

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No.UPLOK-2/DE/126/2022/ARE-18

Multi Storied Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru-560001
Date: 17th November, 2022.

RECOMMENDATION

Sub: Departmental Inquiry against Shri K.Ramesh, the then Tahsildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat-reg.

Ref: 1) Government Order No.ಸಿಆಸುಇ 36 ನೇಇಬಿ 2017, Bengaluru, dated: 30/05/2022.

2) Nomination Order No.UPLOK-2/DE/126/2022, Bengaluru, dated: 07/06/2022 of Upalokayukta, State of Karnataka, Bengaluru.

3) Inquiry Report dated: 17/11/2022 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-18, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.

The Government by its order dated: 30/05/2022 initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Shri K.Ramesh, the then Tahsildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat

(hereinafter referred to as Delinquent Government Officials, for short as DGO) and entrusted the Departmental Inquiry to this Institution.

2. This Institution by Nomination Order No.UPLOK-2/DE/126/2022, Bengaluru, dated: 07/06/2022 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-18, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru, as the Inquiry Officer to frame charges and to conduct Departmental Inquiry against DGO.
3. The DGO, Shri K.Ramesh, the then Tahsildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat tried for the following charges:

ಅನುಬಂಧ-1
ದೋಷಾರೋಪಣೆ

ಶ್ರೀ.ಕೆ.ರಮೇಶ್, ಹಿಂದಿನ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್, ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಹಾಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯ, (ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಆಪಾದಿತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರ 'ಆಸನೌ' ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಲ್ಪಡುವ) ಆದ ನೀವು, ದೂರುದಾರರು ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸಹೋದರರು ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಮರುವೇಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1 ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಪಾರಿಕತ್ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ದೂರುದಾರರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಲೋಪ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಆದಕಾರಣ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆಪಾದಿತ ನೌಕರರಾದ ನೀವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸೇವಕರಾಗಿದ್ದು, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಪಾಲನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಪೂರ್ಣ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸದೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸೇವಕರಿಗೆ ತರವಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು,

✓

ನೀವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಾಗರಿಕ ಸೇವಾ ನಿಯಮಗಳು (ನಡತೆ) 1966 ನಿಯಮ
(3)(1) (i) ರಿಂದ (iii)ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದುರ್ನಡತೆಯನ್ನೆಸಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries-18) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that, the Disciplinary Authority has 'Not Proved' the charge leveled against DGO, Shri K.Ramesh, the then Tahsildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat.
5. On perusal of the Inquiry Report, in order to prove the guilt of DGO, the Disciplinary Authority has examined one witness i.e., PW-1 and Ex. P-1 to P-11 documents were got marked. In fact, DGO was also examined himself as DW-1 and Ex. D-1 to D-13 documents were got marked.
6. On re-consideration of Inquiry Report and taking note of the totality of the circumstances of the case, 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 to exonerate DGO, Shri K.Ramesh, the then Tahsildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur


4

4

District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka
Government Secretariat of the charges leveled against him.

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.



(JUSTICE K.N.PHANEENDRA)
UPALOKAYUKTA-2,
STATE OF KARNATAKA.

5

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No: UPLOK-2/DE/126/2022/ARE-18

M.S.Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru - 560 001.
Dated: 17/11/2022

ENQUIRY REPORT

Present : Rajakumar S. Amminabhavi
Addl. Registrar of Enquiries-18,
Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bengaluru.

Sub:-The departmental enquiry against Sri K. Ramesh, the then Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat - reg.

- Ref:-** 1) G.O. No. ಸಿಆಸುಇ 36 ಸೇಇವಿ 2017 ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು dated: 30/05/2022.
2) Nomination order No. Uplok-2/DE/126/2022 Bengaluru, dated: 07/06/2022 of Hon'ble Upalokayukta-2, Karnataka.

The Departmental Enquiry is initiated against DGO on the basis of the complaint lodged by one Sri M.S. Abdul Karim, S/o Late Sattharsab, Maruvekere Village, Ganjalagunte Post, Kasaba Hobli, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkuru District (herein after referred as 'Complainant') against Sri K. Ramesh, the then Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat (herein

after referred to as the Delinquent Government Official in short 'DGO') who lodged a complaint before Karnataka Lokayukta that was taken up for investigation u/s 9 of Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984.

2. Brief allegations made in the complaint are that:-

ದೂರುದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಮರುವೇಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1 ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ದೂರುದಾರರು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸಹೋದರರು ಪಾರಿಕತ್ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ದೂರುದಾರರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಎದುರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೆ ನಿರ್ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಎದುರುದಾರರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ತನಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಎದುರುದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮರುವೇಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1, ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ 2ಎ, ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ಪತ್ರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಖಾತೆ ಪಹಣಿ ಮಾಡಲು ದಿ.14/5/2014 ರಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ದೂರುದಾರರು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದಿ.20/5/2014 ರಂದು ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ನಮೂನೆ 21 ಮತ್ತು 12 ಅನ್ನು ಎಂ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.6/2013-14 ರಂತೆ ದಿ.26/5/2014 ರಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರಿಗೆ ರವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಂತರ, ಆರ್.ಆರ್.ಟಿ/ಸಿ.ಆರ್/503/2013-14 ರಂತೆ ಸ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1 ರ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 4 ಗು., ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣವನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ, ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ 2ಎ., ಇರುವುದನ್ನು 2ಎ., 4ಗು., ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲು ದೂರುದಾರರು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಎಂ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.6/2013-14ನೇದ್ದನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದಿ.16/5/2016 ರಂದು ದೂರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹಿಂಬರಹ ನೀಡಿ ಸಕ್ಷಮ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ದೂರುದಾರರು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಯಮಾನುಸಾರ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಆದೇಶ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು ಅಂತ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ದೂರುದಾರರ 4 ಗು., ಜಮೀನಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಎದುರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡದಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಎದುರುದಾರರು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

3. Therefore, acting u/s 12(3) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984, recommendation is required to be made to the Competent Authority for initiating disciplinary proceedings against the respondent Sri K. Ramesh, the then Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat and to entrust the departmental inquiry to this authority under Rule 14-A of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957.
4. After assessing all the records and reports the Hon'ble Upalokayukta has arrived at a conclusion that, DGO has committed misconduct as per rule 3 (1) (i) to (iii) of KCSR (CCA) Rules, 1966. So, recommended for initiation of departmental enquiry acting u/s 12(3) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984 and recommended to initiate proceedings u/s 14-A of KCS (CCA) Rules 1957.
5. In view of Government Order cited at reference No.1, the Hon'ble Upalokayukta-2 vide Order cited at reference No.2 has nominated Additional Registrar Enquiries-18 to frame Articles of Charge and to conduct enquiry against aforesaid DGO.
6. On the basis of the nomination, Article of Charge was prepared under Rule 11(3) of the KCS (CCA) Rules and was sent to the DGO which is as follows;

ಅನುಬಂಧ-1
ದೋಷಾರೋಪಣೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

೨

ಶ್ರೀ.ಕೆ.ರಮೇಶ್, ಹಿಂದಿನ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್, ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಹಾಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯ, (ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಆಪಾದಿತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರ 'ಆಸನಾ' ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಲ್ಪಡುವ) ಆದ ನೀವು, ದೂರುದಾರರು ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸಹೋದರರು ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಮರುವೇಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1 ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಪಾರಿಕತ್ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ದೂರುದಾರರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಲೋಪ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಆದಕಾರಣ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆಪಾದಿತ ನೌಕರರಾದ ನೀವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸೇವಕರಾಗಿದ್ದು, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಪಾಲನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಪೂರ್ಣ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸದೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸೇವಕರಿಗೆ ತರವಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ನೀವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಾಗರಿಕ ಸೇವಾ ನಿಯಮಗಳು (ನಡತೆ) 1966 ನಿಯಮ (3)(1) (i) ರಿಂದ (iii)ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದುರ್ನಡತೆಯನ್ನೆಸಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಅನುಬಂಧ-2
ದೋಷಾರೋಪಣೆಯ ವಿವರ

1. ಶ್ರೀ.ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಅಬ್ದುಲ್ ಕರೀಮ್ ತಂದೆ ಲೇಟ್ ಸತ್ತರ್‌ಸಾಬ್, ಮರುವೇಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಗಂಜಲಗುಂಟೆ ಅಂಚೆ, ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್, ತುಮಕೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ (ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ "ದೂರುದಾರರು" ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಲ್ಪಡುತ್ತಾರೆ) ತಮ್ಮ ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ.ರಮೇಶ್, ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್, ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ತುಮಕೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ (ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ 'ಆಪಾದಿತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರು' "ಆಸನಾ" ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯಲ್ಪಡುತ್ತಾರೆ) ರವರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ನೀಡಿದ ದೂರನ್ನು, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಲೋಕಾಯುಕ್ತ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ಕಲಂ 9ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತನಿಖೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಿದೆ.

2. ದೂರಿನ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ಸಾರಾಂಶ:

ದೂರುದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಮರುವೇಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1 ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ದೂರುದಾರರು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸಹೋದರರು ಪಾರಿಕತ್ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ದೂರುದಾರರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಎದುರುದಾರರಿಗೆ

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೆ ನಿರ್ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎದುರುದಾರರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ತನಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 9

3. ಎದುರುದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮರುವೇಕೆರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1 ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ 2ಎ, ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ಪತ್ರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಖಾತೆ ಪಹಣಿ ಮಾಡಲು ದಿ.14/5/2014 ರಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ದೂರುದಾರರು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದಿ.20/5/2014 ರಂದು ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ನಮೂನೆ 21 ಮತ್ತು 12 ಅನ್ನು ಎಂ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.6/2013-14 ರಂತೆ ದಿ.26/5/2014 ರಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರಿಗೆ ರವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಂತರ ಆರ್.ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿ.ಆರ್.503/2013-14 ರಂತೆ ಸ.ನಂ.59/1ಎ1 ರ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 4 ಗು., ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣವನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. 2ಎ., ಇರುವುದನ್ನು 2ಎ., 4ಗು., ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲು ದೂರುದಾರರು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎಂ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.6/2013-14 ಅನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದಿ.16/5/2016 ರಂದು ದೂರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹಿಂಬರಹ ನೀಡಿ ಸಕ್ಷಮ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ದೂರುದಾರರು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಯಮಾನುಸಾರ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಆದೇಶ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು ಅಂತ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.
4. ದೂರುದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತ್ಯುತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಪುನರುಚ್ಚರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.
5. ದೂರುದಾರರು ಹಾಜರುಪಡಿಸಿದ ದೂರು ಮತ್ತು ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳು, ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮತ್ತು ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳು, ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತ್ಯುತ್ತರ ಮತ್ತು ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದಾಗ, ಪಾರಿಕತ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ದೂರುದಾರರ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ 2ಎ., ಜಮೀನು ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ನಂತರ ದೂರುದಾರರು ತನ್ನ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ "2ಎ., 4ಗು.," ಜಮೀನು ದಾಖಲಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಹೀಗಾಗಿ ಎಂ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.6/2013-14 ಅನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಆರ್.ಐ.ರವರು, ದಿ.27/6/2014 ರಂದು ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 2ಎ., ನಮೂದಾಗಿದ್ದು 4ಗು., ಕೈಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಅಂತ ಎಂ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.6/2013-14 ಅನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.
6. ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪ ವಿಭಾಗಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿದ್ದು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ದೂರುದಾರರು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೆ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ದೂರುದಾರರ ಜಮೀನು 2ಎ., 4 ಗು., ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು 2ಎ., ಅಂತ ಖಾತೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ದೂರುದಾರರಿಗೆ "4ಗು.," ಜಮೀನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ನಮೂದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಎದುರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ

70

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದಾಗ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಎಂ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.6/2013-14 ಅನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಏಕೆ ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ದೂರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ತನ್ನದಲ್ಲದ ತಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ದೂರುದಾರರು ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಅನುಭವಿಸುವಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ದೂರುದಾರರ 4 ಗು., ಜಮೀನಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಎದುರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡದಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎದುರುದಾರರು ಮೇಲ್ನೋಟಕ್ಕೆ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

7. ಅದಲ್ಲದೆ ಆಪಾದಿತ ನೌಕರರು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ/ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಾಗಿದ್ದು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರದೆ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಲೋಪವೆಸಗಿ, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ/ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ತರವಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಮೇಲ್ನೋಟಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಕಾರಣ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಾಗರೀಕ ಸೇವಾ (ನಡತೆ) ನಿಯಮ, 1966ರ ನಿಯಮಗಳು 3(1)(i) ಮತ್ತು (ii) ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದುರ್ನಡತೆ/ದುವರ್ತನೆಯೆಸಗಿದ್ದು, ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಭಾದ್ಯರಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಸದರಿಯವರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಇಲಾಖಾ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಲೋಕಾಯುಕ್ತ ಕಾಯಿದೆ ಕಲಂ 12(3)ರ ಅಡಿ ಪ್ರದತ್ತವಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಕ್ಷಮ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಆಪಾದಿತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರ ವಿರುದ್ಧದ ಇಲಾಖಾ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಾಗರೀಕ ಸೇವಾ (ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ, ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣ ಮತ್ತು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1957ರ ನಿಯಮ 14-(ಎ)ರಡಿ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ವಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಕೋರಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಶಿಸ್ತು ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯಾದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ (1)ರ ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಗೌರವಾನ್ವಿತ ಉಪಲೋಕಾಯುಕ್ತರವರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದು, ಗೌರವಾನ್ವಿತ ಉಪಲೋಕಾಯುಕ್ತರವರು ಅಪರ ನಿಬಂಧಕರು (ವಿಚಾರಣೆಗಳು-18) ಇವರನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಈ ಆಪಾದನೆ.

7. The said Article of Charge was sent to the DGO on 04/07/2022. Case was posted for appearance of the DGO on 18/07/2022.
8. On 18/07/2022 case was called out. AOC sent to DGO was duly served, the DGO is present and FOS of DGO is recorded and he claims for trial.

9. In order to substantiate and to prove the allegations leveled against the DGO, the disciplinary authority has got examined PW-1, complainant and got marked documents **EX.P-1 to 11** documents. The Disciplinary authority closes their side evidence.
10. Then, second oral statement of the DGO is recorded. The DGO submits that, he himself adduce his evidence.
11. Then the DGO himself examined as DW-1 and got marked documents **EX.D-1 to 13** documents. DW-1 is thereby fully cross examined. After closure of evidence of DGO, then the case is posted for arguments.
12. Heard the arguments on both sides.
13. Following are the points that arise for my consideration;
 - 1) Whether the Article of Charges leveled against the DGO, Sri K. Ramesh, the then Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat is proved by the Disciplinary Authority?.
14. My answer to the above point is in the '**Negative**' for the following:

REASONS

15. In order to substantiate the claim and prove the allegations of article of charge, the presenting officer has examined the complainant as PW-1. In his chief, he deposed that, his

12 ✓
father Late Sattarsab was having land bearing Sy.No.59/1A/a of Maruvekere Village, Madhugiri Taluk and his mother died on 26/08/2013 and his Father was died on 17/04/2014. For his parents, they are having three sons, among the three sons, he has given application on 13/05/2014 to the Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk for mutating their names to the said survey number land jointly in the name of himself and his two brothers i.e., Khalil Ahamed and Sameerulla. But, the DGO has not mutated their names and for that reason, the said application was given to the Tahasildar on 13/05/2014, the same is marked as Exhibit P-1 and his signature is marked as Exhibit P-1(a) and his mother and father's death certificate extract's are marked as Exhibit P-2 and 3 respectively. At the time of filing of the said application, he has also produced, heirship certificate dated 30/01/2015 and same is marked as Exhibit P-4 and in the said RTC of said Sy.No.59/1A/1, to the extent of 2 acre is marked as Exhibit P-5. In the said RTC his father's name was shown to the extent of 2 acres for the year 2013-14 and copy of said RTC is marked as Exhibit P-6. Since, the DGO has not complied the application filed by him and thereby, he has constrained to file the present complaint before this institution on 31/03/2015, it is marked as Exhibit P-7 and his signature is marked as Exhibit P-7(a) and along with Exhibit P-7 Form No. I and II are marked as Exhibit P-8 and 9 and his signature is marked as Exhibit P-8(a) and Exhibit P-9(a) respectively.

16. In his cross examination made by the DGO, he deposed that, he has filed the application to the DGO for entering their joint names of himself and his brothers in the RTC which is to the extent of measuring 2 acres. Further, it is true that, Revenue Inspector and Village Accountant came for spot inspection. He denied the suggestion that, the Revenue Inspector has jointly entered the names of himself and his brother in the said survey number. But, he volunteers that; endorsement issued by the Revenue Inspector reveals that, it cannot be jointly entered, as the application filed by him, since, he has filed the application mentioning, the land is measuring to the extent of 2 acres 4 gunta, though it is mentioned in the RTC to the extent 2 acres only.
17. The DGO himself is examined as DW-1. In his chief examination he deposed that, from March-2013 to June-2013, he served as Grade-I Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk. Thereafter, he was got transferred to that effect, he has produced the CTC which is marked as Exhibit D-1. Since, the complainant was given application for mutating the name of complainant and his brother's name jointly in the said survey number measuring 2 acre 4 gunta and the said application which is already marked and he has also produced some RTC which is marked as Exhibit D-2. Though the complainant filed application for mutating his name and his brother's name jointly in the said survey number stating that, it was 2 acre 4 gunta. But, actually it measures 2 acres only and thereby, he has send the said

case along with attached revenue documents to the 'Bhoomi section' and the said 'bhoomi section' have sent it to Revenue Inspector in Form No.12 and 21 and the said 'Boomi section', after receiving the same they have given No.5334/2013-14 dated 14/05/2014 and copy of the same is marked as Exhibit D-3. Form No.21 which have been issued by the bhoomi section dated 20/05/2014 and copy of the same is marked as Exhibit D-4.

18. Since, it is a disputed case, thereafter, the Revenue Inspector has given MR No. under **Rule 46** to the said land, copy of the said MR i.e., MR No.H6 and it is treated as **RRT/TCK/503/2013-14 of Maruvekere Sy.No.15/1A/1**. Though the application is given for certification the mutation of the said survey number to the extent of 2 acres 4 gunta. Since, original extent of land in the said survey number was only 2 acres and thereby, only on account of that reason, the Revenue Inspector rejected the said application under said MR on 27/06/2014 and said copy of MR which was not certified as per application made by the complainant and it is marked as Exhibit D-5.
19. Further, he has deposed that, as per Government circular No.RD/44/MRR/2014 dated 25/07/2014 for certification of heirship and copy of the said circular is marked as Exhibit D-6. It reveals that, the certification of heriship, for certification of the mutation, the Revenue Inspector may allow the said application or reject it. As per the said circular, Revenue Inspector is competent person for

certification of disputed mutation. Since, Revenue Inspector himself is authorized officer, in the disputed RTC there is '4' gunta of land was not having by the father of the complainant and it was only to the extent of 2 acre and on account of that reason only Revenue Inspector has rejected certification of said mutation and to that effect, the Revenue Inspector has also given endorsement dated 08/05/2015 to the complainant and copy of said endorsement is marked as Exhibit D-7.

20. On perusal of Exhibit D-7 it is clearly mentioned that, the complainant may challenge the order passed by the Revenue Inspector, before the Competent Authority i.e., Assistant Commissioner, Madhugiri as per the Exhibit D-7. The present complainant has also filed appeal before the Assistant Commissioner on 29/06/2015 and copy of the same is marked as Exhibit D-8. The copy of mutation extract (Rule-46) is marked as Exhibit D-9 and copy of heriship certificate of deceased father and mother of complainant issued by the Village Accountant is marked as Exhibit D-10. As per the heirship certificate issued by the Village Accountant, the deceased father and mother of complainant, apart from complainant's brother their parents are also having five daughters and said five daughters of their father have filed civil suit before the Civil Court Madhugiri bearing O.S. No. 155/2018 and copy of the plaint is marked as Exhibit D-11.

21. Further, the DGO has also submitted letter to Lokayukta office dated 19/06/2015 with respect to disputed survey number. The complainant may approach before the Competent Authority by way of filing appeal, as the Revenue Inspector was rejected disputed MR No.6/2013-14 dated 16/05/2015 and that copy of letter is marked as Exhibit D-12. The present DGO wrote letter to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur have wrote letter to the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, M.S. building, Bengaluru with respect to that, the complaint is pending before this institution and Assistant Commissioner, Madhugiri as per letter No.ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ:ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ/ಸಿಆರ್/102/2016-17 dated 19/05/2017 as per 12(3) submitted to the government by the Assistant Commissioner, Madhugiri to register the case against the DGO and copy of said letter dated 30/11/2017 issued by the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur, to the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department is marked as Exhibit D-13. These are the relevant documents produced by the DGO and thereby he prays for discharge him from the enquiry proceedings,
22. In the cross examination made by the Presenting officer, he deposed that, it is true that, the complainant at the time of filing application, he has produced copy of sale deed dated 16/04/1929 and said document is marked as Exhibit P-10, again he volunteers that, the said complainant which was produced documents along with application, it may be partition deed and said partition deed dated 30/03/1961 is

marked as Exhibit P-11. Further, it is true that, on perusal of Exhibit P-11 it measures 2 acres 4 guntas. He denied suggestion that, the complainant filed complaint for mutating joint name in Sy.No.59/1A/1, 2 acres 4 guntas of Maruvekere village is mentioned in Exhibit P-11. But, you have not mutated the said survey number to the extent of 2 acre 4 gunta and thereby, you have done dereliction in discharging his official duty. Further, he volunteer's that, since at the time of mutating the name of complainant's father in the RTC, it is to extent of 2 acre only and thereby only the Revenue Inspector, as per Exhibit D-5 have rejected the certification of said MR since, RTC which stands in the name of the father of the complainant only to the extent of 2 acre. Further, he denied the suggestion that, since, he being the higher official of Revenue Inspector knowing fully well complainant as per Exhibit P-11 he himself and his brothers were and are in possession and enjoyment of 2 acre 4 gunta's of landed property. He has not certified the said mutation to the extent of 2 acre 4 gunta and he is deposing falsely. It is true that, prior to computerization of RTC, it was written by hand, even mutations also hand written. It is true that, Exhibit D-11 which is not pertains to the present case in hand and he has produced the some documents which are not relates to the present case. He denied other suggestions.

23. On perusal of averments made in the complaint, documents produced by the complainant and also defence evidence and documents produced by the DGO. It is an admitted fact

18
that, complainant has filed application before the Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk as per Exhibit P-1 for mutating name of the complainant and his brother's after the death of their parents and he has produced the death certificates of his respective parents which are marked as Exhibit P-2 and 3. As per Exhibit P-5 which stands in the name of complainant's father. As per Exhibit P-6, RTC for the year 2013-14. It is also admitted that, since Tahasildar/DGO fails to comply the certification of mutation, on account of that reasons, complainant has filed the present complaint before this institution which is marked as Exhibit P-7 and Form No. I and II as Exhibit P-8 and 9. It is also admitted fact that, during the course of cross of PW-1, he has admitted that, Revenue Inspector and Village Accountant have visited the spot and it is also admitted fact that, the DGO was served as a Tahasildar Madhugiri Taluk till 2015.

24. Further, DGO in the cross examination made by the presenting officer, he has admitted that, the complainant was produced documents along with complaint Exhibit P-1 copy of sale deed dated 16/04/1929 which is marked as Exhibit P-10 and also partition deed dated 30/03/1961 in that document, 2 acre 4 gunta of said survey number land is shown and that document is marked as Exhibit P-11 and as per Exhibit P-11 in the said survey number 2 acre 4 gunta was fallen to the share of father of complainant as per Exhibit P-11.

25. Looking to the said admissions and documents produced by the complainant, the said disputed land as per Exhibit P-10 copy of sale deed and as per Exhibit P-11 partition deed, in the said survey number land measuring 2 acre 4 gunta was allotted to the share of complainant's father towards southern portion having specific boundaries. The said partition deed dated 30/03/1961. But, complainant has not produced copy of RTC as per Exhibit P-11. The said survey number land i.e., 2 acre 4 gunta was duly certified in the name of complainant's father and entered in the RTC. But, as per the RTC produced by the complainant himself which is marked as Exhibit P-6 for the year 2013-14, the name of his father is shown in the said survey number to the extent of 2 acre only. As per MR No.9/1974-75 and on account of that reason only, the said application filed by the complainant which was referred to the bhoomi section as a disputed one and thereafter, it was treated as RRT by the Revenue Inspector and by virtue of the RTC produced by the complainant for the year 2013-14.
26. Since, the complainants father and mother were died as per Exhibit P-2 and 3 and at the time of death of their father as per Exhibit P-6 the extent of land in the said survey number in column No.9 and 12, it was only to the extent of 2 acre and on that ground, the Revenue Inspector has rejected on 27/06/2014 the said mutation which is marked as Exhibit D-5 and Revenue Inspector has also given endorsement to the complainant to prefer an appeal against the order

passed by the Revenue Inspector in RRT No.503/2013-14, the said endorsement is marked as Exhibit D-7.

27. Since, as per circular produced by the DGO which is marked as Exhibit D-6, the Revenue Inspector who is the competent officer either to certify the mutation or reject it and against certification or rejection of mutation, the aggrieved party may prefer appeal before the Competent Authority. But, in the instant case, the complainant instead of preferring an appeal before the Competent Authority being aggrieved by the rejection of mutation as per Exhibit D-5, he has filed complaint before this authority. Even though he is having alternative remedy.
28. However, in the instant case, if the DGO as per the government order under reference, he ought not have challenged the government order as per reference No.1 or he ought not have challenged the article of charge before the competent authority, if he has not having jurisdiction. Since, defence set up by the DGO, by producing documents and his oral evidence, the complainant was and is having alternative remedy by challenging the alleged certification of order passed by the Revenue Inspector as per Exhibit D-5 i.e., MR No.H6/2013-14 rejecting RRT/CR/503/2013-14 dated 27/06/2014 by Revenue Inspector, Kasaba Hobli, Madhugiri Taluk before the Competent Authority and as per endorsement issued by the Revenue Inspector as per Exhibit D-7. Therefore, looking to the oral evidence, coupled with documentary evidence and period of trial faced by the DGO,

at the time of filing complaint before this institution and trial faced in the enquiry proceedings. Further, the DGO is already retired, this enquiry authority that, period of trial faced by the DGO that itself suffice. Hence, in the light of above observations the Competent Authority fails to prove the charges leveled against DGO rather than the defence set up by the DGO. Hence, I constrained to answer the above point in "**Negative**". Hence, I record the following;

FINDINGS

The Disciplinary Authority has not proved the charges leveled against the Delinquent Government Official Sri K. Ramesh, the then Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat.

Submitted to His Lordship Hon'ble Upalokayukta-2 for further action in the matter.



(RAJKUMAR.S.AMMINABHAVI)
C/c Additional Registrar Enquiries-18
Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.

A N N E X U R E S

1. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY:

PW1	Sri M.S. Abdul Karim, S/o Late Satthar Sab, Maruvekere Village, Ganjalagunte Post, Kasaba Hobli, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkuru District
-----	--

2. LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY:


Ex.P1	Letter dated 13/05/2014 of complainant addressed to Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk
Ex.P2	Xerox copy of Death certificate of Mother of the complainant
Ex.P3	Xerox copy of Death certificate of Father of the complainant
Ex.P4	Xerox copy of heirship certificate
Ex.P5	Xerox copy of the title book
Ex.P6	Xerox copy of RTC
Ex.P7	Letter dated 31/05/2015 of complainant addressed to Hon'ble Lokayukta. (original)
Ex.P8	Form No.I
Ex.P9	Form No.II
Ex.P10	Sale deed dated 16/04/1929
Ex.P11	Partition deed dated 30/03/1961

3. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF DELINQUENT GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL:

DW1	Sri K. Ramesh, the then Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk, Tumkur District, presently Under Secretary to Government, Karnataka Government Secretariat
-----	---

4. LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DELINQUENT GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL:

Ex.D1	Xerox copy of CTC
Ex.D2	Xerox copy of Letter dated 13/05/2014 of complainant addressed to Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk
Ex.D3	Xerox copy of document forwarded to bhoomi section
Ex.D4	Xerox copy of Form No.21
Ex.D5	Xerox copy of MR dated 27/06/2014
Ex.D6	Xerox copy of circular dated 25/07/2014
Ex.D7	Xerox copy of endorsement dated 08/05/2015
Ex.D8	Xerox copy of Letter dated 29/06/2015 of complainant addressed to Assistant Commissioner, Madhugiri Sub-Division
Ex.D9	Xerox copy of the mutation extract dated 14/05/2014
Ex.D10	Xerox copy of heirship certificate
Ex.D11	Xerox copy of O.S. No.155/2018
Ex.D12	Xerox copy of letter dated 19/06/2015 of Tahasildar, Madhugiri Taluk
Ex.D13	Xerox copy of letter dated 30/11/2017 of Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District


(RAJKUMAR.S.AMMINABHAVI)
 C/c Additional Registrar Enquiries-18
 Karnataka Lokayukta,
 Bengaluru.

