

**GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA**



**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

NO:LOK/INQ/14-A/408/2011/ARE-4

Multi Storied Building,  
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,  
Bengaluru-560 001,  
Date: 29/12/2017

**RECOMMENDATION**

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, First Division Surveyor, Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey, Belagavi – Reg.

Ref:- 1) Government Order No.ಕಂಇ 218 ಭೂದಾಸೇ(3) 2011, Bengaluru dated 31/10/2011.

2) Nomination order No.LOK/INQ/14-A/408/2011, Bengaluru dated 16/11/2011 of Upalokayukta-1, State of Karnataka, Bengaluru

3) Inquiry Report dated 26/12/2017 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru

-----

The Government by its Order dated 31/10/2011, initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, First Division Surveyor, Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey, Belagavi (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/408/2011, Bengaluru dated 16/11/2011 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru, as the Inquiry Officer to frame charges and to conduct Departmental Inquiry against DGO for the alleged charge of misconduct, said to have been committed by him.

3. The DGO Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, First Division Surveyor, Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey, Belagavi was tried for the following charge:-

“That, you Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, the DGO, while working as First Division Surveyor in the office of the Asst. Director of Land Records, City Survey in Belgaum the complainant namely Sri Prashanth S/o. Anandarao Gayakwad being the heir of his second aunt Smt. Indira who died on 26/11/2008, had applied at the City Survey Office of Belgaum in the month of August 2009 to enter his name in the City Survey records of the property standing in the name of Smt. Indira and enquired about it and then you asked for bribe of Rs.700/- and after request demand was reduced to Rs.500/- and on 02/01/2010 you received the said amount as bribe the complainant to show official favour, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, the act of which was unbecoming of Government Servant and thereby committed misconduct as enumerated U/R. 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1966.”

4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that the Disciplinary Authority has proved the above charge against DGO Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, First Division Surveyor, Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey, Belagavi.

5. On re-consideration of report of inquiry, 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 30/9/2019.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge (demand and acceptance of bribe) proved against DGO Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, and the time that may be required for issuance of I & II show cause notices before passing final orders, it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of compulsory retirement from service on DGO Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, First Division Surveyor, Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey, Belagavi and also permanently withholding 50% of pension payable to DGO Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura.

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.

  
(JUSTICE N. ANANDA)  
Upalokayukta-1, 28/12  
State of Karnataka,  
Bengaluru



**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No.LOK/ARE-4/14-A/ENQ-408/2011

M.S. Building,  
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Road  
Bangalore-560 001  
Date: 26/12/2017

**ENQUIRY REPORT**

**Present :** Sri. S. Gopalappa  
Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4 (Incharge)  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bangalore

**Sub:** Departmental Enquiry against  
Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura,  
First Division Surveyor,  
Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records,  
City Survey,  
Belgaum.

**Ref:** 1. Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in Compt/  
Uplok/BGM/303/2010/DRE-1 dt. 21.09.2011.  
2. Govt. Order No. RD 218 LRS (3) 2011 Bangalore  
dt. 31/10/2011.  
3. Nomination Order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/408/2011  
Bangalore Dated 16/11/2011 by Hon'ble Upalokayukta-I.

\*\*\*

1. On the basis of the materials placed by the Additional Director General of Police, Karnataka Lokayukta Bangalore, that DGO Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, First Division Surveyor, Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey, Belgaum has committed misconduct as public servant in the official work of the complainant, an investigation was taken up u/s 7(2) of K.L. Act 1984.
2. After completion of the investigation, a report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 was sent to the Government on 29/9/2011 as per reference no.1. In pursuance of the report, Government was pleased to issue G.O.

dt.31/10/2011 authorizing Hon'ble Upalokayukta to hold enquiry as per reference no.2. Hence in pursuance of Government order nomination was issued by Hon'ble Upalokayukta-1 on 16/11/2011 authorizing ARE-4 to hold enquiry and report as per reference no. 3.

3. On the basis of nomination articles of charge was prepared under Rule 11(3) of KCS (CCA) Rules 1957 and was sent it to the DGO on 28/02/2012.

### **ANNEXURE NO. I**

#### **CHARGE**

*Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, the DGO while working as First Division Surveyor in Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey in Belgaum the complainant namely Sri Prashanth S/o Anandarao Gayakwad being the heir of his second aunt Smt. Indira who died on 26/11/2008, had applied at the City Survey office of Belgaum in the month of August 2009 to enter his name in the city survey records of the property standing in the name of Smt. Indira and enquired about it and then asked for bribe of Rs. 700/- and after request demand was reduced to Rs. 500/- and on 02/01/2010 received the said amount as bribe from the complainant to show official favour, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, which act as unbecoming of a Government servant and thus committed misconduct as enumerated under rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (conduct) Rules, 1966.*

### **ANNEXURE II**

#### **STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT.**

*The complainant namely Sri Prashanth S/o Anandarao Gayakwad, r/o House no. CCB III, 3<sup>rd</sup> cross, Nehru Nagar, Belgaum being the heir of his second aunt Smt. Indira who died on 26/11/2008, had applied at the City Survey office of Belgaum in the month of August 2009 to enter his name in*

the city survey records of the property standing in the name of Smt. Indira. In this connection the complainant approached the DGO and enquired about his work. Instead of telling that, it cannot be issued to the complainant for one reason or the other, demanded bribe of Rs. 700/- and request reduced the demand to Rs. 500/-. The complainant was not willing to pay bribe as demanded by the DGO. Therefore, on 02/01/2010, the complainant lodged complaint before the Lokayukta Dy.SP, Belgaum (hereinafter referred to as the Investigating Officer, for short, "the I.O."). The I.O. registered the complaint in Cr. No. 01/2010 for the offences punishable u/s 7, 13(1)(d) r/w 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988. During the course of investigation into the said crime, when the tainted amount of Rs. 500/- was given by the complainant to the DGO, the I.O. trapped the DGO on 02/01/2010 in the presence of the complainant, the Panch witnesses and his staff in the Office of the ADLR at Belgaum and seized the tainted amount from the DGO under mahazar after following post-trap formalities. The I.O. took statement of the DGO in writing and recorded statements of the complainant, the panch witnesses and others. After receiving report of the chemical examiner, the I.O. submitted report of investigation. The facts and materials on the record of investigation of the I.O. prima facie showed that, the DGO being a Government servant failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and acted in a manner unbecoming of a Government Servant. Therefore, a suo-moto investigation was taken up u/s 7(2) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act and an observation note was sent to the DGO calling for his explanation. The DGO submitted his reply and the reply was not convincing and not satisfactory to drop the proceedings. As the facts and materials on record prima-facie showed that the DGO has committed misconduct as per rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (conduct) Rules, 1966. Therefore, a report u/s 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act was sent to the Competent Authority with recommendation to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the DGO and to entrust enquiry under rule 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services

*(Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957 to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta. Accordingly, the Competent Authority initiated Disciplinary Proceedings against the DGO and entrusted enquiry under rule 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957 to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta. Hence, this charge.*

4. After service of AOC, the DGO appeared before the Enquiry officer and his first oral statement under rule 11(9) of KCS (CCA) Rules was recorded. DGO has filed his written statement denying all the allegations he further states he never demanded and accepted bribe amount from the complainant, he is not guilty of the charges. Hence prays to exonerate him from all the charges.
5. In support of the disciplinary authority, PW 1 to 4 are examined. Ex. P1 to 9 are marked. When the case was posed for recording the SOS of DGO he did not appear before the Enquiry officer hence the DGO was place Ex-parte. Then the Learned Presenting Officer filed written brief and he was also heard orally.
6. Points for consideration;
  - i. Whether the charge is proved by the Disciplinary Authority?
  - ii. What order?
7. My answers to the above points are as follows;
  - i. In the affirmative.
  - ii. As per final order,  
for the following;

#### **REASONS**



8. **Point no.1 :-** The complainant who is examined as PW-1 has deposed that his father had two wives namely Indira and Kamala. They were residing together. Indira died on 26/11/2008 issueless, leaving her property wherein CTS no. 10825 in Belgaum city. They obtained legal heir certificate and approached city survey office with application dt. 24/08/2009. They paid requisite fee and obtained receipt when they approached DGO he used to tell them to come again and again and then this way he made him to meet several times and harassed them lastly DGO demanded Rs. 700/-. DGO informed that if the money is not paid his work will not be done. On bargaining he agreed to attend the work on payment of Rs. 500/-, he felt bad and lodged a complaint as per Ex.P.1 before Lokayukta Police.
9. Further PW-1 has deposed that the I.O. secured the presence of two panchas namely Ubedulla Budihal and Nanjundaiah and requested them to act as panchas. He presented Rs. 500/- before I.O. Pancha Nanjundaiah noted down the numbers. Police applied powder to the notes. Pancha Ubedulla Budihal kept the money into his shirt left side pocket. Lokayukta police washed both the hands of Ubedulla Budihal and it turned into pink colour. At that time the I.O. has drawn the pre-trap mahazar Ex.P.2.
10. Further PW-1 has deposed that all of them went near city survey office. Himself and Nanjundaiah went to City survey office. Rest of them were with the police near city survey office. At that time the DGO was chatting with somebody near city survey office below the tree. DGO called him to another side and asked him whether he has bought the money. He answered affirmatively again DGO took him to a room meant for issuance of receipts and again demanded the money. Therefore he paid the entrusted money to the DGO. DGO received in the right hand shifted to his left hand and kept it in the left side pant pocket.

11. Further PW-1 has deposed that the DGO took him to his chamber in the meanwhile he gave a signal by rubbing his face with his hand kerchief. Immediately the police came there. He showed the DGO and told that the DGO has received the money from him. Police held the hands of DGO. Both the hands of DGO in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. On enquiry the DGO produced the said note. On verification it was tallied with the money entrusted to him. The I.O. washed the left side pant pocket of DGO in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. DGO gave his statement as per Ex.P.3 which is false. I.O seized the copies of documents as per Ex.P.4. Receipt Ex.P.5 and drawn the trap mahazar Ex.P.6.
12. In the cross examination PW-1 has deposed that his step mother Indira died issueless. The khata of her property was to be changed in the name of himself and his father. On 24/8/2009 he submitted the application. He admits that he has paid requisite fee of Rs. 50/-. He admits that if the application and fee is given in the cash counter they will issue a receipt and then the application will be forwarded to concerned case worker. He admits that DGO was the concerned case worker who had to delete the name of his step mother and insert the name of his father and himself. He admits that on 1/9/2009 DGO has received his application. He admits that on the basis of the application a notice was published and a copy was given to him. He admits that since objections were not received within the prescribed period, the DGO recommended the file to ADLR. He admits that on 31/10/2009 ADLR has granted a diary. He does not know that on 31/10/2009 according to the sanction given by ADLR his name and his father name are mentioned in the property card.
13. Further PW-1 admits that on 2/9/2009 he has put the signature before the DGO and at that time the other staff also present. He denies that on 2/9/2009 he asked the DGO to change the khata and the matter is urgent. He denies that the DGO informed that there is a 30 days notice

period and according to law the work will be carried out. He denies that he made a false allegation against DGO. He denies that when he made allegation against DGO, DGO informed him that he will lodge a police complaint. He denies that he abused the DGO in filthy language and at that time the staff pacified him.

14. Further PW-1 has deposed that on 26/11/2009 he prepared an application to secure the extract and submitted the same on 27/11/2009 along with requisite fee of Rs. 15/-. He has denied that on 26/11/2009 he was aware that the khata was changed to the name of his father and himself. It may be true that in special court on 27/11/2009, he has deposed that he was aware about the khata changed in the name of his father and himself. He does not remember the name of the clerks Kencharahuth and Bhandekar. He does not know the received application was sent to the Supervisor B.B. Patil for certification. He does not know that after the khata extracts were ready they have to be received in the counter. He denies that as on 31/10/2009 his work was not pending before DGO.
15. For the question that why he has not received extract upto January 2009 though he has submitted application on 26/11/2009, PW-1 has deposed that DGO informed that his work is not done. He admits that in Special court he has deposed that from 27/11/2009 to 115 days due to pressure work it was not possible him to meet the DGO. He does not know that Sri. B.B.Patil and his inferior officers were responsible to issue the copies of extracts and not the DGO. He admits that at the time of entrustment of money a tape recorder was handed over to him. He admits that I.O had given instructions to switch on the tape recorder. He has deposed that I.O. informed to switch on the tape recorder and no problem if it is not switched off. He does not know whether this fact is written in mahazar or not. He admits that in criminal case he has deposed that he forgot to switch on the tape recorder. He does not know that there is a government

canteen in Belguam city survey office. He admits that a trees is existing in front of city Survey office.

16. Further PW-1 admits that on 2/1/2010 he had been to city survey office, the DGO was standing under the tree along with a person. He does not know the name of said person is Abbas Ali Kunnibhavi. He denies that since he has approached him from backside the DGO did not notice him and at that time without the notice of DGO, he thrusted the money into the pant left side pocket. He denies that the DGO was perplexed by the time he took out the money and attempted to give it to ~~me~~<sup>him</sup>. Lokayukta police held DGO. He denies that the Lokayukta police took the DGO inside the city survey office. He denies that DGO has stated before I.O. that in the background of the earlier incident the complainant intentionally kept the money into his pocket. He admits that there are Superiors officers above the DGO. He has not complained to the higher officers of DGO. Further some suggestions and denials nothing much is elicited from the mouth of PW-1.
17. The shadow witness who is examined as PW-2 has deposed that Lokayukta police summoned himself and one Nanjundaiah, at that time the complainant and I.O. were present. Contents of the complaint were explained to him. Complainant present Rs. 500/- to him, pancha Nanjundaiah noted down the numbers and kept the money the into shirt pocket of the complainant. Hand wash of Nanjundaiah was taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. I.O. gave instructions to himself and complainant and drawn the pre-trap mahazar Ex.P.2.
18. Further PW-2 has deposed that all of them went near the office of DGO. DGO was standing near the tree, when the complainant approached DGO, DGO asked whether he has brought the money. Complainant said yes. The DGO received the money in the application receiving section. DGO

received the money from right hand shifted it to left hand and kept it into pocket. Complainant gave signal to I.O., I.O, his staff and another pancha came there. Complainant showing the DGO informed I.O that he has received the money from him. Hand wash of DGO was taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. On verification of the money presented by the DGO, it was tallied with the money entrusted to the complainant. The pant pocket portion was dipped into solution and it turned into pink colour. DGO has given a statement as per Ex.P.3. Then the I.O has drawn the trap mahazar Ex.P.6.

19. In the cross examination, PW-2 has deposed that he does not know that the written order passed by his higher authorities to go to Lokayukta police is not mentioned in the mahazar. The I.O. has not introduced any woman to him. He has seen the mahazar drawn in the police station. Then he went to the police station the complainant and Nanjundaiah were present. There was no conversation between himself and Nanjundaiah. He introduced themselves, when they were leaving the Lokayukta police station the place was informed, but not during the entrustment Mahazar
20. Further PW-2 admits that there was a tree in front of ADLR's office. Near the tree somebody was talking with DGO. He does not know that his name is Anwar. He does not know that cash counter and applications receiving counter are one and same. According to him it is the application receiving counter. He does not know that outside the counter there is 2ft space for public. According to him that space is measuring 4ft. He admits that there is a wooden stand in front of the counter and the counter is fenced. He cannot say that the counter is situated on 4ft height. He does not know that the person sitting in the counter will be visible to outside. He denied that he did not go to the passage therefore he does not know anything

21. Further PW-2 has denied that without the notice of DGO the complainant thrust the money into his pant pocket. When the complainant took out the money and was attempting to give it to the complainant, Lokayukta police held him. He denied that as on 31/10/2009 the work of complainant was completed. He admits that about 3 months back there was quarrel between DGO and complainant. He does not know in that background false complaint is filed and false trap is laid.
22. The I.O who is examined as PW-3 has deposed that on 02/01/2010 he received the complaint Ex.P1. He registered the crime no. 01/2010 and forwarded the FIR Ex.P.7 to concerned authorities. He secured panchas namely PW-2 and Nanajundaiah, introduced the complainant and explained the contents of the complaint. The complainant presented Rs. 500/- (500 X 1). The police staff applied Phenolphthalein powder to the notes. Nanjundaiah counted the money and kept it into the shirt pocket of the complainant. Hand wash of Nanjundaiah was taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. He gave instructions to panchas and complainant and drawn the pre-trap mahazar Ex.P.2.
23. Further PW-3 has deposed that all of them went near the office of DGO, complainant and PW-2 went to meet the DGO, himself and staff, pancha were waiting outside then the complainant came out and gave the signal. Immediately himself, his staff and another pancha went near the complainant. The complainant shown the DGO and informed that he demanded and received bribe amount to issue the property extract. He introduced himself to DGO. Both hand wash of DGO was taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. The DGO presented the tainted amount and on verification it was tallied with the amount entrusted to the complainant. Pant of DGO was taken, pocket portion was dipped into solution and it turned into pink colour. The complainant and PW-2 narrated the incident. DGO has given his statement as per Ex.P.3,

which is false according to the complainant and PW-2. He seized the file pertaining to the complainant, attendance register extract, as per Ex.P.4 and receipt Ex.P.5. Photographs were taken at each and every stage and drawn the trap mahazar Ex.P.6 and prepared the rough sketch.

24. Further PW-3 has deposed that he arrested DGO and continued the investigation. On 28/7/2010 he received the Sketch Ex.P.8 from PWD and on 28/07/2010 he received FSL report Ex.P.9 and on his retirement he handed over further investigation to Police Inspector Sri. R.K. Patil.
25. In the cross examination PW-3 has denied that according to his say on 02/10/2010 at 10.30 am the complaint was written. Further he has deposed that he has verified the documents. He admits that the complainant had given application on 24/08/2009 to change the khata from his deceased step mother into the name of himself and his father. He admits that the notice was published calling for objections within 30 days.
26. Further PW-3 admits that since no objections were received on 31/10/2009 with a shara, DGO forwarded the file to ADLR and obtained the sanction. He admits that the DGO was concerned case worker for change of khata. He admits that on 31/10/2009 order was passed to change the khata. He denies that therefore as on 31/10/2009 the process of changing khata was completed. He admits that after obtaining the sanction for change of khata the file was to be forwarded to record room. He admits that after changing the khata the khatedar has to submit an application and obtain the khata extract.
27. Further PW-3 admits that one Kencharahuth was working in application receiving section. He admits that the application of complainant was received in application receiving section. He denies that one B.B. Patil was in-charge of issuing the khata extract. PW-3 has voluntarily deposed that DGO was the responsible official to issue the khata extract. He has not produced any documents on record to show that the DGO was responsible

official in issuing khata extract. But he has recorded the statement of higher officials. But according to the statements, DGO was responsible official to issue khata extract. He denies that complainant requested the DGO to change the khata immediately without waiting for 30 days. He denies that since DGO refused to do so there was a quarrel between complainant and DGO. He denies that in order to wreck vengeance, the complainant has filed a false complaint. He admits that on 26/11/2009, complainant submitted an application for khata extract as per Ex.P.4(a). He admits that DGO was not the competent authority to act upon Ex.P.4(a).

28. Further PW-3 has denied that in the background of earlier incidents this false complaint is filed. He does know that on 2/1/2010 at 4.00pm under the tree DGO was talking to one Anwar Abbas Ali Kunnibhavi. But DGO was talking with one person. He has not enquired about said person in the incident. He denies that when the DGO was talking to some person without his knowledge, the complainant thrust the money into the pant pocket of DGO. He denies that at that time he held the DGO. He admits that near application receiving section, there is 3ft passage, on the east and south the walls are existing and on the west there is small counter existing which is in 2 & ½ to 3ft on the northern side the only door for entry to city survey office receiving section is existing. He admits that the incident that takes place, in this place will be visible to receiving section. He denies that since no incident took place he has not enquired the application receiving official. He has denied that he has created Ex.P.2 & 6.
29. PW-4 has deposed that on 14/9/2010 he received a further investigation of this case. On 18/9/2010 recorded the statement of Anandrao, Subash Rotti, Ashok Patil and after completion of the investigation, he filed the charge sheet against DGO.



30. In the cross examination PW-4 has denied that as on 31/10/2010 the work of complainant was completed. He denies that Anand Rao, Subash Rotti and Ashok Patil have not given their statements before him. He has denied that he has not obtained PSO and though the allegations are not proved, he has filed false charge sheet against DGO.
31. The DGO has taken a contention that in front of his office under the tree when he was talking to one Anwar Abbas Ali Kunnibhavi, the complainant came from hind side without his knowledge thrusting the money into his pant left side pocket, when he took out the money and was attempting to return the money to the complainant, Lokayukta police held him. But the DGO has not examined himself or said Anwar Abbas Ali Kunnibhavi to substantiate his contention. After giving the signal to I.O., the I.O. first held the hands of DGO and took his hand wash. At that time IO did not find money in the hands of DGO. After the hand wash of DGO on enquiry the DGO took out the money from pant left side pocket and presented it before the I.O. Therefore this contention of the DGO cannot be accepted. Except the suggestions and denials nothing much is elicited from the mouth of PW-1 to 3 in order to disbelieve their evidence.
32. The oral and documentary evidence clearly show that the DGO while working as First Division Surveyor in Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey in Belgaum the complainant namely Sri Prashanth S/o Anandarao Gayakwad being the heir of his second aunt Smt. Indira who died on 26/11/2008, had applied at the City Survey office of Belgaum in the month of August 2009 to enter his name in the city survey records of the property standing in the name of Smt. Indira and enquired about it and then asked for bribe of Rs. 700/- and after request demand was reduced to Rs. 500/- and on 02/01/2010 received the said amount as bribe from the complainant to do an Official favour. Thereby DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity devotion to duty

and acted in a manner unbecoming of a Government/Public Servant.  
Hence I proceed to answer to this point in the affirmative.

**POINT NO.2:-** For the reasons discussed above I proceed to pass the following;

**ORDER**

The disciplinary Authority has proved the charges as framed against the DGO Sri Madiwalappa Hanumanthappa Lokura, First Division Surveyor, Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, City Survey, Belgaum.

Hence, this report is submitted to Hon'ble Upalokayukta-I for kind consideration.

Dated this the 26<sup>th</sup> day of December of 2017

sd/✓  
(S. Gopalappa)  
Additional Registrar Enquiries-4(Incharge),  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bangalore.

**ANNEXURES**

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

PW-1 :- Sri. Prashanth Gayakwad  
PW-2 :- Sri Ubbedullah Abdul Ajhid Budhihal  
PW-3 :- Sri. Wilson Sudhakar  
PW-4 : Sri Hanumanth Gowda

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

Ex.P-1 : Complaint  
Ex.P-2 : Entrustment Mahazar  
Ex.P-3 : DGO Statement

Ex.P-4 : Seized documents  
Ex P-5 : Receipt  
Ex P-6 : Trap Mahazar  
Ex.P-7 : FIR  
Ex P-8 : Sketch  
Ex.P-9 : FSL Report.

Dated this the 26<sup>th</sup> day of December of 2017

<sup>sd/-</sup>  
(S. Gopalappa)  
Additional Registrar Enquiries-4 (Incharge),  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bangalore.

