirupathi B Hadagali, Bagalkot alleging that, by violation of the stay order of Assistant Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot amended 'H' Uttara, and "D" Uttara. The said complaint taken up for investigation u/sec. 9(3) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act 1984 and secured the comments of Tahasildar, Bagalkot and Sheristedar, computer section, Bagalkot and Village Accountant, Kesanur Village.
8. The land measuring 30 acres belongs to APMC was sold in favour of Sri Tirupathi B Hadagali thorough a sale deed dated 11/11/2002 and the Revenue Inspector, Kaladagi, Village Accountant, Bagalkot and Sheristedar, Computer Section, Taluk office approved the Mutation Entry No.2592 and submitted that, there is no such violation effected in the said mutation. On verifying the records "J" Form along with the copy of the sale deed was sent by Sub-Registrar, Bagalkot to the Tahasildar, Office, Bagalkot, for making mutation entry which was issued by the Tahasildar,

217/26

Bagalkot, on 03/12/2002. The Village Accountant, Kesanur entered the M.E.NO.2587 in Form No.12 on 23/12/2003 before the approval of the mutation. Complainant/Sri. Siddaramappa Lakshmappa Jakkannavar, filed an application on 20/03/2003 which was submitted on 26/03/2003 before the Tahasildar, intimating the filing of W.P.No.1782/2003. The said Writ Petition dismissed on 10/02/2003 and after enquiry Deputy Tahasildar, Kaladagi rejected the objection of the complainant and approved the Mutation No.2587 as per the order dated 19/05/2003. But in view of the Government Circular, when the objections of the complainant rejected a new Mutation No is to be sanctioned and thereby Deputy Tahasildar, Kaladgi effected the new Mutation No.2592. The complainant filed an appeal against the said mutation before the Assistant Commissioner, Bagalkot, and got the stay. The Assistant Commissioner, Bagalkot on 25/08/2003 dispose the appeal confirming the order of Deputy Tahasildar, Kaladagi. Thereafter, complainant filed a petition before the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/Respondent/38/2003-2004 and in which the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot on 05/09/2003 granted 60 days stay. Since this you-DGO being the court section clerk of D.C. Bagalkot, required to communicate the order of Deputy Commissioner, regarding the stay granted on 05/09/2003 to the Taluk Office, Bagalkot immediately and you failed to communicate the said stay order immediately and actually it was sent on 24/09/2003 which was received in Taluk Office, Bagalkote on

01/10/2003. In the meanwhile the mutation entry No.2592 was finalised on 22/09/2003 by changing the name of Sri Tirupathi B Hadagali in records. Therefore, it is found that, this DGO purposefully and intentionally in order to facilitate the person of by name Sri Tirupathi B Hadagali, committed a delay in dispatching the stay order passed by the Deputy Commissioner and even though the order passed on 05/09/2003 in RTS/Respondent/38/2003-04 you-DGO have send the same to Tahasildar on 24/09/2003 which was received on 01/10/2003 i.e., knowingly after the acceptance and approval of mutation entry No.2592 in favour of Sri Tirupathi B Hadagali on 22/09/2003 and thereby committed a misconduct not only the dereliction of duty and misconduct in-violation if Rule 3(1) of KCS (Conduct) Rules.

9. Said facts supported by the material on record show that the you-DGO being a Government Servant has failed to maintain absolute integrity besides devotion to duty and acted in a manner unbecoming of a Government Servant, and thereby repeatedly committed misconduct and liable for disciplinary action.

10. Therefore, investigation was taken up against you-DGO and an observation note was sent to you to show cause as to why recommendation should not be made to the Competent Authority for initiating departmental inquiry against you-DGO in the matter. For

21/7/18

that, you- DGO gave your reply. However, the same has not been found convincing to drop the proceedings.

11. Since said facts and material on record prima-facie show that you-DGO has committed misconduct under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of the KCS (Conduct) Rules, 1966, now, acting under section 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984, recommendation is made to the Competent Authority to initiate disciplinary proceedings against you-DGO to entrust the inquiry to this Authority under Rule 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957. In turn Competent Authority entrust the enquiry to this institution vide Ref (1) and Hon'ble Upa Lokayukta nominated the enquiry authority, to conduct enquiry and report vide ref (2) Hence, the charge.

12. The AOC was duly served on the DGO. Initially the DGO appeared and his FOS was recorded on 07/01/2017. However, later on he remained absent, hence he was placed Ex-parte. Since the DGO later on remained Ex-parte the question of recording SOS, defence evidence and Questionnaire does not arise.

13. In order to substantiate the charge, the Disciplinary Authority examined one witness as PW-1 and got marked the documents at Ex.P-1 to P-10 and closed their side. Since the DGO later on remained Ex-parte, the question of recording SOS, defence evidence

and questionnaire as provided U/Rule 11(9), 11(16), 11(17) and Rule 11(18) of Karnataka Civil Services (CC & A) Rules 1957 does not arise.

14. Upon consideration of the charge leveled against the DGO, the evidence led by the Disciplinary Authority by way of oral and documentary evidence, the only point that arises for my consideration is as under:

Point No-1) Whether the Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily proved that, the DGO Sri K.Y. Bidari the then FDA, Court Case Worker in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot, now working as Special Tahasildar, Bagalkot, was responsible for sending the copy of stay order passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in Revision No. RTS/R/38/2003-04 dated 05/09/2003 immediately to the Tahasildar, Bagalkot and the DGO intentionally failed to communicate the said order till 30/09/2003 which was received by the office of Tahasildar on 01/10/2003, in order to favour the other party Sri Tirupathi B. Hadagali and to facilitate the Tahasildar, Bagalkot to pass an order for

rectification and to approve the mutation entry No.2592 and thereby failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, which act is unbecoming of a Government Servant and thus committed mis-conduct as enumerated U/R 3 (1) (i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

15. My finding on the above point is held in **the "Affirmative"** for the following:

:: REASONS ::

16. **Point No-1:-** The complaint is filed by Sri Siddaramappa Jakkannanavar and he has been examined as PW-1. He states that, the APMC Bagalkot owns 30 acres of land worth several crores of rupees. The then President of the APMC Sri Sanganagouda Jakkanagouda and the Secretary Smt Sudhathai Heremani have colluded with one Tirupathi B Halagali and illegally sold 30 acres of land on 11/11/2002 in favour of Tirupathi B Halagali. The mutation entry was also changed in favour of Tirupathi B Halagali. Based upon the sale deed the revenue authorities have mutated the name of Tirupathi B Halagali. PW-1 further states that, when he came to know about the illegal sale, which had caused huge loss to the APMC, he lodged this complaint to the Lokayukta Institution to

take action against the Tahasildar Bagalkot, Shirestedar Computer section, Revenue Inspector, Kaladagi, Village Accountant Kesanur and Tirupathi B Halagali. He identifies the complaint in Form No-1 and II at Ex.P-1 and P-2. He has produced the xerox copy of the sale deed executed by the APMC President and Secretary in favour of Tirupathi B Halagali and it is at Ex.P-3. On perusal of the sale deed it is observed that, the APMC President and Secretary have sold totally 30 acres of land in favour of Tirupathi B Halagali. Based upon the sale deed at Ex.P-3, the mutation was effected in favour of Tirupathi B Halagali. He has produced mutation extract which is at Ex.P-4. On careful perusal of Ex.P-4, it is observed that, the name of Tirupathi B Halagali has been mutated to the said lands as per sale deed at Ex.P-3. He further submits that, he had challenged the said mutation No.2587 done by Upa Tahasildar before the Assistant Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/AP/8/03-04. The Learned Assistant Commissioner had stayed the order of Upa Tahasildar. He further submits that, the Assistant Commissioner later on vacated the stay order and upheld the order of Upa Tahasildar. He has produced the stay order granted by the Assistant Commissioner and it is at Ex.P-5. On careful perusal of this document M.E. No.2587 of Kesanuru Village has been stayed. He has produced the final order in RTS/AP/8/03-04 and it has been marked Ex.P-6. On careful perusal of this document the RTS appeal has been dismissed and the order of Upa Tahasildar has been upheld. PW-1 further states that, against the said order of the Assistant

21/7/11

Commissioner he preferred a revision before the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04. The Learned Deputy Commissioner quashed M.E.No.2587 and directed the Upa Tahasildar to reconsider the application. He has produced the copy of the order of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot and it is at Ex.P-7. On careful perusal of this document, it is observed that, the order of Assistant Commissioner and Upa Tahasildar has been set aside and they have been directed to reconsider the application afresh.

17. PW-1 further states that, the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot had stayed the order of Assistant Commissioner in RTS appeal for a period of 60 days and he has produced the copy of the said order which is at Ex.P-8.

18. PW-1 further states that, the DGO was working in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot and he was responsible for dealing with the court cases. The DGO was working as a FDA and he was responsible for communicating the stay order granted by the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in revision petitions. Though the stay order was granted by the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04 on 05/09/2003, the DGO had deliberately not intimated the same to the Tahasildar Bagalkot. The DGO had intentionally delayed the intimation of the stay order in order to help the said Tirupathi B Halagali. The DGO intimated the

Tahasildar, Bagalkot only on 30/09/2003. It was received by the office of Tahasildar, Bagalkot on 01/10/2003. The DGO had intentionally delayed the intimation of stay order and hence, the Learned Tahasildar certified the mutation entry No.2592 and accordingly the name of the purchaser Sri Tirupathi B Halagali was mutated to the said 30 acres of land. If the DGO had intimated the stay order granted by Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04 immediately, the mutation No.2592 of Kesanur Village would not have been certified. If the stay order of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04 was communicated to the Tahasildar, Bagalkot immediately, the mutation entry No.2592 of Kesanuru Village would not have been certified. The DGO had intentionally not communicated the stay order and hence, the mutation was effected. He further states that, the DGO has committed dereliction of duty and misconduct intentionally and he is responsible for the said consequences.

19. PW-1 further states that, when the Assistant Commissioner, Bagalkot granted stay order in respect of M.E. No.2587 of Kesanur Village, he had submitted an application to the Learned Tahasildar on 23/06/2003. He has produced the copy of the said application which is at Ex.P-9. PW-1 further states that, after the order of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04 the Upa Tahasildar on 20/06/2003 approved M.E. No.2592 and entered the

21/7/16

name of purchaser Sri Tirupathi B Halagali. He has produced the copy of the said mutation which is at Ex.P-10.

20. PW-1 further states that, the DGO in order to illegally help Sri Tirupathi B Halagali did not intimate the order of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04 dated 05/09/2003. He further states that, the DGO is responsible for illegal certification of mutation entry. PW-1 further states that, the DGO is responsible for the said act and hence, necessary action may be taken against him.

21. I have carefully gone through the oral evidence of PW-1, the documents produced and the report U/s 12(3) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act 1984 and also the entire scrutiny file.

22. On careful perusal of the documents produced by the complainant, the material documents are Ex.P-8, Ex.P-5, Ex.P-6 and Ex.P-7. It is observed that, the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot had granted stay order against the order of Assistant Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/AP/8/2003-04 on 05/09/2003. The said order was stayed for a period of 60 days. This fact is quite clear from the document at Ex.P-8. It is the order of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/2003-04. The order of Assistant Commissioner, Bagalkot has been stayed for a period of

60 days. However, the said order was not communicated by the DGO in time to the Tahasildar Bagalkot. In the mean time M.E. No.2592 was approved. Though the stay order was granted by the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot it was not communicated by the DGO up to 30/9/2003. On 30/09/2003 the said order is mentioned in the outward register of the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot. The stay order copy was received by the Tahasildar Office Bagalkot on 01/10/2003. In the mean time the mutation in the name of purchaser Tirupathi B Halagali has been certified. It is quite clear that, the DGO has colluded with the purchaser and deliberately delayed the communication of the stay order granted by the Deputy Commissioner Bagalkot. The very purpose of granting the stay order was defeated by the delay caused by the DGO in communicating the order. Though the stay order was granted by the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot on 05/09/2003, it was not communicated for a period of more than 25 days. In the mean time ME No.2592 was approved and the whole process of obtaining the stay order by the complainant was defeated by the arbitrary and illegal inaction of the DGO. The DGO was responsible person dealing with court matters and he was duty bound to intimate the stay order immediately to the Tahasildar, Bagalkot. However, the DGO has deliberately kept quite up to 30/09/2003. The stay order was communicated to the Tahasildar, Bagalkot only on 01/10/2003. In the mean time M.E.No.2592 was approved and accordingly the name of the purchaser was entered.

9/17/16

Hence, the DGO was responsible for not sending the stay order passed by the Deputy Commissioner in RTS/R/38/2003-04 dated 05/09/2003 to the office of Tahasildar Bagalkot immediately. Though the order of the Assistant Commissioner in RTS/AP/8/2003-04 dated 25/08/2003 was stayed for a period of 60 days, the DGO immediately did not intimate the same to the Tahasildar Bagalkot and due to non receipt of the stay order M.E.No.2592 was approved. Hence, the DGO is responsible for non communication of the stay order of Deputy Commissioner Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/2003-04. Hence, the act of DGO amounts to dereliction of duty and misconduct.

23. For the reasons stated above the DGO, being the Government/Public Servant has failed to maintain absolute integrity besides devotion to duty and acted in a manner unbecoming of Government servant. On appreciation of entire oral and documentary evidence, I hold that the charge leveled against the DGO is established. Hence, I answer point No.1 in the "Affirmative".

:: ORDER ::

***The Disciplinary Authority has proved
the charge against the DGO Sri K.Y.
Bidari, Special Tahasildar, Bagalkot.***

24. This report is submitted to Hon'ble Upa Lokayukta-1 in a sealed cover for kind perusal and for further action in the matter.

Dated this the 27th day of January 2020

(Patil Mohankumar Bhimanagouda)
Additional Registrar Enquiries-13
Karnataka Lokayukta
Bangalore

217/16

ANNEXURE

Witness examined on behalf of the Disciplinary Authority
PW-1: Sri Siddaramappa Jakkannanavar (Original)
Witness examined on behalf of the DGO
Nil
Documents marked on behalf of the Disciplinary Authority
Ex.P-1: Form No-I (Original). Ex.P-1(a): Signature of the complainant.
Ex.P-2: Form No-II (Original) Ex.P-2 (a): Signature of the complainant.
Ex. P-3: The xerox copy of the sale deed executed by the APMC President and Secretary in favour of Tirupathi B Halagali.
Ex. P-4: The Xerox copy of Mutation Extract No.2587.
Ex.P-5: The Xerox copy of stay order granted by the Assistant Commissioner in RTS/AP/8/03-04.
Ex.P-6: The Xerox copy of final order in RTS/AP/8/03-04.
Ex.P-7: The Xerox copy of the order of Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04.
Ex.P-8: Stay order of the Deputy Commissioner, Bagalkot in RTS/R/38/03-04 (Xerox)
Ex.P-9: The Xerox copy of the application submitted by the complainant to the Tahasildar, Bagalkot.

Ex.P-10: The Xerox copy of Mutation Extract No.2592
(Xerox)

Documents marked on behalf of the DGO
Nil

Dated this the 27th day of January 2020

Patil
27/1/2020
(Patil Mohankumar Bhimanagouda)
Additional Registrar Enquiries-13
Karnataka Lokayukta
Bangalore