



KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No.LOK/ARE-4/INQ/497/2012

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

Dated 15.05.2018

RECOMMENDATION

Sub:- Departmental inquiry against Shri N. Nagamurthy,
Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle (in
charge Tagachagere) Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna
Taluk, Ramanagara District - reg.

- Ref:- 1) Government Order No. RD 120 BDP 2012
dated 26.11.2012.
2) Nomination order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/497/2012
dated 13.12.2012 of Upalokayukta, State of
Karnataka.
3) Inquiry Report dated 11.05.2018 of Additional
Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta,
Bengaluru.

~~~~~

The Government by its Order 26.11.2012, initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Shri N. Nagamurthy, Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle (in charge Tagachagere) Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara 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. LOK/INQ/14-A/497/2012 dated 13.12.2012 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 N dated 14.03.2014, the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-8, Karnataka Lokayukta was re-nominated as Inquiry Officer to conduct the departmental inquiry against the DGO. Finally, by order No. UPLOK-2/DE/2016 dated 03.08.2016, the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-4, Karnataka Lokayukta was re-nominated as Inquiry Officer to conduct the departmental inquiry against the DGO.

3. The DGO - Shri N. Nagamurthy, Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle (in charge Tagachagere) Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara District was tried for the following charge:-

“That, you, Shri N. Nagamurthy (hereinafter referred to as Delinquent Government Official, in short DGO), while working as the Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle and i/c. of Tagachagere, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagar District demanded and accepted a bribe of Rs.1,000/- through one Shri Kumar on 21.09.2010 from complainant - Smt. R. Manjula w/o late Rama, No.341/8, Medar Beedi, Elekeri, Channapattana Town, Ramanagar District for getting done the work of the complainant i.e., for getting issued the survivor certificate from Tahasildar, Channapatna, 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 the Karnataka Civil Service (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 N. Nagamurthy, Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle (in charge Tagachagere) Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara District.

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 First Oral Statement of the DGO furnished by the Inquiry Officer, DGO - Shri N. Nagamurthy is due to retire from service on 30.06.2020.

7. Having regard to the nature of charge (demand and acceptance of bribe) '*proved*' against DGO - Shri N. Nagamurthy, Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle (in charge Tagachagere) Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara District, it is hereby recommended to the Government to impose penalty of 'compulsory retirement from

service and also, to permanently withhold 30% of the pension payable to DGO - Shri N. Nagamurthy'.

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

Connected records are enclosed herewith.

  
(JUSTICE N. ANANDA)  
Upalokayukta,  
State of Karnataka. 15/5

**KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA**

No.LOK/ARE-4/INQ/497/2012

M.S. Building  
Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Road  
Bangalore-560 001  
Date: 11/05/2018

**:: ENQUIRY REPORT ::**

**Sub:** Departmental Enquiry against,

Sri N. Nagamurthy  
Village Accountant  
Vandaraguppe Circle  
Kasaba Hobli  
Channapatna Taluk  
Ramanagara District (incharge)  
Tagachagere

- Ref:**
- 1) Report u/s 12(3) of the K.L Act, 1984 in  
Compt/Uplok/BD/549/2012/DRE-1  
Dated: 10/10/2012
  - 2) G.Order. No. RD 120 BDP 2012  
Bangalore, dated: 26/11/2012
  - 3) Order No.LOK/INQ/14-A/497/2012  
Bangalore dated: 13/12/2012  
of the Hon'ble Upalokayukta

\*\*\*

This Departmental Enquiry is directed against Sri N. Nagamurthy, Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara District (incharge), Tagachagere (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: 13/12/2012 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 to PW3. When the matter pending for recording of evidence of PW4, 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 N. Nagamurthy, (herein after referred to as Delinquent Government Official, in short DGO), while working as the Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle and I/c of Tagachagere, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara District demanded and accepted a bribe of Rs. 1,000/- through one Sri Kumar on 21/09/2010 from complainant Smt. R. Manjula w/o late Rama, No. 341/8 Medar Beedi, Elekeri, Channapattana Town, Ramanagar District for getting done the work of the complainant i.e., for getting issued the survivor certificate from Tahasildar, Channapatna, 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. R. Manjula w/o late Rama, No. 341/8, Medar Beedi, Elekeri, Channapattana town, Ramanagar District filed a complaint on 21/09/2010 before the DyS.P., Karnataka Lokayukta, Ramanagar alleging that her husband who was working as Jamedar in Agriculture Department and he died on 13/05/2010 and that his first wife Smt. Jayamma is died in the year 1994 and thereafter, she had married Sri Rama after the death of his first wife as per the customs and that she had filed an application before the Tahasildar, Channapatna on 05/08/2010 to issue survivor certificate for the purpose of getting the benefits from the Government on account of the death of her husband and*

that Sri N. Nagamurthy, Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle & I/c of Tagachagere, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagar District, (herein after referred to as Delinquent Government Servant, in short DGO) had submitted his report on my application and that thereafter, when she met Tahasildar, Channapatna, he told her that the list of the surviving members of the family of the first wife of her (complainant) deceased husband was necessary and in the meantime on 13/09/2010, the DGO met her in the Taluk Office, Channapatna and that he told her that he would get her work done and for that he demanded a bribe of Rs. 3,000/- and he also told her that in case if he was not available in his office to pay the said amount in the hands of his assistant Sri Kumar and at that time Sri Kumar was also present and that on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010 Sri Kumar demanded the bribe amount by making a call to the mobile of the complainant bearing No. 9611644156 from his mobile phone bearing No. 8971416389 and that when she told him that she was not in a position to arrange the demanded bribe amount of Rs. 3,000/- he asked her to pay Rs. 1,000/- on that day and to pay the balance on the next day and thus the DGO demanded and insisted for the payment of bribe amount of Rs. 1,000/- through his assistant Sri Kumar.

As the complainant was not willing to pay any bribe to the DGO, he went to Dy.S.P., Karnataka Lokayukta, Ramanagar on 21/09/2010 and lodged a complaint. On the basis of the same a case was registered in Ramanagar Lokayukta Police Station Cr. No. 06/2010 for the 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 21/09/2010 by the Investigating Officer after your demanding and accepting the bribe amount of Rs. 1,000/- from the complainant through your Assistant Sri Kumar in the presence of shadow witness and the said bribe amount which you had received from the complainant was seized from the possession of Sri Kumar, the assistant of the DGO 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. 1,000/- from the complainant on 21/09/2010 for doing an official act i.e., for getting done the work of the complainant i.e., for getting issued the survivor certificate from Tahasildar, Channapatna. 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 26/02/2013 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 as follows:-

The articles of charge framed against the DGO is illegal and bad-in-law. The DGO never demanded any money as bribe from the complainant and he has not accepted any bribe amount on 21/09/2010. The DGO denies the charge and the statement of imputation of misconduct. The DGO never demanded nor accepted any money. No money is recovered from the possession of the DGO. DGO has not committed any misconduct. Hence, he has prayed 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 four witnesses as PW1 to PW4 and got marked documents at Ex.P1 to P9. Ex.P9 are the xerox copies of the 17 photos taken at the time of entrustment mahazar and also the trap mahazar. But in the evidence of PW4 by oversight instead of Ex.P9 it is mentioned as Ex.P17 by oversight.

9. PW2 to PW4 have not been cross-examined and inspite of giving sufficient time they have not been cross-examined. The order sheet discloses that on 20/05/2017 itself the side of the disciplinary authority was closed and case was posted for Second Oral Statement of the DGO to 02/06/2017. The DGO and his counsel remained absent and the DGO was placed exparte and afterwards the written brief on the side of the disciplinary authority has been filed. After many hearing dates on 07/09/2017 the DGO filed an application to recall PW2 and PW3 for cross-examination and by allowing the application witness summons were issued to PW2 and PW3. But subsequently the DGO remained absent and on 03/05/2018 the learned counsel for the DGO submitted that he is not able to contact the DGO inspite of efforts and appropriate orders may be passed. As the DGO was absent continuously from numbers of the hearing dates and in view of his counsel submitting no instructions the DGO was placed exparte and PW2 and PW3 have not been again issued witness summons for their cross-examination. As the DGO has remained absent and exparte Second Oral Statement and questioning of the DGO u/Rule 11(18) of KCS (CC&A) Rules were dispensed with.

10. The Disciplinary Authority has submitted written brief, but DGO has not submitted his written brief. Arguments of the Presenting Officer was heard.

11. Upon consideration of the oral and documentary evidence placed on record, the defence of DGO, the only points, that arises for the consideration of this enquiry authority is:-

1) Whether the Disciplinary Authority satisfactorily proved the charge framed against DGO?

2) What order?

12. 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 ::**

**13. Point No.1:** As stated above it is the case of the disciplinary authority that the DGO while working as the Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle & I/c of Tagachagere, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagar District, demanded and accepted bribe of Rs. 1,000/- through Sri T.Kumar on 21/09/2010 from the complainant Smt. R. Manjula for doing an official work and thereby he has committed the misconduct.

14. The complainant has been examined as PW3 and the copy of the complaint lodged by her before the Lokayukta police station is at Ex.P1. The gist of Ex.P1 is to the effect that PW3 is the second wife of Late Rama, who was working as Jamedar, in Agriculture department, M.S. Building, Bangalore and he died in the year 2010 and to obtain the service benefits of her husband, PW1 was in need of survival certificate and hence on 05/08/2010 she had given an application in the Tahasildar office, Channapattana for issue of survival certificate. The DGO is the Village Accountant and in charge of Revenue Inspector of Kasaba Hobli. On 13/09/2010 the complainant met the DGO in the Taluk office and requested for her work for which the DGO demanded bribe amount of

Rs. 3,000/- and to pay the bribe amount to one Sri T. Kumar, who works in his office and at that time the above said assistant of the DGO was also present. On 20/09/2010 at 10 a.m. the above said Sri T. Kumar called the complainant over her mobile and insisted for payment of the bribe amount and when PW1 pleaded her inability to pay the amount demanded for which Sri T. Kumar told her to bring Rs. 1,000/- tomorrow and in view of PW1 not willing to get her work done by paying the bribe amount, she has lodged the complaint on 21/09/2010 at 11.30 a.m. before the Lokayukta Police, Ramanagar district.

15. PW3 in her evidence has reiterated the above said averments made in Ex.P1 in her deposition. She has deposed that after she lodged the complaint as per Ex.P1, the I.O. secured two panchas and they were introduced to her and she told about the complaint lodged by her to the panchas. She has deposed that she produced Rs. 1,000/- (Rs.500x1+Rs.100x5) before the I.O. She has deposed that the denomination and numbers of the currency notes were noted in a sheet and the copy of the same is at Ex.P6. She has deposed that powder was smeared to the said currency notes and those notes were given to PW1.-Smt. Javamma and she kept the same in her purse (PW3) and afterwards the hands of the PW1 when washed in the solution that solution turned to pink colour. She has deposed that I.O. gave her a voice-recorder and instructed her to record the conversation that is going to take place while giving the bribe amount. She has deposed that the entrustment mahazar was drawn and the copy of the same is at Ex.P2.

16. PW1-Smt. Javaramma and PW4-Sri Chaluveeraiah are the pancha witnesses and they have deposed that the entrustment mahazar that was drawn in the Lokayukta police station and the copy of the same is at Ex.P2. They have also deposed that the denomination and numbers of the currency notes were noted in a sheet.

17. PW3 has further deposed that afterwards herself, pancha witnesses, I.O. and his staff went to the office of the DGO situated near Channapattana bus-stand. She has deposed that herself and Smt. Javaramma went inside the office to meet the DGO and in the office Sri T. Kumar was present and he asked her whether she has brought the amount of Rs. 1,000/- and at that time, Smt. Javaramma was near door of that office. She has deposed that she gave the amount of Rs. 1,000/- and Sri T. Kumar received the amount with his right hand counted the same by using his both hands and kept the same in the drawer. She has deposed that she gave the signal to Smt. Javaramma and in turn she gave the signal to the I.O. and I.O. and his staff and another pancha came there and she told what happened inside the office. She has deposed that the hands of Sri T. Kumar were washed in the solution separately and those solutions turned to pink colour. She has deposed that when questioned where is the bribe amount said Sri T. Kumar removed the amount from the drawer and produced the same and those notes tallied with the notes mentioned in Ex.P6. She has deposed that she had not switched on the voice-recorder given to her and hence the conversation has not been recorded. She has deposed that the above said Sri T. Kumar gave his explanation in writing and copy of the same is

at Ex.P5. She has deposed that the copy of the explanation given by DGO is at Ex.P7. She has deposed that the copy of her file from Page Nos.33 to 102 are at Ex.P8. She has deposed that the xerox copies of the photos taken at the time of the entrustment mahazar and at the time of the trap mahazar are at Ex.P9. She has deposed that Ex.P3 is the copy of the trap mahazar.

18. In Ex.P5 Sri T. Kumar has stated that he is working as Assistant of the Village Accountant of Tagachagere circle from 12 years and on 21/09/2010 he had been to his office and at about 3 p.m PW3 came to the office and forcibly thrust the amount. But he has not demanded any amount from PW3. In Ex.P5 it is not stated in what manner PW3 forcibly thrust the amount. In Ex.P7 the DGO has stated that on 21/09/2010 at 2 p.m. he was in Taluk office and he was not at all in his office and he has not demanded or accepted any bribe amount from PW3.

19. It is not in dispute that the survival certificate sought by PW3 was not issued till the date of lodging the complaint and there is no cross-examination of PW3 and thus the evidence of PW3 (complainant) has remained unchallenged. As stated above PW3 has clearly stated that the DGO demanded the bribe of Rs. 3,000/- and asked her to pay the same to his assistant Sri T.Kumar.

20. PW1 Smt. Javamma has deposed that herself and the complainant went to the private office of the DGO after the entrustment mahazar and she stood near the window and the DGO was not present at that time but one Sri T. Kumar was

present. She has deposed that the complainant gave the signal and police inspector came there and enquired Sri T. Kumar and PW3. She has deposed that the hands of Sri T. Kumar when washed in the solution that solution turned to pink colour. She has deposed that Sri T. Kumar produced the bribe amount to the I.O. but she did not see from where Sri T. Kumar picked up the bribe amount. She has deposed that she has not seen what happened inside the private office of the DGO. Any how she has deposed that the hand wash of the DGO was positive and he produced the bribe amount to the I.O. She has been treated as hostile witness and cross-examined by the Presenting Officer. Ex.P4 is the copy of the FSL report which shows that the left hand and also the right hand wash of Sri T. Kumar was positive.

21. As stated above PW4 is another pancha witness and he has deposed about the entrustment mahazar and also about the trap mahazar. No doubt he is not a shadow witness. But he has given his evidence in accordance with the contents of Ex.P2-entrustment mahazar and Ex.P3-trap mahazar.

22. PW2 is the Sri H. Manjappa and he has deposed that from October 2007 to May 2011 he was working as Dy.S.P., in Lokaykukta office, Ramanagar. He has deposed about the complainant lodging the complaint as per Ex.P1 on 21/09/2010. He has deposed about the securing the panchas and conducting the entrustment mahazar as per Ex.P2. He has also deposed about the trap mahazar. He has deposed that Ex.P9 are the copies of the photos taken at the time of the entrustment mahazar and trap mahazar. He has deposed that the hand wash of Sri T. Kumar was positive and he produced



the bait amount from the table drawer of the DGO. There is no reasons to disbelieve the evidence of pW1 to PW4. There is no ill-will between the PW3 and DGO and there is no reason to discard the evidence of PW3 who is the complainant. As stated above PW3 has clearly deposed that for issue of survival certificate the DGO demanded bribe amount of Rs. 3,000/- and asked PW3 to pay the same to his assistant Sri T. Kumar. She has deposed that at that time Sri T. Kumar was also present along with the DGO. She has also deposed that on 21/09/2010 in the afternoon when she went to meet the DGO along with the shadow witness the DGO was not present but his assistant Sri T. Kumar was present and he asked her to pay the bribe amount of Rs.1,000/- and hence she paid the same to him. She has also deposed that earlier to that Sri T. Kumar had telephoned to her and asked her to bring Rs. 1,000/- when PW3 told him that she has arranged only Rs. 1,000/-. Only on the ground that DGO was not present in his private office when PW3 paid the bait amount to Sri T. Kumar, the case of the Disciplinary Authority cannot be discarded and as stated above there is the unchallenged evidence of PW3 to the effect that as per the instructions of DGO only she paid the bait amount to the hands of Sri T. Kumar. As stated above, she has also deposed that, it was the DGO who demanded for the bribe amount and told the complainant to pay the same to Sri T. Kumar who is his assistant. Thus the Disciplinary Authority has satisfactorily proved the charge framed against the DGO.

23. 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**.

**24. 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 N. Nagamurthy, Village Accountant, Vandaraguppe Circle, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara District (incharge), Tagachagere, committed mis-conduct as enumerated U/R 3(1) (i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.*

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

Dated this the 11<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2018

-Sd/-

(Somaraju)

Additional Registrar Enquiries-4,  
Karnataka Lokayukta,  
Bangalore.

**:: ANNEXURE ::**

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

- PW-1 :- Smt. Javaramma (shadow panch witness)  
PW-2 :- Sri H. Manjappa (I.O.)  
PW-3:- Smt. R. Manjula (complainant)  
PW-4:-Sri Chaluveeraiah (another panch witness)

**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): Relevant entry in Ex.P1  
Ex.P-2: Certified copy of the Entrustment Mahazar  
Ex.P-2(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P2  
Ex.P-3: Certified copy of the Trap Mahazar  
Ex.P-3(a,b): Relevant entry in Ex.P3  
Ex.P-4: Certified copy of the chemical examination report  
Ex.P-5: Certified copy of the explanation of Sri T. Kumar  
Ex.P5(a,b): Relevant entry in Ex.P5  
Ex.P-6: Certified copy of the notes domination and numbers mentioned in white sheet  
Ex.P-6(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P6  
Ex.P-7: Certified copy of the explanation of DGO  
Ex.P7(a): Relevant entry in Ex.P7  
Ex.P-8: Certified copy of the file of the complainant  
Ex.P-9: Xerox copies of the photos on the white sheet (total 17 photos)

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

NIL

**Note:** Ex.P9 are the xerox copies of the 17 photos taken at the time of entrustment mahazar and also the trap mahazar. But in the evidence of PW4 by oversight instead of Ex.P9 it is mentioned as Ex.P17 by oversight.

Dated this the 11<sup>th</sup> day of May, 18

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

