

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA

No. Lok/ARE-10/14-A/Enq-504/2013

Multi-storeyed Building,
Dr.B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Bangalore, dt.03.03.2015.RECOMMENDATION

Sub: Departmental Enquiry against Shri Jaikrishna,
Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayath,
Chamarajanagar Taluk and District - reg.

Ref: 1. Government Order No. ಗ್ರಾಅಪ 189 ವಿಸೇಬಿ 2013
dated 25.11.2013 & corrigendum dt. 03.12.13.
2. Nomination Order No. LOK/INQ/14-A/
504/2012 dated 17.12.2013.

~~~~~

The Government, by its Order dated 25.11.2013 & corrigendum dt. 03.12.13, initiated the disciplinary proceedings against Shri Jaikrishna, Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayath, Chamarajanagar Taluk and District (herein after referred to as the Delinquent Government Official, for short 'DGO') and entrusted the departmental inquiry to this Institution. This Institution, by Nomination Order dated 17.12.2013, nominated the Additional Registrar of Enquiries-10,

✓

Karnataka Lokayukta, Bangalore to conduct the departmental inquiry against the DGO for the alleged misconduct alleged to have been committed by the DGO.

2. The Inquiry Officer by his report dated 19.02.2015 has held that, the charge of misconduct alleged against the DGO is held proved.

3. The charge alleged against the DGO was that, while he was working as an Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayath, Chamarajanagar Taluk and District, in 2012 a complaint was filed against him before this Institution in No. Compt/Uplok.Mys.2759/2012/ARE-7 by one D, Nagaraju s/o Shri Dodadundaiah, Uttuvalli, Kasaba Hobli, Chamarajanagar Taluk and District, alleging misconduct against the DGO. The DGO was sent with notice for appearance, however, when he failed to appear, reminder was sent on 15.12.2012, 18.01.2013 and also sent one notice through RPAD. Though the notices were served upon the DGO, he did not respond to any of the

5

notices. Thereafter, another RPAD notice dt. 15.02.2013 was served on DGO on 22.01.2013. Despite of the said notice also, he did not respond. Thereafter, another notice was sent through the Lokayukta police. Even for the said notice also, he did not respond. As a result, show cause notices dt. 06.04.2013, 22.05.2013 were also issued calling upon him to show cause as to why disciplinary proceedings should not be initiated against him for not responding to the notices issued and disobeying the directions of Hon'ble Upalokayukta. Even to the show cause notice also, DGO failed to respond, as a result, he committed a misconduct within the meaning of Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

4. The then scrutiny officer in No. Compt/Uplok/Mys.2759/2012/ARE-7 has been examined. In his evidence, he has stated that, the DGO, despite of issue of show cause notice by RPAD and through Lokayukta police, has failed to appear before the Inquiry Officer. As a result, he failed to respond to



the notice, but also failed to obey the directions. Even when show cause notice was issued, for that also DGO did not respond.

5. The documentary evidence produced at Exs.P1 to P6 proves the misconduct of the DGO. To the contrary, even in this proceeding, the DGO has failed to lead any evidence nor has stepped into the witness box to deny the allegation against him in this complaint. Hence, I have no reason to disagree with the findings recorded by the Inquiry Officer.

6. Hence, having regard to the nature and gravity of the misconduct alleged against the DGO - Shri Jaikrishna, Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayath, Chamarajanagar Taluk and District, I hereby recommend to the Government for withholding of five annual increments with cumulative effect in exercise of powers under Rule 8(iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules.

4

notices. Thereafter, another RPAD notice dt. 15.02.2013 was served on DGO on 22.01.2013. Despite of the said notice also, he did not respond. Thereafter, another notice was sent through the Lokayukta police. Even for the said notice also, he did not respond. As a result, show cause notices dt. 06.04.2013, 22.05.2013 were also issued calling upon him to show cause as to why disciplinary proceedings should not be initiated against him for not responding to the notices issued and disobeying the directions of Hon'ble Upalokayukta. Even to the show cause notice also, DGO failed to respond, as a result, he committed a misconduct within the meaning of Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1966.

4. The then scrutiny officer in No. Compt/Uplok/Mys.2759/2012/ARE-7 has been examined. In his evidence, he has stated that, the DGO, despite of issue of show cause notice by RPAD and through Lokayukta police, has failed to appear before the Inquiry Officer. As a result, he failed to respond to

the notice, but also failed to obey the directions. Even when show cause notice was issued, for that also DGO did not respond.

5. The documentary evidence produced at Exs.P1 to P6 proves the misconduct of the DGO. To the contrary, even in this proceeding, the DGO has failed to lead any evidence nor has stepped into the witness box to deny the allegation against him in this complaint. Hence, I have no reason to disagree with the findings recorded by the Inquiry Officer.

6. Hence, having regard to the nature and gravity of the misconduct alleged against the DGO - Shri Jaikrishna, Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayath, Chamarajanagar Taluk and District, I hereby recommend to the Government for withholding of five annual increments with cumulative effect in exercise of powers under Rule 8(iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules.

✓

7. Action taken in the matter is to be intimated to this

Authority.

Connected records are enclosed here with.

*S. B. Adi. 3/8/15*  
(Justice Subhash B. Adi)  
Upalokayukta,  
State of Karnataka.