

No.UPLOK-2/DE.811/2017/ARE-11

Multi Storied Building, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi, Bengaluru-560 001. Dated 04.03.2022

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Sri G.Krishnareddy, Panchayath Development Officer, Palyakere Grama Panchayath, Bagepalli Taluk, Chikkaballapur District - reg.

Ref:- 1) Government Order No.RDP 501 GPS 2017 dated 15.06.2017.

- 2) Nomination order No. UPLOK-2/DE.811/2017 dated 23.06.2017 of Hon'ble Upalokayukta, State of Karnataka.
- 3) Inquiry report dated 02.03.2022 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.

The Government by its order dated 15.06.2017 initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Sri G.Krishnareddy, Panchayath Development Officer, Palyakere Grama Panchayath, Bagepalli Taluk, Chikkaballapur 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-2/DE.811/2017 dated 23.06.2017 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-11, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bangalore, 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 was tried for the charge of causing delay in making payment of cheque for Rs.5000/- which was dishonored for insufficient balance, from the fund reserved for higher education of SC/ST and thereby committed misconduct.
- 4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries11) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary
 evidence has held that, the above charge against the DGO Sri
 G.Krishnareddy, Panchayath Development Officer,

Palyakere Grama Panchayath, Bagepalli Taluk, Chikkaballapur District, is 'not proved '.

- 5. On re-consideration of report of inquiry, I do not find any reason to interfere with the findings recorded by the Inquiry Officer. Therefore, it is hereby recommended to the Government to accept the report of Inquiry Officer and exonerate DGO Sri G.Krishnareddy, Panchayath Development Officer, Palyakere Grama Panchayath, Bagepalli Taluk, Chikkaballapur District, of the charges leveled against him.
 - 6. Action taken in the matter shall be intimated to this Authority.

Connected records are enclosed herewith.

JUSTICE B.S.PATIL)

Upalokayukta-2, State of Karnataka.

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

NO.UPLOK-2/DE/811/2017/ARE-11

M.S.Building, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi, Bengaluru-560 001, Date: 02/03/2022.

:: ENQUIRY REPORT::

Sub: Departmental Enquiry against:

Shri. G. Krishnareddy, Panchayath Development Officer, Palyakere Grama Panchayath, Bagepalli Taluk, Chikkaballapur District - reg.

- Ref: 1. Government Order No. ಗ್ರಾಅಪ 501 ಗ್ರಾಪಂಕಾ 2017, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ 15/06/2017.
 - 2. Nomination Order No. UPLOK-2/DE/811/2017, Bengaluru dated 23/06/2017.
- 1. The Departmental Enquiry is initiated against Shri. G. Krishnareddy, Panchayath Development Officer, Palyakere Grama Panchayath, Bagepalli Taluk, Chikkaballapur District (hereinafter referred to as the Delinquent Government Official, in short DGO) on the basis of the complaint dated 27/01/2016 of Complainant, Shri. Rajashekar L. of Mandyanpalli, Bagepalli, Chikkaballapur. The allegation in the complaint was that the DGO gave cheque for Rs.5,000/- to complainant on 12/11/2014 as beneficiary for higher education to SC/ST. But the same was dishonoured for insufficient funds. By this, the DGO has committed misconduct, dereliction of duty, and complainant prayed to take action.

- 2. Hon'ble Upalokayukta on perusal of complaint, copy of cheque issued by DGO, report dated 06/02/2017 and other documents found prima-facie case, and forwarded Report dated 16/05/2017 U/s 12(3) of The Karnataka Lokayukta Act 1984, to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the DGO. The Government by its order dated 15/06/2017 entrusted the matter to Hon'ble Upalokayukta.
- 3. Hon'ble Upalokayukta by its order dated 23/06/2017 nominated this Additional Registrar Enquiries, to conduct enquiry. Notice of Articles of Charges, statement of imputations of misconduct with list of witness and documents was served upon the DGO. The DGO denied the charges and claimed to be enquired. The DGO has shown his shown his date of retirement as 31/07/2023 in his first oral statement.
- 4. The Articles of charge framed by ARE-11 is as follows:

ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಆರ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣಾರೆಡ್ಡಿ ಆದ ನೀವು ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಬಾಗೇಪಲ್ಲಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಪಾಳ್ಯಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 2014–15ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ 13ನೆಯ ಹಣಕಾಸು ಯೋಜನೆಯಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಯಾದ ಅನುದಾನದ ಶೇಕಡಾ 25ರಲ್ಲಿ ರೂ.10,000/–ಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಜಾತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಉನ್ನತ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು. 5,000/-ಗಳನ್ನು ಫಿರ್ನಾಧಿಯಾದ ಪ್ಸೆಕಿ ರೂ. ಅನುದಾನದ ಎಲ್.ರಾಜಶೇಖರ ರವರಿಗೆ ಚೆಕ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ನೀಡುವಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ವಿಳಂಬ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ತಡವಾಗಿ ರೂ.5,000/–ಗಳ ಚೆಕ್ಕನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಕಾರಣ ಸದರಿ ಚೆಕ್ ತಿರಸ್ಕೃತಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕಾರಣರಾಗಿದ್ದು ಆ ಮೂಲಕ ನೀವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕುದಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ದುರ್ನಡತೆಯಿಂದ



ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಾಗರಿಕ ಸೇವಾ ನಿಯಮಗಳು (ನಡತೆ) 1966 ನಿಯಮ 3(1) (ii) ರಿಂದ (iii) ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದುರ್ನಡತೆಯನ್ನೆಸಗಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ.

5. The statement of imputations of misconduct framed by ARE-11 is as follows:

ದೂರುದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ರಾಜಶೇಖರ್ ಬಿನ್ ವೆಂಕಟರಮಣಪ್ಪ, ಮಂಡ್ಯಂಪಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಪಾಳ್ಯಕೆರೆ ಅಂಚೆ, ಬಾಗೇಪಲ್ಲಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಮರ ಇವರು ತಮ್ಮ ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ 2014–15ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ 13ನೆಯ ಹಣಾಸು ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡಾ 25ರ ಎಸ್.ಸಿ/ಎಸ್.ಟಿ. ಅನುದಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಶೇಕಡಾ 22.75% ಎಸ್.ಸಿ/ಎಸ್.ಟಿ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಉನ್ನತ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟ ಅನುದಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಧನಸಹಾಯ ನೀಡುವಂತೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 16–11–2013ರಂದು ದೂರುದಾರರು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಗ್ರಾಮಸಭೆ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ವಿಳಂಬ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರ ಕಾರಣ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಹಕ್ಕು ಅಧಿನಿಯಮದಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದಾಗ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೋರಬಾರದೆಂದು ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ನೀಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ರೂ.10.000/–ಗಳ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನೀಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಆಮಿಷವೊಡ್ಡಿದ್ದು, ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಮಿಷಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗದೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ದಿನಾಂಕ 12–11–2014ರಂದು ಆಪಾದಿತರಾದ ನೀವು ಯಾವುದೇ ಗ್ರಾಮಸಭೆ ನಡೆಸದೆ ರೂ.5,000/–ಗಳ ಚೆಕ್ಕನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಚೆಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 15–1–2014ರಂದು ಹಾಜರು ಪಡಿಸಿದಾಗ ಸದರಿ ಚೆಕ್ಕು ಅಮಾನ್ಯಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಆಪಾದನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂದಿಸಿದಂತೆ, ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಮರ ಲೋಕಾಯುಕ್ತ ಮೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧೀಕ್ಷಕರು ತನಿಖೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರಂತೆ ತನಿಖಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ತನಿಖೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ.

- 1)ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ವಿಳಂಬ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ರೂ.5,000/–ಗಳ ಚೆಕ್ಕನ್ನು ನೀಡಿರುವುದು.
- 2) ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಚೆಕ್ಕು ಅಮಾನ್ಯಗೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತದೆ.



UPLOK-2/DE/811/2017/ARE-11 ಶೇಕಡಾ 25%ರ ಅನುದಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಧನ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ವಿನಾ:ಕಾರಣ ತೊಂದರೆ ನೀಡಿರುವುದು.

ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಗೆ ತನಿಖಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ತನಿಖಾ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಪಾದಿತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಾದ ನೀವು ಎಸ್.ಸಿ./ಎಸ್.ಟಿ. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಉನ್ನತ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ನೀಡಲು ವಿಳಂಬ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ತದನಂತರ ರೂ.5,000/-ಗಳ ಚೆಕ್ಕನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದ್ದು ಸದರಿ ಚೆಕ್ಕು ಸಹ ಅಮಾನ್ಯಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಈ ಕೃತ್ಯ ದುರ್ನಡತೆ ಎಂಬ ಪರಿಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಸೇವಾ (ನಡತೆ) 1966ರಡಿ 3(1)ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದುರ್ವರ್ತನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎದುರುದಾರರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಶಿಸ್ತಿನ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಕ್ಷಮ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಲೋಕಾಯುಕ್ತ ಕಾಯ್ಗೆ ಕಲಂ 12(3) ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಜರುಗಿಸಿ ಇಲಾಖಾ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಗೆ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ನೀಡುವಂತೆ ಕೋರಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ಸಕ್ಷಮ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಶಿಫಾರಸನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮಕೈಗೊಂಡು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವಂತೆ ಗೌರವಾನ್ವಿತ ಉಪಲೋಕಾಯುಕ್ತರವರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ದೋಷಾರೋಪಣೆ.

- 6. The DGO filed written statement on 15/11/2017 denying the allegations, and has stated in paragraph No. 6 that on humanitarian grounds, he has paid the amount to complainant before RTI Commissioner, out of record. He has prayed to exonerate him.
- 7. The points that arise for consideration are as follows:
 - Whether the disciplinary authority proves that the DGO gave cheque for Rs.5,000/- to complainant, beneficiary meant for higher education of SC/ST, and same was dishonoured and thereby, the DGO has committed misconduct, dereliction of duty, acted in a manner unbecoming of a government servant and not



maintained absolute integrity, violating R.3(1)(i) to(iii) of K.C.S. (conduct) Rules, 1966?

(2) What findings?

- 8. (a) The disciplinary authority has examined 2 witnesses and got 19 documents exhibited.
- (b) The DGO has examined himself as DW1 and got 2 documents exhibited.
- 9. Heard Learning Presenting Officer and perused written brief of DGO and all documents.
- 10. The answers to the above points are :
 - (a) In the Negative.
 - (b) As per final findings, for the following.

REASONS

11. (a) **Point No.1-** Complainant/PW1 has deposed that he belongs to scheduled caste, and he was entitled for benefit of Rs.10,000/- for higher education of scheduled caste and scheduled tribe in the year 2013-14. He had filed application for the same, and the Xerox copy is got marked as ExP1. Another application to PDO of Palyakere panchayath is marked as ExP2. Allotment of funds for civil works is got marked as ExP3. Cheque of Rs.5,000/- signed by DGO was handed over to Rangaswamy, who is younger brother of his brother. The cheque was not signed by the President of said Panchayath. On presentation by PW1, the cheque was dishonoured. PW1 returned the cheque to DGO. Report of Bagepalii taluk panchayath is got marked as ExP4. Cheque signed by DGO and president is got marked as ExP5.



UPLOK-2/DE/811/2017/ARE-11

- (b) PW1 further deposed that he filed application under RTI Act, and letter of correspondence to taluk panchayath to Bagepalli D.C. Chikkaballapur are all got marked as ExP6 to 12. The DGO furnished wrong information, and therefore PW1 states that he lodged complaint before lokayukta. The complaint is got marked as ExP15 and form I and II as ExP13and 14.
- (c) PW1 in cross examination by Learned Advocate for DGO has stated that he was staying in hostel in Bengaluru, when application which is at ExP2 was submitted by him. He used to come to his village once in a month. He has stated that he received endorsement from bank with respect to dishonour of cheque. He states that he does not know that members of panchayath have given application to withhold his cheque. He states that funds were not available to honour the cheque. He has not filed complaint under provisions of N.I.Act.
- 12. (a) PW2 Shri. Hjaresh.A.Killedar, investigating officer, has deposed that he recorded statements of DGO and PW1. The same are got marked as ExP16 and 17respectively. He states that he furnished report that DGO had given cheque which has been dishonoured and that, PW1 has received Rs.7,000/- from DGO personally. The same is in paragraph No. 3, 7th line, which reads as hereunder.

"Witness identifies his report, and same is marked as ExP18 and witness signature is marked as ExP18(a). I have given report that DGO had given cheque, ExP5, and same was dishonoured, and that PW1 has received Rs. 7,000/- from the DGO personally. Even PW1 has accepted in his statement,



ExP17 about having received Rs.5,000/- once and Rs. 2,000/- another time, from DGO."

The report of PW2 is got marked as ExP18 and that of S.P., Lokayukta, Chikkaballapur is got marked as ExP19.

- (b) In cross examination by Learned Advocate for DGO, PW2 has stated that he has not received any document that DGO had received letter from president of said gram panchayath, that PW1 is non-resident, and payment should not be done.
- 13. (a) The DGO/DW1 has stated that he has paid Rs.5,000/-once to PW1, and on direction of RTI commissioner Rs.2,000/-, total Rs.7,000/- to PW1 for his education, and same is not in relation to this matter. He has got office note dated 24/11/2014 addressed to DGO marked as ExD1 and copy of action plan is got marked as ExD2. He states that PW1 has given false information about him in application and lodged false complaint.
- (b) In cross-examination by Learned Presenting Officer, he has stated that Rs.5,000/- to PW1 was paid prior to appearance before Information Commissioner. He has denied the suggestion that costs of Rs.2,000/- was imposed upon him by Information Commissioner.
- 14. From above evidence, the charge is mainly with respect to dishonour of cheque for no genuine cause. PW1/Complainant in chief examination states that the cheque of Rs.5,000/- got dishonoured as the president had not signed it. In cross examination , he states that it was dishonoured for insufficient funds, He also states that he was living in Bengaluru and visits village once in a month. As such, when there are different versions



UPLOK-2/DE/811/2017/ARE-11 of the holder of cheque, it was incumbent upon the disciplinary authority to produce the Memo of bank with respect to dishapour

authority to produce the Memo of bank with respect to dishonour of cheque, that forms the relevant document to prove the said aspect along with other documents. But the same is not adduced. Also even report of PW2 which is at ExP18 paragraph No.2, page No. 2, shows that Rs.7,000/- is already paid by DGO to PW1. DGO says, he has paid on humanitarian grounds. Taking all this into consideration this ARE finds that disciplinary authority has not proved the charges against the DGO. Accordingly, this point is answered is the **Negative**.

15. **Point No.2:-** For the aforesaid reasons this Additional Registrar (Enquiries) proceeds to record the following:

FINDINGS

The disciplinary authority has not proved the charges against the DGO.

Submitted to Hon'ble Upalokayukta for kind approval, and necessary action in the matter.

(SACHIN KAUSHIK R.N.)

I/c Additional Registrar Enquiries-11), Karnataka Lokayukta, Bangalore.

ANNEXURE

List of witnesses examined on behalf of the Disciplinary Authority:-

PW1:-

Sri.Rajashekara. L

PW2:-

Sri.Hjaresh Killedar

43/22

List of witnesses examined on behalf DGO:-

D.W.1 Sri. G.R.Krishnareddy

List of documents marked on behalf of Disciplinary Authority:-

Ex P1	Xerox copy Application dated 16/11/2013.
Ex P2	Xerox copy of one more application addressed to PDO dated 23/08/2014
Ex P3	Xerox copy of a list of the allotment of funds of the year 2014-15.
Ex P4	Xerox copy of enquiry report conducted by Bagepalli taluk panchayath dated 18/03/2016.
Ex P5	Xerox copy of the cheque dated 12/11/2016.
Ex P6	Xerox copy of application filed under RTI Act 23/08/2014.
Ex P7	Xerox copy of application filed under RTI Act 10/10/2014.
Ex P8	Xerox copy of letter of DGO dated 05/09/2014.
Ex P9	Xerox copy of application addressed to the Executive Officer dated 10/10/2014.
Ex P10	Xerox copy of reminder dated 15/10/2014.
Ex P11	Xerox copy of application under RTI Act dated 26/11/2014.
Ex P12	Xerox copy of application addressed to D.C. Chikkaballapur dated 22/01/2016.
Ex P13	Original complaint in FORM NO1 dated 27/01/2016.
Ex P14	Original affidavit in FORM No.II
Ex P15	Original complaint dated 27/01/2016
Ex P16	Statements of DGO and PW1 recorded on 30/01/2017
Ex P17	Statements of DGO and PW1 recorded on 30/01/2017
Ex P18	Report of PW2 dated 30/01/2017
Ex P18(a)	Witness signature
Ex P19	Report of S.P.Lokayukta, Chikkaballapur dated 06/02/2017



UPLOK-2/DE/811/2017/ARE-11

List of documents marked on behalf of Defence.

Ex D1	Copy of office note dated 24/11/2014.
Ex D2	Copy of action plan of the year 2014/15.

(SACHIN KAUSHIK R.N.)

I/c Additional Registrar (Enquiries-11), Karnataka Lokayukta, Bangalore.