

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No:UPLOK-1/DE/514/2017/ARE-14

Multi Storied Buildings,
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru-560 001,
Date: 28/03/2019

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Sri Govinda Reddy Madnal, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District – Reg.

- Ref:-1) Government Order No.ಗ್ರಾಅಪ/243/ಗ್ರಾಪಂಕಾ/2017 Bengaluru dated 30/03/2017.
- 2) Nomination order No.UPLOK-1/DE/514/2017 Bengaluru dated 07/04/2017 of Upalokayukta-1, State of Karnataka, Bengaluru.
- 3) Inquiry Report dated 26/03/2019 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-14, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru

The Government by its Order dated 30/03/2017 initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Sri Govinda Reddy Madnal, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District (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/514/2017 dated 07/04/2017 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-1, 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/2017 Bangalore dated 6/7/2017 the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-7 was re-nominated as Inquiry Officer to conduct Departmental inquiry against DGO. Again by order No. UPLOK-1 & 2/DE/Transfers/2018, dated 06/08/2018 the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-14 was re-nominated as Inquiry Officer to conduct Departmental Inquiry against DGO.

3. The DGO Sri Govinda Reddy Madnal, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District was tried for the following charge:-

“While you DGO Sri.Govinda Reddy Madnal, working as Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Gram Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District, the work of construction of individual toilets was undertaken by Mirkhal Grama Panchayath under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan Scheme during year 2014-15 and on investigation it is found that the application filed by the beneficiaries under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan is dtd: 17.9.2014 but the work confirmation certificate, inspection of site prior to construction in form no.3, first stage work inspection in form no.5 and second stage work inspection report in form no.7 are dated: 17.9.2014. In the approval order dtd:25.9.2014 it is mentioned that applicant Dilip Shivaji Rao has filed application on 13.9.2014 and date of inspection before commencement of work is shown as 20.9.2014 and the muster roll it is shown that work was carried out from 17.9.2014 to 2.10.2014. The signature of the beneficiaries Sri.Dilip Shivaji Rao on the application filed under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan Scheme and his signature in the application given for work under

MGNREG Scheme do not tally. The documents maintained by you in respect of the work are all created documents and therefore you DGOI has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and therefore you are guilty of misconduct under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of KCS (Conduct) Rules 1966”.

4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries-) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that the Disciplinary Authority has proved the above charge against DGO Sri Govinda Reddy Madnal, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District.

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 Sri Govinda Reddy Madnal, he is due to retire from service on 31/05/2043.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge proved against DGO Sri Govinda Reddy Madnal, it is hereby recommended to the Government for imposing penalty of withholding four annual increments payable to DGO Sri Govinda Reddy Madnal, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District with cumulative effect and also

for deferring the promotion of DGO by four years whenever he becomes due for promotion.

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.


(JUSTICE N. ANANDA) 28/3
Upalokayukta-1,
State of Karnataka,
Bengaluru

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No.UPLOK-1/DE/514/2017/ARE-14

M.S. Building
Dr.B.R. Ambedkar Road
Bangalore-560 001
Date: 26/3/2019**ENQUIRY REPORT****Present :** Smt. K.Bhagya Additional
Registrar of Enquiries-14
Karnataka Lokayukta
Bangalore.**Sub:-**Departmental enquiry against
Sri.Govindareddy, Panchayath
Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama
Panchayath, Mirkal, Basavakalyan Taluk,
Bidar District- regarding.

- Ref:-**
1. Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in
-
- Compt/Uplok/GLB/3017/2016, DRE-3
-
- Dtd.,14.3.2017.
-
2. Government Order No. ಗ್ರಾಅಪ/243/ಗ್ರಾಪಂಕಾ/2017
-
- Bengaluru, dated: 20.3.2017.
-
3. Nomination Order No: UPLOK-1/DE/514/17
-
- Bengaluru Dated: 7.4.2017 of Hon'ble
-
- Upalokayukta-1, State of Karnataka,
-
- Bangalore.
-
4. Order No.Uplok-1/DE/2017, Bangalore,
-
- dtd:6-7-2017 of Hon'ble Upalokayukta.
-
5. Note No: Uplok-1& 2/ DE/Transfers/2018,
-
- Bangalore, Dt:6.8.2018.

* * * *



The complainant by name Sri.Anil Kumar S/o Dilip Rao Patil, Mirkhal Post, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District (hereinafter referred to as 'complainant' for short) filed the complaint against the DGO, alleging misconduct and dereliction of duty.

2. After completion of the investigation a report was sent to the Government u/s 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act as per reference No.1. In pursuance of the report the Government of Karnataka was pleased to issue the G.O. Dtd.,30.03.2017 authorizing the Hon'ble Upalokayukta to hold enquiry as per reference No.2. In pursuance of the G.O., the nomination was issued by the Hon'ble Upalokayukta-1 on 07.04.2017 authorizing ARE-1 to hold enquiry and to report as per reference No. 3 and this file is transferred from ARE-1 to ARE-7 and ARE-7 to ARE-14 as per reference No.4. & 5.

3. On the basis of the nomination, the Articles of Charge against the DGO framed by the then Additional Registrar of Enquiries-1 which includes Articles of Charge at Annexure-I and Statement of Imputation of Misconduct at Annexure No.II are the following and the same was sent to the DGO on 26.04.2017.

ANNEXURE-I
CHARGE:

4. *While you DGO Sri.Govinda Reddy
Mudnal working as Panhayath Development Officer,*



Mirkhal Gram Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District, the work of construction of individual toilets was under taken by Mirkhal Grama Panchayath under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan Scheme during year 2014-15 and on investigation it is found that the application filed by the beneficiaries under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan is dtd: 17.9.2014 but the work confirmation certificate, inspection of site prior to construction in form No.3, first stage work inspection report in form No.7 are dated:17.9.2014. In the approval order dated: 25.9.2014 it is mentioned that applicant Dilip Shivaji Rao has filed application on 13.9.2014 and date of inspection before commencement of work is shown as 20.9.2014 and the muster role it is shown that work was carried out from 17.9.2014 to 2.10.2014. The signature of the beneficiaries Sri. Dilip Shijaji Rao on the application filed under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan Scheme and his signature in the application given for work under NGNREG Scheme do not tally. The documents maintained by you in respect of the work are all created documents and therefore you DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and therefore you DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an



act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and therefore you are guilty of misconduct under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of KCS (Conduct) Rules 1966.

ANNEXURE-II

STATEMENT OF IMPUTATION OF MISCONDUCT

5. **Brief facts of the case are :-** An investigation was taken up by invoking section 9 of Karnataka Lokayukta Act, on the basis of the complaint filed by Sri Anil Kumar S/o Dilip Rao Patil, Mirkhal Post, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District (hereinafter referred to as 'complainant' for short), against Sri. Govinda Rddy, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama Panchayath, Mirkal, Basavakalyan Taluk Bidar District (hereinafter referred to as DGO for short).

6. The Complainant alleges that 'individual toilet has been constructed through Mirkal Grama Panchayath under Nirmal Bharath Abhiyana Scheme for the year 2014-15 with work I.D. No. 1506002034/RS/161949. Without utilizing the labourers registered under MGNREG scheme, th respondent has completed the construction with his own labourers and has withdrawn the public money for himself and has misappropriated the money. Hence has sought to take action against the respondent.



7. The respondent/panchayath Development Officer has submitted his comments dated 23.1.2017 stating that for construction of individual toilets, an amount of Rs.10,200/- is granted as an incentive. An amount of Rs.4,700/- is granted towards purchase of materials under Nirmal Bharath Scheme and Rs.5,500/- is granted towards labour cost under MGNREG Scheme for the year 2014-15. As per the guidelines under MGNREG Scheme, action plan along with approved estimate has been sanctioned vide administrative and technical approval No. 141/GPK/141 dtd.5.9.2014. the beneficiary Sri. Dilip Shivajirao has constructed toilet. He has mentioned the names of the workers in form No.6. Sri. Pandarinatha and his wife Lakshmibai Pandarinatha have worked as labourers with Job Card No.KN-06-002-034-002/982. They have been paid wages to their bank account through EFMS after following the procedures under the scheme. Therefore has prayed to drop him from the proceedings.

The respondent has produced the documents pertaining to the work "construction of individual toilet in Dilip Shivajirao" with work I.D.No. 1506002034/RS/161949. The Muster Roll under MGNREG sheme of Mirkal Grama Panhayath produced by the respondent show that wage amount of Rs.2,674/- is paid to Sri. Pandarinatha and his wife Lakshmibai by depositing to their bank account No.11169100000689 of Pragathi Grameena Bank. But the complainant alleges that the respondent by showing his own workers has raised bills in their names.



8. The respondent has not produced the photographs taken during the construction of toilet. The photographs found in copies of the documents produced by the respondent are not clear. The application by the beneficiary under Nirmal Bharath Abhiyan is dated 17.9.2014. The work confirmation certificate, Inspection of the site prior to construction (Form No. 3), 1st Stage work inspection report (form No.) and 2nd stage of work inspection report (form No.7) are dated 17.9.2014, Application for work under MGNREG, Notice for reporting to work, application for release of incentive under Nirmala Bharath Abhiyana along with approval produced by the respondent are all dated 17.9.2014, it is mentioned that the applicant Dilip Shivajirao has filed application on 13.9.2014 and inspection before commencement of work is carried out on 20.9.2014. But the Muster roll show that the work has been carried out from 17.9.2014 upto 2.10.2014, Even before approval order, the work is shown to have been commenced. The signatures of the beneficiary Sri. Dilip Shivajirao on the application under Nirmal Bharath Abhiyan and the signature of the beneficiary in the application for work under MGNREG are totally different. Therefore, the name of the workers and bank account number with is mentioned in the application for work under MGNREG cannot be considered as the one which is provided by the beneficiary. Therefore, all the documents produced by the respondent seem to be created documents. There are prima-facie materials to indict respondent for the above said misconduct.



9. In view of the above discrepancies, the comments of respondent cannot be accepted at this stage. Hence, the respondent has failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and has acted in a manner which is unbecoming of a Government Servant for which he has made himself liable for departmental action.

10. Since the said facts and materials on record prima facie show that, Sri. Govnda Reddy Mudnal, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Gram Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar Rules, 1966 recommendation is made under Sec.12(3) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984 to the Competent Authority to initiate disciplinary proceedings against Sri. Govinda Reddy Mudnal, Panchayatha Developmen Officer, Mirkhal Gram Panchayath, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District and to entrust the inquiry to this authority under Rule 14-A of Karnataka Civil Service(Classifications,, control and Appeal) Rules, 1957.

11. The said Articles of Charge served on the DGO, and the DGO had appeared before this Enquiry Officer on 08-06-2017 and his First Oral Statement under Rule 11(9) of the KCS(CCA) Rules, 1957 was recorded. The DGO, had denied the charge.

12. The DGO had filed his written statement and contended that, he has released an amount of Rs.10,200/- as an incentive and



Rs. 4700/- towards the purchase of materials under Nirmal Bharath Abhiyana Scheme and Rs.5,500/- towards the labour cost under MGNREG Scheme. Action plan along with approved estimate has been sanctioned under administrative and technical approval No: 141/GPK/141 dated 05.09.2014. The beneficiary Sri. Dilip Shivaji Rao has constructed the toilet and has mentioned the names of the workers in form No.6. Sri. Pandarinatha and his wife Lakshmibai Pandarinatha had worked as labourers with job card No. KN-06-002-034-002/982. He has paid the wages to them vide their bank account in EFMS after following the procedure under the scheme. Thus, he has followed all the due procedures as contemplated under the MGNREG Scheme. But, the complainant has filed a false and misconceived complaint against him. Hence, he prayed to accept his contentions and exonerate him from the charge leveled against him by this Authority.

13. The Disciplinary Authority has examined the complainant as PW-1 and 7 documents got marked on behalf of the complainant as P1 to P7. The Second Oral Statement of the DGO was recorded. The DGO has not led any evidence on his behalf.

14. Heard the argument of both the side. The DGO has also filed his written argument.



15. The points that arise for my consideration are:

Point No.1 : Whether the charges levelled against the DGO is proved by the Disciplinary Authority?

Point No.2 : What order?

My answers to the above points are as under:

Point No. 1 : In the Affirmative.

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

REASONS

16. Point No.1 : I have gone through the case papers before me. Here the complainant by name Sri.Anil Kumar S/o Dilip Rao Patil, Mirkhal Post, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District has filed the complaint against the DGO alleging that, during the year 2014-15 under Nirmal Bharath Abhiyana Scheme, individual toilet was constructed by the Mirkal Gram Panchayath without utilizing the labourers registered under MGNREG Scheme. The DGO had completed the construction work by using his own labourers and had withdrawn the public money for himself by creating the bills and thus has mis- appropriated the money and has committed misconduct and dereliction of duty and hence prayed to take action against him.



17. The DGO was working as PDO of Mircle Gram Panchayath from 2014 to 2016.
18. The Disciplinary Authority got examined the complainant as PW-1 and 7 documents got marked on behalf of the complainant. The complainant deposed before this authority saying that, in the month of August-September 2015, the DGO visited for survey regarding the existence of toilets in the houses of the said Gram panchayath. He had a toilet in his house. The DGO came and inspected and said that, he can raise bill in respect of only one material and took the photograph of the door of his toilet and also said that, he cannot give the labour cost. The DGO had credited an amount of Rs. 5,400/- only to the account of his father towards the material cost only. After six months, the complainant observed through online that, the DGO had raised the concocted bills by showing the payment to the labourers. But, the DGO himself informed to him, when he had visited his house for inspection of the toilet that, the labour cost cannot be payable. Thus the DGO had created bills and misappropriated the amount.
19. The Ex.P1 is the online Muster report regarding the payment to the labourers, which is marked as Ex.P1. Ex.P2 is the complaint given by the public of Mircle Gram Panchayath to EO, Taluk Panchayath, Basavakalyana, Bidar District. Ex.P3 is the complaint dt: 17.5.2016 given by this complainant to the EO, Zilla



Panchayath, Bidar. Ex.P4 is the complaint dt: 16.5.2016 given by this complainant to the EO, Zilla Panchayath, Bidar. Ex.P5 is the complaint by this complainant to this institution. Ex.P6 and P7 are the form No. I and II. These are all documents on which the complainant has relied upon.

20. Though, the complainant has deposed that, the DGO had created the bills by showing the payment towards the cost of the labourers, he had not used the labourers who were having job cards but used his own labours and misappropriated the amount, the charge framed against him is entirely different. Which is, as; ***“the work of construction of individual toilets was under taken by Mirkhal Grama Panchayath under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan Scheme during year 2014-15 and on investigation it is found that the application filed by the beneficiaries under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan is dtd: 17.9.2014 but the work confirmation certificate, inspection of site prior to construction in form No.3, first stage work inspection report in form No.7 are dated:17.9.2014. In the approval order dated: 25.9.2014 it is mentioned that applicant Dilip Shivaji Rao has filed application on 13.9.2014 and date of inspection before commencement of work is shown as 20.9.2014 and the muster role it is shown that work was carried out from 17.9.2014 to 2.10.2014. The signature of the beneficiaries Sri. Dilip Shiaji Rao on the application filed under Nirmal Bharath Abiyan Scheme and his signature in the application*”**



given for work under NGNREG Scheme do not tally. The documents maintained by you in respect of the work are all created documents and therefore you DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and therefore you DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant”.

21. But, regarding the above charge, the complainant has not at all produced any documents except the online Muster roll report, which is marked as Ex.P1, which shows the payment of labour cost to two labourers. Other documents are the complaints to various authorities including this institution. Regarding the above charge, complainant has not produced any documents. Though, in the Chief Examination the complainant has deposed as, “ ಆ.ಸ.ನೌ ರವರು ಆಗಸ್ಟ್-ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ 2015ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆ.ನೌ.ರರು ಮಿರಕಲ್ ಗ್ರಾ.ಪಂ. ವ್ಯಪ್ತಿಯ ಮನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶೌಚಾಲಯಗಳು ಇರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶೌಚಾಲಯ ಇತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ, ಆ.ನೌ.ರರು ಒಂದು ಸಾಮಗ್ರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಮತೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಬಿಲ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಶೌಚಾಲಯದ ಬಾಗಿಲಿನ ಫೋಟೋ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರು ಮತ್ತು ಕೂಲಿಕಾರರ ಹಣ ಪಾವತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು”. In the cross examination he has deposed as, “ಶೌಚಾಲಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಆಸನೌರವರು ಬಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸರಿ”. Further, the

complaint to this institution itself is as, “ಈ ಮೇಲಿನ ವಿಷಯ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಬೀದರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಬಸಕಲ್ಯಾಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಮಿರಖಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಮದ 2014-15ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ನಿರ್ಮಲ್ ಭಾರತ ಅಭಿಯಾನ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶೌಚಾಲಯ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹಾತ್ಮಾ ಗಾಂಧಿ ಉದ್ಯೋಗ ಖಾತ್ರಿ ಜಾಬ ಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಹೊಂದಿರುವ ಲೇಬರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಬಳಸದೇ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಿಚ್ಚಿಯಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮದೇ ಆದ ಲೇವರ್‌ಗಳು ತಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಾವು ಖುದ್ದಾಗಿ ಬಿಲ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಣ ಪಡೆದಿರುವ ಪಿ.ಡಿ.ಓ ಮತ್ತು ತನ್ನ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಇವರೆಗೂ ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಲ್ಲ ನಾವು ಖುದ್ದಾಗಿ ಆನ್‌ಲೈನ್ ನೋಡಿದಾಗ ನಮಗೆ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿದೆ”. Here, the DGO has not led any evidence. Though, the charge is like above, he has not at all produced any documents regarding the said aspect. So, this authority called for the complaint file and verified each and every document which are on record. They clearly reveal that, this DGO has not produced the photographs taken during the construction of toilet. The copies of photographs produced are not clear. Further, the application by the beneficiary under Niremal Bharath Abhiyana is dated 17.09.2014. The work confirmation certificate, Inspection of the site prior to construction(form No.3), 1st Stage work inspection report (Form No.5) and 2nd Stage of work inspection report (form No.7) are dated 17.9.2014. Application for work under MGNREG, Notice for reporting to work, application for release of incentive under Nirmal Bharath Abhiyana along with approval produced by the respondent are all dated 17.9.2014. In the approval order (form No.4) dated 25.9.2014, it is mentioned that the applicant Dilip



Shivajirao has filed application on 13.9.2014 and inspection before commencement of work is carried out on 20.9.2014. But the Muster Roll shows that the work has been carried out from 17.9.2014 upto 2.10.2014. Even before the approval order, the work is shown to have been commenced. The signature of the beneficiary Sri. Dilip Shivajirao on the application under Nirmal Bharath Abhiyan and the signature of the beneficiary in the application for work under MGNREG are totally different. Therefore, the name of the workers and bank account number which is mentioned in the application for work under MGNREG cannot be considered as the one which is provided by the beneficiary. So, all the documents produced by the DGO at the time of calling the comments from him are nothing but created documents. Later, at the stage of evidence also he has not at all produced any relevant documents in order to rebut the evidence led by the complainant or to defeat the charge framed against him.

22. So, from the available documents on record, it can be said without any hesitation that, the disciplinary authority has proved the charge levelled against him about the misappropriation of funds and dereliction of duty.

23. Hence, I answer the **Point No. 1 In the Affirmative and** I proceed to pass the following order;



ORDER

The Disciplinary Authority has proved the Charge framed against the DGO. Sri.Govindareddy, Panchayath Development Officer, Mirkhal Grama Panchayath, Mirkal, Basavakalyan Taluk, Bidar District.

This report be submitted to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta in a sealed cover forthwith.

Dated this the 26th March 2019


(K. BHAGYA)

Additional Registrar Enquiries-14
Karnataka Lokayukta
Bangalore

ANNEXURES

Sl. No.	Particulars of Documents
1	Witness examined on behalf of the Disciplinary Authority
	PW-1: Sri.Anil Kumar S/o Dilip Rao Patil,
2	Documents marked on behalf of the Disciplinary Authority Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-4
	Ex. P-1: Mustroll report (computerized)dated 5.9.2014
	Ex. P-2: Complaint Dated 2.11.2015.
	Ex. P-3: Lr. Dated 17.5.2016.
	Ex. P-4: Lr. Dated 16.5.2016. (xerox).
	Ex. P-5: Lr. Dated 14.12.2016. (xerox).
	Ex. P-6: Form No.I Original
	Ex. P-7: Form No. II

Dated this the 26th March 2019


(K. BHAGYA)

Additional Registrar Enquiries-14
Karnataka Lokayukta
Bangalore