



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No.LOK/INQ/14-A/219/2012/ARE-4

Multi Storied Building,  
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,  
Bengaluru-560 001.  
Dated 11.05.2018

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Shri M.B. Mallikarjuna s/o M. Basavaraju, First Division Assistant, Office of the Joint Director of Public Instruction, Mysuru - reg.

- Ref:- 1) Government Order No. ED 118 LIB 2012 dated 14.05.2012 and its corrigendum dated 16.05.2012.
- 2) Nomination order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/219/2012 dated 25.05.2012 of Upalokayukta-2, State of Karnataka.
- 3) Inquiry Report dated 09.05.2018 of Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru.

~~~~~

The Government by its Order dated 14.05.2012 and its corrigendum dated 16.05.2012, initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Shri M.B. Mallikarjuna s/o M. Basavaraju, First Division Assistant, Office of the Joint Director of Public Instruction, Mysuru [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/219/2012 dated 25.05.2012 nominated Additional Registrar

of Enquiries-3, 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. LOK/INQ/14-A/2014 dated 14.03.2014, the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-8, Karnataka Lokayukta was re-nominated as Inquiry Officer to conduct departmental inquiry against DGO. Finally, by Order No. UPLOK-2/DE/2016 dated 03.08.2016, the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru was re-nominated as Inquiry Officer to conduct departmental inquiry against DGO.

3. The DGO - Shri M.B. Mallikarjuna s/o M. Basavaraju, First Division Assistant, Office of the Joint Director of Public Instruction, Mysuru was tried for the following charge:-

“That you, Sri M.B. Mallikarjuna, (hereinafter referred to as Delinquent Government Official, in short DGO), while working as the First Division Assistant, O/o the Joint Director, Public Instruction Department, Mysore demanded and accepted a bribe of Rs.5,000/- on 07/06/2008 from complainant Smt. Maya w/o Suresh, No. 1854, Rathan Singh, 1<sup>st</sup> cross, Mandi Mohalla, Mysore for getting changed/changing the name of the daughter of the complainant in her Marks Card of March 2007 from Krutika to Heera, that is for doing an official act, and thereby you failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and thus 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- 4) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that, the Disciplinary Authority has '*proved*' the above charge against the DGO - Shri M.B. Mallikarjuna s/o M. Basavaraju, First Division Assistant, Office of the Joint Director of Public Instruction, Mysuru.


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.

6. As per the First Oral Statement of DGO furnished by the Inquiry Officer, the DGO - Shri M.B. Mallikarjuna is due to retire from service on 31.05.2029.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge (demand and acceptance of bribe) '*proved*' against DGO - Shri M.B. Mallikarjuna s/o M. Basavaraju, First Division Assistant, Office of the Joint Director of Public Instruction, Mysuru, it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of 'compulsory retirement from service on the DGO - Shri M.B. Mallikarjuna'.

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.

  
(JUSTICE N. ANANDA) 11/5  
Upalokayukta,  
State of Karnataka.

**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No.LOK/INQ/14-A/219/2012/ARE-4

M.S. Building  
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Road  
Bangalore-560 001  
Date: 09/05/2018

**:: ENQUIRY REPORT ::**

**Sub:** Departmental Enquiry against,

Sri M.B. Mallikarjuna  
s/o M. Basavaraju  
First Division Assistant  
Public Instruction Department  
Office of the Joint Director  
**Mysore**

- Ref:**
- 1) Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in  
Compt/Uplok/MYS/431/2010/ARE-11  
Dated: 21/01/2012
  - 2) G.Order. No. ED 118 LIB 2012  
Bangalore, dated: 14/05/2012 and its  
corrigendum dated: 16/05/2012
  - 3) Order No.LOK/INQ/14-A/219/2012  
Bangalore dated: 25/05/2012  
of the Hon'ble Upalokayukta

\*\*\*

This Departmental Enquiry is directed against Sri M.B. Mallikarjuna s/o M. Basavaraju, First Division Assistant, Public Instruction Department, Office of the Joint Director, **Mysore** (herein after referred to as the Delinquent Government Official in short "DGO").

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

3. In view of the Government Order cited above at reference-2, the Hon'ble Upalokayukta, vide order dated: 25/05/2012 cited above at reference-3, nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-3 of the office of the Karnataka Lokayukta as the Enquiry Officer to frame charges and to conduct Inquiry against the aforesaid DGO. Additional Registrar Enquires-3 prepared Articles of Charge, Statement of Imputations of mis-conduct, list of documents proposed to be relied and list of witnesses proposed to be examined in support of Article of Charges. Copies of same were issued to the DGO calling upon him to appear before this Authority and to submit written statement of his defence.

4. When the matter was pending for enquiry in recording the evidence of the witnesses of Disciplinary Authority, this matter was transferred to Addl. Registrar of Enquiries-8 vide Order No.LOK/INQ/14-A/2014, Bangalore dated: 14/03/2014 of the Hon'ble Uplokayukta Addl. Registrar of Enquirie-8 proceeded with the enquiry in recording the evidence of PW1 and PW2. When the matter pending for recording of evidence of PW3, again transferred to this Addl. Registrar of Enquiries-4 vide O.M. No. Uplok-2/DE/2016 Bengaluru, dated: 03/08/2016 of the Hon'ble Registrar issued with the concurrence of the Hon'ble Upalokayukta. Hence, this enquiry case proceeded by this Addl. Registrar of Enquiries-4 in accordance with law.

5. The Article of Charges framed by ARE-3 against the DGO is as below;

**ANNEXURE NO.I**  
**CHARGE**

*That you, Sri M.B. Mallikarjuna, (hereinafter referred to as Delinquent Government Official, in short DGO), while working as the First Division Assistant, O/o the Joint Director, Public Instruction Department, Mysore demanded and accepted a bribe of Rs.5,000/- on 07/06/2008 from complainant Smt. Maya w/o Suresh, No. 1854, Rathan Singh, 1<sup>st</sup> cross, Mandi Mohalla, Mysore for getting changed/changing the name of the daughter of the complainant in her Marks Card of March 2007 from Krutika to Heera, that is for doing an official act, and thereby you failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and thus you are guilty of misconduct under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of KCS (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

**ANNEXURE NO.II**

**STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT**

*The complainant Smt. Maya w/o Suresh, No. 1854, Rathan Singh 1<sup>st</sup> cross, Mandi Mohalla, Mysore filed a complaint on 05/06/2008 before the Police Inspector, Karnataka Lokayukta, Mysore alleging that, her daughter Krutika Naidu passed 10<sup>th</sup> Std., in the year 2007, and that she had filed a suit in the court for change of the name of her daughter from Krutika to Heera and that the said suit was decreed in the month of September 2007 and that, she had filed application before the DDPI and St. Mathais School, Mysore for changing the name of her daughter as Heera in the School records and in the school records her name was changed as Heera and that on*

03/03/2008 she filed an application along with the copy of the decree passed by the Court before the Joint Director, Public Instructions Department, Mysore for change of the name of her daughter in her SSLC Marks card of March 2007 and that in that connection, she had met Sri M.B. Mallikarjuna, First Division Assistant, O/o the Joint Director, Public Instruction Department, Mysore (herein after referred to as Delinquent Government Servant, in short DGO) on many occasions and inspite of it, he had not done the work and made her to wander and that on 04/06/2008 again she went to the DGO and asked him about her work and at that time, he demanded a bribe of Rs. 10,000/- and that when she pleaded her inability to pay so much of amount he reduced it to Rs.5,000/- and he told her that the said bribe amount of Rs.5,000 should be paid on 05/06/2008 and thus, the DGO demanded and insisted for the payment of bribe amount of Rs. 5,000/-

As the complainant was not willing to pay any bribe to the DGO, he went to the Police Inspector, Karnataka Lokayukta Mysore on 05/06/2008 and lodged a complaint. On the basis of the same a case was registered in Mysore Lokayukta Police Station Cr. No.07/2008 for offences punishable under Sections 7,13(1)(d) r/w section 13(2) of the P.C. Act, 1988 and FIR was submitted to the concerned learned special judge.

After registering the case, investigating Officer observed all the pre-trap formalities and entrustment mahazar was conducted and you, the DGO was trapped on 07/06/2008 by the Investigating Officer after your demanding and accepting the bribe amount of Rs.5,000/- from the complainant in the presence of shadow witness and the said bribe amount which you had received from the complainant was seized from your possession under



*the seizure/trap mahazar after following the required post trap formalities. During the investigation the I.O. has recorded the statements of panchas and other witnesses and further statement of the complainant. The I.O. during the investigation has sent the seized articles to the chemical examiner and obtained the report from him and he has given the result as positive.*

*The materials collected by the I.O. during the investigation prima facie disclose that you, the DGO, demanded and accepted bribe of Rs. 5,000/- from the complainant on 07/06/2008 for doing an official act i.e., for getting changed/changing the name of the daughter of the complainant in her marks card of March 2007 from Krutika to Heera. Thus you, the DGO, have failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and this act on your part is unbecoming of a Government Servant. Hence, you have committed an act which amounted to misconduct as stated under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of KCS (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

*In this connection an observation note was sent to you, the DGO and you have submitted your reply which, after due consideration, was found not acceptable. Therefore, a recommendation was made to the competent authority under Section 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta, Act 1984, to initiate departmental proceedings against you, the DGO. The Government after considering the recommendation made in the report, entrusted the matter to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta to conduct departmental/disciplinary proceedings against you, the DGO and to submit report. Hence the charge.*

6. DGO appeared before this Enquiry Authority on 08/01/2013 and on the same day his First Oral statement

was recorded U/R 11(9) of KCS (CC & A) Rules 1957. The DGO pleaded not guilty and claims to hold an enquiry.

7. DGO has filed his written statement contending that, he has not demanded any illegal gratification and he has not accepted the same and he has been falsely implicated in this case. DGO has not committed any misconduct as alleged. The DGO reserved his right to produce the relevant documents at the time of the evidence. Hence, he has prayed for cross-examination of the witnesses and to exonerate him from the charges leveled against him in this case.

8. In order to substantiate the charge leveled against the DGO, the Disciplinary Authority examined in all three witnesses as PW1 to PW3 and got marked documents at Ex.P1 to P14. In spite of sufficient opportunity given PW3 has not been cross-examined and the cross-examination of PW3 has been taken as nill. The DGO remained absent for recording his Second Oral Statement and he has been placed exparte. As the DGO has remained exparte questioning of the DGO u/Rule 11(18) of KCS (CC&A) Rules was dispensed with.

9. The Disciplinary Authority through the Presenting Officer as well as DGO have not submitted the separate written brief. Oral argument of the Presenting Officer was heard. The points, that arise for the consideration of this enquiry authority are:-

Point NO.1:-Whether the Disciplinary Authority satisfactorily proved the charges framed against DGO?

Point NO.2:- What order?

10. My finding on the above points are as follows:-

Point No.1: In the “ **AFFIRMATIVE**”

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

**:: REASONS ::**

**11. Point No.1:** It is the case of the Disciplinary Authority that the DGO while working as First Division Assistant in the office of the Joint Director of Public Instruction Department, Mysore demanded and accepted the bribe amount of Rs. 5,000/- on 07/06/2008 from the complainant Smt. Maya w/o Suresh, for changing the name of the daughter of the complainant in the marks card and thereby he has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty.

12. The complainant has been examined as PW1 and copy of the complaint lodged by her in the Lokayukta police station is at Ex.P1. In Ex.P1 PW1 has stated that her daughter Kum. Krutika Naidu passed 10<sup>th</sup> standard in the year 2007 (SSLC) and after consulting the astrologer it was decided to change the name of the daughter of PW1 from S. Krutika Naidu to Kum. Heera and in that respect a suit was filed before the Mysore Civil Court and the court passed the decree for change of name as sought for in September 2007. In Ex.P1 it is further stated that on 03/03/2008 PW1 gave the copy of the decree of the civil court to the office of the Joint Director of Public Instruction, Mysore for change of the name of her daughter in the SSLC marks card and the original SSLC mark card was also given to the said office. In Ex.P1 it is further stated that the concerned clerk Sri Mallikarjuna (DGO) did not do the work and made her to visit the said office several times

and on 04/06/2008 when she met the DGO in his office and requested for her work the DGO demanded bribe of Rs. 10,000/- and when she told him that she cannot give the amount demanded the DGO reduced the bribe amount to Rs.5,000/- and told that if Rs.5,000/- is not given, the work cannot be done and also asked her to bring the amount on 05/06/2008 and hence he has filed the complaint. The complaint has been lodged on 05/06/2008 at 10 a.m. in Lokayukta police station, Mysore.

13. PW1 in her evidence has reiterated all the above said averments made in her complaint-Ex.P1. She has deposed that she had approached the DGO several times for change of name of her daughter in the SSLC mark card and the DGO demanded bribe of Rs. 10,000/- and after discussion he reduced the bribe amount to Rs.5,000/- and hence she gave the complaint as per Ex.P1. She has deposed that after she lodged the complaint the police inspector summoned two pancha witnesses to the Lokayukta police station and introduced them to her.

14. PW2 is one of the pancha witness by name Sri Kiran Kumar N.V. and he has deposed that in the year 2008 he was working as FDA in the office of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation South Zone, Mysore and as per the instructions of his higher officer he had been to the Lokayukta police station on 05/06/2008 at 11 a.m. and in the police station another pancha witness Smt. Hemalatha and the complainant were present and he was introduced to them. He has deposed that he was also made aware of the complaint lodged by PW1.

15. PW1 and PW2 have deposed about the entrustment mahazar, the copy of which is at Ex.P2. They have deposed that PW1 produced five currency notes of the denomination of Rs. 1,000/- each and the serial numbers of the currency notes were noted in the separate sheet and phenolphthalein powder was applied to the currency notes. They have further deposed that after the same the notes were given to the hands of the pancha witness Smt. Hemalatha who counted the same and kept the same in the bag of PW1 and afterwards the hands of Smt. Hemalatha washed in sodium carbonate solution and that solution turned to pink colour. They have deposed that they have signed the entrustment mahazar.

16. PW1 and PW2 have further deposed that themselves and another pancha witness Smt. Hemalatha, the police inspector and his staff went to the office of the DGO and the vehicle was stopped outside the office of the DGO.

17. PW1 has further deposed that herself and pancha witness went inside the DGO office and DGO was not present in the office and she informed the same to the police and all of them returned back to the police station and she returned the tainted currency notes to the police inspector and a mahazar was written at that time and the copy of the same is at Ex.P3. PW2 has also deposed about the same in his evidence.

18. PW1 and PW2 have deposed that they were asked to come to the police station on 07/06/2008 and accordingly they went to the police station on 07/06/2008 and again the tainted currency notes which had been kept in the almirah

was removed and given to the pancha witness Smt. Hemalatha and she kept the same in the bag of the complainant and again they went to the office of the DGO and the vehicle was stopped at a distance.

19. PW1 has deposed that herself and the panch witness went inside the office of the DGO and PW1 met the DGO and enquired about her work for which the DGO asked whether she has brought the bribe amount of Rs. 5,000/- and when she enquired the DGO whether she has to pay the bribe amount the DGO said yes and asked her to come at 5.30 p.m. She has further deposed that herself and pancha witness went inside the office of the DGO at 5.30. p.m. and DGO demanded for bribe amount and she gave the tainted currency notes and DGO received the same and kept it in his shirt pocket.

20. PW2 has deposed that on 07/06/2008 in the evening himself and PW1 went inside the office of the DGO and PW1 met the DGO and enquired about her work and the DGO asked for the bribe amount of Rs. 5,000/- and PW1 gave the tainted currency notes and the DGO received the same and kept it in his shirt pocket.

21. PW1 and PW2 have deposed that after the DGO received the amount PW1 went outside the office of the DGO and gave the pre-arranged signal and immediately the police inspector, his staff and another pancha came there and PW1 showed the DGO to the police inspector and the police inspector introduced himself to the DGO.

22. PW1 has deposed that the inspector asked the DGO to produce the bribe amount and the DGO produced the bribe amount of Rs. 5,000/- and the hands of the DGO were washed in sodium carbonate solution and that solution turned to pink colour. PW1 has deposed that the shirt of the DGO was removed and the shirt pocket was washed in sodium carbonate solution and that solution also turned to pink colour and the Entrustment Mahazar was also drawn and the copy of the same is at Ex.P4.

23. PW2 has deposed that the hands of the DGO were washed in the sodium carbonate solution and the solution turned to pink colour and afterwards the DGO produced the tainted currency notes of Rs. 5,000/- from his shirt pocket and those currency notes were the same currency notes mentioned in the Entrustment Mahazar. He has also deposed about the wash of the shirt of the DGO being positive. He has also deposed that trap mahazar was drawn and copy of the same is at Ex.P4.

24. PW3 is the police inspector and he has deposed about PW1 coming to the Lokayukta police station and lodging the complaint the copy of which is at Ex.P1. He has deposed that he registered the case on the basis of Ex.P1 and sent the FIR to the court and the copy of the same is at Ex.P5. He has deposed that he secured two panchas PW2 and Smt. Hemalatha and conducted the entrustment mahazar the copy of which is at Ex.P2. He has further deposed about the contents of the entrustment mahazar, the copy of which is at Ex.P2. He has deposed that the denomination and numbers of the notes were noted in a sheet by the panchas and the copy

of the same is at Ex.P6. He has deposed that afterwards they went to the office of the DGO and reached the office of the DGO at 12.30 p.m. PW1 and PW2 went inside the office of the DGO and at 12.50 p.m. they came back and told that the DGO is not in the office and when he was contacted over phone he told PW1 to come on 07/06/2008. He has deposed that all of them returned back to the police station and the tainted currency notes were taken back from PW1 and kept in the almirah. He has further deposed that he instructed the complainant and pancha witnesses to come tomorrow and accordingly on 07/06/2008 at 10 a.m. they came to the Lokayukta police station and the tainted currency notes were again kept in the bag of the complainant by the pancha witness Smt. Hemalatha and afterwards her hands were washed in clean water. He has further deposed that again they left the police station and reached the office of the DGO at 10.40 a.m. and PW1 and PW2 were sent inside the office and PW1 came back and told that the DGO has directed her to come after 4 p.m. and hence they returned back to the police station and after 4 p.m. again PW1 and PW2 along with the daughter of PW1 Kum. Heera were sent inside the office of the DGO and at 6 p.m. PW1 came outside the office and gave the pre-arranged signal and immediately himself, his staff and another pancha went inside the office and enquired PW1 and PW1 showed the DGO and told him that he has demanded and accepted the bait amount of Rs. 5,000/- and kept it in his shirt pocket and asked her to wait for five minutes to give the corrected marks card. He has deposed that he introduced himself to the DGO and told him about the complaint registered against him. He has deposed that he got the hands



of the DGO washed separately in sodium carbonate solution and both the solutions turned to pink colour. He has deposed that afterwards the DGO produced the bait amount from his shirt pocket and the denomination and numbers of those currency notes tallied with the denomination and numbers mentioned in Ex.P6. He has deposed that even the shirt wash of the DGO was positive. He has deposed that he asked the DGO about his explanation and the DGO gave his explanation in writing and the copy of the same is at Ex.P7. In Ex.P7 it is only stated that with malafide intention the complaint is filed to the effect that the amount has been paid to the DGO. But there is no connection between the DGO and the incident alleged. Thus the DGO has only denied the claim of PW1 that he has demanded and received the amount. But he has not given any explanation as to how tainted currency notes were found in his shirt pocket and why his hand wash and shirt wash were positive.

25. PW1 and PW2 have been cross-examined. But nothing is made out in their cross-examination to discard their evidence. As stated above there is no cross-examination of PW3.

26. PW3 has also deposed that he seized the file of the daughter of the complainant and the copies of the same is at Ex.P8. Ex.P8 contains the copy of the court decree, the letter given by PW1 for change of name of her daughter in the school records including the marks card. He has also deposed that the original SSLC marks card which was given for correction was also seized and the copy of the same is also found in Ex.P8. In that marks card there is mention about the change of name of the daughter of the complainant as per court

decree. But the same had not been given to PW1. PW3 has deposed that Ex.P11 is the copy of the rough sketch prepared by him and Ex.P12 is the copy of the sketch obtained from the Engineer of PWD department. He has deposed that the FSL report is at Ex.P14. Ex.P14 discloses that both the hand wash of the DGO and the shirt wash of the DGO were positive. PW1 to PW3 have no ill-will against the DGO. Hence their evidence cannot be brushed aside.

27. PW2 is the shadow witness. He has also given his evidence in support of the case of the Disciplinary Authority. As stated above the DGO has not given any explanation as to why his hand wash and shirt wash were positive in case he had not received the amount of Rs. 5,000/- from PW1. PW1 to PW3 have given evidence in support of the case of the disciplinary Authority. Hence, it has to be said that the Disciplinary Authority has proved satisfactorily that the DGO demanded and accepted the illegal gratification of Rs. 5,000/- from the complainant on 07/06/2008.

28. Thus the DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and acted in a manner of unbecoming of a Government Servant. Hence, I answer this point in the **AFFIRMATIVE**.

**29. Point NO.2:-** For the reasons discussed above, I proceed to pass the following:-

**:: ORDER ::**

*The Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily proved the charge in this case that, DGO- Sri M.B. Mallikarjuna s/o M. Basavaraju, First Division Assistant, Public Instruction Department, Office of the Joint Director, Mysore committed mis-conduct as enumerated U/R 3(1) (i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

30. Hence this report is submitted to Hon'ble Upalokayukta-2 for kind perusal and for further action in the matter.

Dated this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of <sup>May</sup>~~April~~, 2018

-Sd/-

(Somaraju)

Additional Registrar Enquiries 4,  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bangalore.

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

- PW-1 :- Smt.Maya (complainant)  
PW-2 :- Sri Kiran Kumar N.V. (shadow panch witness)  
PW-3:- Sri D. Jayaramu (I.O)

**LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENCE:**

NIL

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

- Ex.P-1: Certified copy of the complaint  
Ex.P1(a,b): Relevant entry in Ex.P1  
Ex.P-2: Certified copy of the entrustment mahazar  
Ex.P-2(a to e): Relevant entry in Ex.P2  
Ex.P-3: Certified copy of the mahazar  
Ex.P-3(a to e): Relevant entry in Ex.P3  
Ex.P-4: Certified copy of the Trap Mahazar

- Ex.P-4(a to g): Relevant entry in Ex.P4  
Ex.P-5: Certified copy of the FIR  
Ex.P5(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P5  
Ex.P-6: Certified copy of the note denomination and numbers mentioned white sheet  
Ex.P-6(a to c): Relevant entry in Ex.P6  
Ex.P-7: Certified copy of the explanation of DGO  
Ex.P7(a to d): Relevant entry in Ex.P7  
Ex.P-8: Certified copy of the file of the complainant (containing 19 sheets)  
Ex.P-9: True copies of the Xerox copy of photos on the white sheet (total seven photos)  
Ex.P-10: True copy of the attendance register extract  
Ex.P-10(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P10  
Ex.P-11: True copy of the rough sketch  
Ex.P-11(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P11  
Ex.P-12: Certified copy of the sketch  
Ex.P-13: True copy of the requisition of Sri D. Jayaramu, I.O. Police Inspector, Karnataka Lokayukta, Mysore  
Ex.P-14: Certified copy of the chemical examination report  
Ex.P14(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P14

**LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DGO:**

NIL

Dated this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 18

-Sd/-  
(Somaraju)  
Additional Registrar Enquiries-4,  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bangalore.