

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No.LOK/INQ/14-A/44/2010/ARE-10

M.S. Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Road
Bangalore-560 001
Date: 16/03/2018

ENQUIRY REPORT

Present : Sri. S. Gopalappa
Additional Registrar of Enquiries-10
Karnataka Lokayukta
Bangalore

Sub: Departmental Enquiry against

Sri. L.K. Deshpande,
The then Child Development
Project Officer,
Women and Child Development
Department, Bellary
(Presently working as Programme
Office, Women and Child
Development Department, Karwar)
-reg.

- Ref:** 1. Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in
Compt/Uplok/GLB/396/2007 dt. 18/08/2009.
2. Government Order No. WCD 577 SJD 2009
Bengaluru Dt. 20/08/2010
3. Nomination Order by Hon'ble Upalokayukta
Dt. 03/09/2010 and modified order
dt. 23/01/2018.

1. On the basis of materials placed by ADGP, KLA, Bengaluru that DGO - Sri. L.K. Deshpande, the then Child Development Project Officer, Women and Child Development Department, Bellary (presently working as Programme Officer, Women and Child Development Department, Karwar) has committed misconduct as

Public Servant in the official work of the complainant, an investigation was taken up u/s 7(2) of K.L. Act 1984.

2. After completion of the investigation, a report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in No. Compt/Uplok/GLB/396/2007/ARLO-4 dt. 18/08/2009 was sent to the Government as per reference no. 1. In pursuance of the report, the Government was pleased to issue order dt. 20/08/2010 authorizing Hon'ble Upalokayukta to hold enquiry as per reference no.2. Hence in pursuance of Government order nomination was issued by Hon'ble Upalokayukta on 03/09/2010 and modified order authorizing ARE-10 to hold enquiry and report as per reference no. 3.
3. On the basis of nomination articles of charge was prepared under Rule 11(3) of KCS (CCA) Rules 1957 and sent it to the DGO on 16/03/2011.

ANNEXURE NO. I

That, you L.K. Deshpande, the DGO, while working as Child Development Project Officer, Women and Child Development Project Officer, Women and Child Development Department (CDPO) at Bellary and on 30/09/1993 demanded and accepted bribe of Rs. 500/- from the complainant Eranna s/o Hanumanth Cheluvagi, Mini Water Supplier, Bettaduru taluk, Manvi, Raichur district to give postings to the wife of the complainant as Anganwadi Teacher to Bettaduru village, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, which act as unbecoming of a Government servant and thus

committed misconduct as enumerated under rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (conduct) Rules, 1966.

ANNEXURE II

STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT.

One Sri Eranna s/o Hanumanth Cheluvagi, Mini Water Supplier, Bettaduru taluk, Manvi, Raichur district gave complaint to Lokayukta Police Inspector of Raichur (herein after referred to as the Investigating Officer, for short "I.O" alleging that the DGO demanded bribe of Rs. 500/- to give postings to his wife as Anganawadi teacher to a vacant place at Bettaduru village. I.O. registered the complaint in Cr.no. 04/93 for the offences punishable u/s 7, 13(1)(d) r/w 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988. During the course of investigation into the said crime, the IO trapped the DGO on 30/09/93 while receiving tainted amount of Rs. 500/- from the complainant. The IO seized the counter foil under mahazar after following post trap formalities. The I.O. took statement of DGO in writing and recorded statements of the complainant, the panch witnesses and others. After receiving report of the chemical examiner, the I.O. submitted report of investigation. The facts and materials on the record of investigation of the I.O. prima facie showed that, the DGO being a Public servant, failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and acted in a manner unbecoming of Public servant. Therefore, a suo-moto investigation was taken up u/s 7(2) of Karnataka Lokayukta Act and an observation note was sent to DGO calling for his explanation. DGO submitted his reply and his reply was not convincing and not satisfactory to drop the proceedings. As the facts and materials on

record prima-facie showed that DGO committed misconduct as per regulation 3(1)(i) of KCS (conduct) Rules 1966. A report u/s 12(3) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act was sent to the Competent Authority with recommendation to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the DGO and to entrust enquiry to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta U/R 14-A of KCS(CCA) Rules 1957. Accordingly, the Competent Authority initiated disciplinary proceedings and entrusted the enquiry to the Hon'ble Upalokayukta, Hence, the charge.

4. The said AOC was served to DGO. The DGO appeared before the Enquiry officer and then his First oral statement under Rule 11(9) of KCS (CCA) Rules was recorded. DGO has filed the written statement denying all the allegations. He further submits that he never demanded any bribe amount from the complainant. DGO has not shown any official favour to the complainant at any point of time while discharging his official duty. He has not committed any misconduct. Hence prays to exonerate from the charges.
5. In support of the disciplinary authority, PW 1 to 3 are examined. The complainant (CW-1) was reported to be dead. Ex. P.1 to P.9 are marked. After closure of the evidence of the disciplinary authority, the Second Oral Statement of DGO is recorded. DGO has submitted that he has defence evidence. In support of DGO, DW-1 to 3 are examined and marked Ex.D.1. Hence answer to questionnaires under Rule 11(18) of KCS (CCA) Rules, 1957 is dispensed with.
6. Then the Learned Presenting Officer and Assistant for DGO have filed written brief and they were also heard orally.

7. Points for consideration

- i. Whether the charge is proved by the Disciplinary Authority?
- ii. What order ?

8. My answers to the above points are as follows;

- i. In the affirmative.
- ii. As per final order
for the following.

REASONS

9. **Point no.1 :-** The panchas who are examined as PW-1 & 2 have deposed that on 30/03/1993 Raichur Lokayukta Police summoned them to Lokayukta police station, introduced the complainant and explained the contents of the complaint Ex.P.1. The complainant presented Rs. 500 (100 X 5). Police applied phenolphthalein powder to the notes. PW-1 gave the money to the complainant. Hand wash of PW-1 was taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. IO gave instructions to themselves and complainant and drawn the pre-trap Mahazar Ex.P.2.
10. Further PW-1 & 2 have deposed that all of them went near the office of CDPO. PW-1 & complainant went to meet the DGO. Further PW-1 has deposed that on enquiry they came to know that DGO has gone to Neeramanvi village. They were waiting there itself. Again at 5.45pm, PW-1 & complainant went to meet the DGO. At the time, the DGO was present. The DGO asked the complainant to go to his house. Then all of them went near the house of DGO. Complainant and PW-1 went to meet the DGO. The

others were waiting outside. When the complainant enquired about his wife's appointment, the DGO asked whether he has brought the money. The complainant said yes. The DGO asked the complainant to keep the money near the grill. Accordingly the complainant kept the money near the grill and gave the signal to the IO.

11. Further PW- 1 & 2 have deposed that lokayukta police came inside the house of DGO. At the time, the DGO pushed the money out from his left hand. The complainant narrated the incident. Hand wash of DGO was taken in sodium carbonate solution. The left hand wash turned into pink colour and right hand wash not turned into pink colour. On verification of the money it was tallied with the amount entrusted to the complainant. DGO has given his statement Ex.P.3 which is false. At that time, IO has drawn the trap mahazar Ex.P.4.
12. In the cross examination PW-1 has admitted that the office of DGO was situated in Manvi. Manvi is situated about 30kms away from Raichur. At 3.00pm they reached Manvi. The vehicle was stopped 20mts away from the office of DGO. He admits that at 5.30pm the DGO was not present in the office. They saw the DGO coming on a vehicle. He admits that on 30/09/1993 after the office hours the DGO went to his quarters in a jeep.
13. Further PW-1 has deposed that from the office of DGO to reach the quarters of DGO 5 minutes is enough by vehicle and 15 minutes is required by walk. On that day, when they reached the quarters of DGO it was 5.45pm. The IO had stopped his vehicle about 10 to 15 mts away. He admits that the quarters are situated in a lane and outside the gate there is a road and after the road there are no

houses. The IO had stopped the vehicle on the other side of the road situated in front of the quarters of DGO. He admits that there is a big gate to verandah of the DGO's house. There is 10 to 15 ft distance from the gate to the house of DGO. He admits that the quarters of DGO is facing towards the road. He admits that the compound wall is 10 to 15ft length and 3 ft height grill is there. When the complainant knocked the door, the DGO opened the Door. At the time, himself and complainant went inside the house.

14. Further PW-1 admits that before knocking the door they were standing outside. He admits that when the DGO opened the door except lungi he was in bare body. He admits that the DGO pushed the money which was kept by the complainant. He admits that he has not given any dictation to prepare Ex.P.2 & 4. Further PW-1 has denied the rest of the suggestions.
15. In the cross examination PW-2 admits that he had not enquired the complaint regarding the genuineness of the complaint. He admits that the IO has not given the complaint for his perusal. But the I.O himself read out the complaint. Further PW-2 has denied the suggestions made by the learned assistant for DGO.
16. The I.O. who is examined as PW-3 has deposed that on 30/09/93 at 11.30 am he received the complaint and registered Cr. no. 04/1993 and forwarded the FIR Ex.P.5 to the court. He secured the presence of PW-1 & 2. Introduced the complainant and explained the contents of the complaint. The complainant presented Rs. 500/- (100 X 5). Note numbers were noted down staff applied phenolphthalein powder to the notes. PW-1 kept the money into the pocket of the complainant. Hand wash of PW-1 was

taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into red colour. He gave the instructions to panchas and complainant and drawn the pre-trap mahazar Ex.P.2.

17. PW-3 has deposed that all of them went near the CDPO office. The complainant and PW-1 went to meet the DGO. They informed that DGO was not in the office and DGO had been to Neeramanvi. He asked them to wait there itself. At about 5.00pm DGO came to office. The complainant and PW-1 informed them that DGO asked them to meet at his house. After some time the complainant went to meet the DGO in his house, they followed him after sometime the complainant gave a signal.
18. PW-3 has further deposed that immediately himself and staff and another pancha came near the complainant. Complainant narrated the incident. He introduced himself to the DGO. Took both hand wash of DGO in sodium carbonate solution. The left hand wash was turned into red colour and right wash did not turn into any colour. On verification of the money which was fallen outside the window, it was tallied with the money entrusted to the complainant.
19. Further PW-3 has deposed that DGO has given his statement Ex.P.3 which is false. At the time he has drawn the trap mahazar Ex.P.4, arrested the DGO and released him on bail. He recorded the statements of witness. Seized articles were sent to FSL, received the sketch from PWD. Secured the copies of documents of complainant's wife as per Ex.P.8. He filed the charge sheet against DGO.

20. In the cross examination PW-3 deposed that he has not written the complaint in his hand writing. He admits that at what time on what day the DGO demanded the money, is not written in the complaint. But it is mentioned that DGO demanded the money before lodging he complaint. The Sub Inspector has written the complaint Ex.P.5, according to the say of the complainant. He did not ask the complainant to write the complaint on his own. The complainant has not produced any documents. He did not ask for the copy of the application. At the time of receiving the complaint he has not taken the explanation from the complainant that on what date the application was given and what is the status of the application.
21. Further PW-3 has deposed that during the year 1993 upto September 1993, 4 cases were registered. He admits that they left Manvi Lokayukta office at 2.00 pm reached near the office of DGO. The complainant and panchas went inside, came out and informed that the DGO was not present in the office and he will come back by 5.00pm. Therefore he has stated that they waited till 5.45pm. He admits that in front of the quarters of the DGO there is 30ft wide road. Abutting to the road compound wall is existing about 10ft away the complainant wall the house is existing. The place is marked in the sketch where the DGO was standing near the door.
22. Further PW-3 has deposed that the complainant where he was standing was not visible to them. Accordingly the DGO was also not visible to them. At that time the street lights were not on. There was no light in front of the quarter of the DGO. When he had been to house of DGO, it was 5.55pm. He saw the money which was fallen outside the window grills. When he entered into the compound. The DGO has given his statement as per Ex.P.3 stating

that he has not demanded money from anybody. The applications were forwarded and inspite of his resistance the complainant kept the money near the window grill. He has enquired the staff of DGO Sri. Ramanchandra Rao, Sri. Herrana and Sri. Janarandhan Kenedy and Sri. Amir Pasha. He admits the statement given by Sri. Ramanchandra Rao, Sri. Herrana and Sri. Janarandhan Kenedy and Sri. Amir Pasha. He secured the letter from the Assistant Director of human and child welfare dept on 8/10/1993 he admits that the DGO had no power to appoint the Anganawadi teachers. Further PW-3 has denied the rest of the suggestions made by the learned Presenting officer.

23. The staff of DGO who is examined as DW-1 has deposed that on 30/03/1993 at 5.30pm he was in the office. At the time he had been to the office of DGO. A black person was sitting in the chamber of DGO and was requesting the DGO to appoint his wife as a Anganawadi worker. The DGO informed that he is not the competent authority to appoint. He has written a shara and forwarded to Raichur district office, the work is not pending with him. Asked the complainant to go out. But he did not go out. The DGO informed that he will lodge the police complaint. The DGO asked the jeep driver Pasha to send the said person out. Pasha lifted the money gave it to the said person and sent him out. The same is stated before lokayukta police. After the driver Heeranna came then, the DGO went to his house.
24. In cross examination DW-1 has deposed that he has worked for 3 to 4 years in the same office. At that time the DGO was his superior officer. On that day he had been to the office of DGO to take his signature. Except this he does not know anything.

25. Another staff Heeranna who is examined as DW-2 has deposed that on 30/3/93 himself and DGO had been to Raichur District Child, Welfare dept. took the scholarship form, handed over to Kalluru high school. On the way attended the Anganawadi workers meeting in Neeramanvi village. The jeep was stopped since the diesel was empty. In motor cycle DGO came to Manvi office. DGO through somebody send the diesel after that he came to Manvi office at 5 to 5.30pm. When he had been to the office of DGO somebody was talking like 'take it' for that DGO asked for not to do the same and asked to go out and at that time, the said person came out.
26. Further DW-2 has deposed that DGO informed the said person that he will hand over him to police. The DGO came and sat in the jeep. But the jeep was not started. With the help of public he started the jeep. The said person informed that he will come to house. DGO informed that he will hand over him to police, if he comes to the house. Then he dropped the DGO to his house.
27. In the cross DW-2 admits that DGO is his higher authority. Except the incident he does not know anything. He admits that according to the request of the DGO he has given the evidence.
28. DGO who is examined as DW-3 has deposed that on 2/8/1993 one Smt. Muniyamma had submitted an application for Anganawadi post. Along with that application, other applications were received. He has verified the application and recommended the said application to Deputy Director, Woman and Child Welfare Department on 18/09/1993. Then no applications were pending before him. On 29/9/93 he had been to Gulbarga to attend the meeting.

29. Further DW-3 has deposed that on 30/9/93 after attending the meeting he came to Raichur at 11.00 o' clock. Received scholarship forms from district office. Handed over to Kalluru School and was proceedings towards Neeramavi and attended the meeting at Neeranamvi and at 4.30pm, he was proceeding towards Manvi. At about 3kms away the vehicle was stopped because diesel tank was empty. DW-2 was driving the jeep at that time he came to Manvi in a motor cycle belonging to others. After coming to office he sent the diesel through Kennedy.
30. Further DW-3 has deposed that he was sitting in the chambers the compliant came to his chamber ad asked about the appointment order of his wife. He informed that the order was not with him and enquire in district office. At the time the complainant attempted to give Rs. 500 to him. He informed that the work is not pending with him and does not want the money. He forcibly kept the money in the chair which was by his side. At that time the jeep driver Pasha had come to take the articles. Inspite of his request the complainant did not take the money and it was lying on the chair. Through pasha he gave the money to the complainant and sent him out. After 5 mins again the complainant came to his office and forcing to receive the money and again he refused the same stating that the work is not pending with him and he will hand over him to police.
31. Further DW-3 has deposed that at that time the staff Ramachandra was present. Ramachandra was also asked the complainant to go out stating that the work was not pending in the office. After the office hours he came to go to his house. Heeranna brought the jeep to his office. He heard the talks between the complainant and

himself. He went near the jeep the jeep was not started and again the complainant came near the jeep and asked him to receive the money. The complainant forced him to come near his house. He informed that money is not required, he need not come to the house and he will submit a report to the police. Then with the help of complainant and another one, jeep engine was on and he came to the house.

32. Further DW-3 has deposed that at 5.45pm the complainant came and knocked the door. When he opened the door the complainant came inside asked him to receive the money. He informed that he will lodge a police complaint. By that time the complainant kept the money near the window grill. He lifted the money from his left hand asked the complainant to take the money and pushed the money out of the grill. By that time the Police came and explained him. He gave the statement Ex.P.3 earlier. He was not aware who were the Police. He never demanded and received the money from the complainant. He is not the appointing authority. He was acquitted in criminal case. Hence prays to exonerate from the charges.
33. In the cross examination DW-3 has deposed that he is MA degree holder. There is no enmity between himself and the complainant. He does not know that the facts deposed in the chief examination are mentioned in the written statement or not. He admits that his hand wash was turned into pink colour. The appointment order will be issued to the candidates, the copies will be forwarded to his officer. Further DW-3 had denied the suggestions made by the Presenting Officer.

34. The DGO has taken the contention that the complainant forcibly kept the money by the side of the window grill. He never demanded and received bribe amount from the complainant. But the evidence of PW-1 to 3 show that the wife of the complainant had submitted an application for appointment of Anganawadi worker post. In this background the complainant approached the DGO. At that time the DGO demanded bribe amount of Rs. 1,000/- and on bargain it was reduced to 500/-.
35. The complainant has lodged the complaint Ex.P.1. The IO registered a case, secured the presence panchas namely PW-1 & 2. Introduced the complainant and explained the contents of the complaint. The complainant presented Rs. 500 (100 X 5). Panchas noted down the numbers. Police staff applied Phenolphthalein powder to the notes. PW-1 kept the money into the shirt pocket of the complainant. Hand wash of PW-1 was taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink colour. Then IO gave instructions to the complainant and panchas and drawn the pre-trap mahazar Ex.P.2.
36. Further the evidence on record show that all of them went near Manvi CDPO office. At the first instance the DGO was not present. Again at 5.45pm the complainant and PW-1 met the DGO and at that time the DGO asked them to come near his house. Then all of them went near the house of DGO. PW-1 and complainant met the DGO, the DGO demanded for money and according to his instructions, the complainant kept the money by the side of window grill. Then the complainant gave a signal to IO. Immediately the IO, his staff and another pancha came there. Looking at the police the DGO pushed the tainted amount out of

the window from his left hand. Therefore his left hand wash was turned into pink colour. The IO seized the tainted amount from the house of DGO, taken the statement of DGO and drawn the pre-trap mahazar Ex.P.4. Therefore this contention of DGO cannot be accepted.

37. The oral and documentary evidence show that DGO while working as Child Development Project Officer, Women and Child Development Department (CDPO) at Bellary and on 30/09/1993 demanded and accepted bribe of Rs. 500/- from the complainant Eranna s/o Hanumanth Cheluvagi, Mini Water Supplier, Bettaduru taluk, Manvi, Raichur district to give postings to the wife of the complainant as Anganwadi Teacher to Bettaduru village.
38. Thereby DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, acted in a manner of unbecoming of a Government Servant as enumerated U/R 3 (1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules 1966. Hence, I proceed to answer this point in the affirmative.

POINT No.2 :- for the reasons discussed above I proceed to pass the following;

ORDER

The disciplinary Authority has proved the charges as framed against the DGO Sri. L.K. Deshpande, the then Child Development Project Officer, Women and Child Development Department, Bellary

(presently working as Programme Officer, Women and Child Development Department, Karwar)

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

Dated this the 16th day of March of 2018

Sd/-
(S. Gopalappa)
Additional Registrar Enquiries-10
Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bangalore.

ANNEXURES

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY:

PW-1 :- Sri. Manmohan H.K.
PW-2 :- Sri. Nagappa
PW-3 :- Sri. Chandrakanth N. Bhandare

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF DEFENCE WITNESS:

DW-1 :- Sri. Ramchandrarao
DW-2 :- Sri Heeranna
DW-3 :- Sri. L.K. Deshpande

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY

Ex P-1 : Statement of Complainant Dated 30-09-1993`
Ex P-2 : Entrustment Mahazar 30-09-93

- Ex P-3 : Statement Date 30-9-93
Ex P-4 : Seizure Mahazar Dated 30-9-93
Ex P-5 : FIR Dated 30-09-93
Ex P-6 : FSL Report Dated 7-10-93 And Enclosed Document
Ex P-7 : Sketch
Ex P-8 : Application Dated 6-3-93
Ex P-9 : GO dated 9-3-1995

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF DGO :

- Ex D-1 : Letter 1-2-1993

Dated this the 16th day of March of 2018

Sd/-
(S. Gopalappa)
Additional Registrar Enquiries-10,
Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bangalore.



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No: LOK/INQ/14-A/44/2010/ARE-10 Multi Storied Building,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bengaluru-560 001.
Dated: 19.03.2018

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Shri L.K.Deshpande,
the then Child Development Project Officer,
Women and Child Development Department,
Ballari (now retired) - reg.

- Ref:- 1) Government Order No. WCD 577 SJD 2009
dated 20.08.2010.
2) Nomination order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/44/2010
dated 03.09.2010 of Upalokayukta, State of
Karnataka.
3) Inquiry Report dated 16.03.2018 of Additional
Registrar of Enquiries-10, Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bengaluru.

~~~~~

The Government by its Order dated 20.08.2010, initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Shri L.K.Deshpande, the then Child Development Project Officer, Women and Child Development Department, Ballari [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/44/2010 dated 03.09.2010 nominated Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru, as the Inquiry

Officer to frame charges and to conduct departmental inquiry against DGO for the alleged charge of misconduct, said to have been committed by him. Subsequently, by Order No. UPLOK-2/DE/2018, dated 23.01.2018, the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-10, Karnataka Lokayukta, Bengaluru was re-nominated as Inquiry Officer to conduct departmental inquiry against DGO.

3. The DGO - Shri L.K. Deshpande was tried for the following charge:-

*“You, Shri L.K. Deshpande, the DGO, while working as Child Development Project Officer (CDPO), Women and Child Development Department at Bellary and on 30.09.1993 demanded and accepted bribe of Rs.500/- from the complainant Eranna s/o Hanumanth Cheluvagi, Mini Water Supplier, Bettaduru taluk, Manvi, Raichur District to give postings to the wife of the complainant as Anganwadi Teacher to Bettaduru village, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, which act as unbecoming of a Government servant and thus committed misconduct as enumerated under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of KCS (Conduct) Rules, 1966.”*

4. The Inquiry Officer (Additional Registrar of Enquiries-10) on proper appreciation of oral and documentary evidence has held that, the Disciplinary Authority has ‘proved’ the above charge against the DGO.


5. On re-consideration of report of inquiry, I do not find any reason to interfere with the findings recorded by the Inquiry Officer. It is hereby recommended to the Government to accept the report of Inquiry Officer.

6. As per the information furnished by the Inquiry Officer, DGO has retired from service on 31.03.2016 (during the pendency of inquiry).

7. Having regard to the nature of charge (demand and acceptance of bribe) '*proved*' against *Shri L.K.Deshpande, the then Child Development Project Officer, Women and Child Development Department, Ballari*, it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of '*permanently withholding 50% of the pension payable to the DGO - Shri L.K.Deshpande*'.

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.

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

