



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS
JUDGE, CHITRADURGA.**

Present:

Sri. Ron Vasudev, B.Com. LL.B.(Spl)
Prl. District & Sessions Judge,
Chitradurga.

Dated this the 16th day of April, 2026

Spl.C.(PC) No.06/2022

Complainant	State by ACB/Lokayuktha Police, Chitradurga. (By Learned Spl. Public Prosecutor, Chitradurga)
--------------------	--

/versus/

Accused:	1. Sri. M.B. Mohan S/o M. Balanaika, Aged about 56 years, Occ: Sherithedar, SLAO Office, NH-150A, Hiriyyuru, R/o Vedavathi Nagara, Hiriyyuru Town, Chitradurga District. 2. Sri Mansoor. A. S/o Late. Ameer Sab, Aged about 38 years, Occ: Driver, R/o Vedavathi Nagara, Hiriyyuru Town, Chitradurga District.
Opponent:	Sri. Veeresh Kumar. A. S/o Amaranna, Aged about 32 years, SLAO, Challakere Road, Hiriyyuru. R/o Brigade Panorama, Mysuru Road, Bengaluru. (A1 by Sri. N.G. Krishnamurthy, Adv., A2 & Opponent by Sri. P.M.

	Hanumantharaya/Smt. Prabhavathi M Hiremath, Adv.,)
--	---

ORDER ON 319 CR.P.C. APPLICATION

The above application is filed by the Spl. Public Prosecutor seeking to proceed against the opponent/Veeresh Kumar S/o Amaranna, the then SLAO, Hiriyyuru, Chitradurga District. After filing of the said application notice was issued to the opponent and he appeared through his counsel and has filed his objection statement.

2. In this background, now the following points would arise for my consideration:

1. Whether the prosecution has shown that there are sufficient materials to proceed against the opponent/Veeresh Kumar S/o Amaranna?
2. If findings on point No.1 is in the affirmative, what is the procedure to proceed against the opponent?
3. What order?

3. I have heard the arguments Spl. Public Prosecutor for ACB and Smt. PMH advocate for the opponent. I have also gone through the evidence adduced by the prosecution by examining PW.1 and 2 and getting marked Ex.P.1 to 48 and M.O.1 to 20 as well as final report and

documents enclosed with it. I have also gone through the written submission filed by the opponent and the decisions reported at AIR 2014 SC 1400 (Hardeep Singh V/s State of Punjab & Ors); Crl.A.No.735/2014 (@Special Leave Petition (Crl.)No.9184/2008) (Babubhai Bhimabhai Bokhira & Anr V/s State of Gujarat & Ors); AIR ONLINE 2021 SC 799 (Ramesh Chandrda Srivastava V/s The State of U.P. & Anr); AIR 2006 SC 389 (Dilawar Singh V/s Parvinder Singh @ Iqbal Singh & Anr) & (2024) 7 SCR 62 (The State of Punjab V/s Partap Singh Verka) relied by Smt. PMH advocate. At the same time I have also considered the Constitution Bench judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Crl.A.No.1669/2009 (Neeraj Dutta V/s State) decided on 15.12.2022. On thorough reading of the entire case file and taking note of submissions canvassed by both side as well as the decisions relied by the opponent, my findings on the above points are as under:-

Point No.1 : In the Affirmative

Point No.2 : S.P. Lokayuktha to move the competent authority of the opponent seeking to prosecute him

Point No.3 : As per final order for the following:-

REASONS

4. **Point No.1 & 2 :-** For the sake of convenience I have taken both these points simultaneously.

5. The prosecution case unfolds with the complaint filed by Smt. Nethra (PW.1) alleging that she is owning lands in Sy.No.13 & Sy.No.372/1 of Hiriyuru and the said lands were acquired for the purpose of widening of NH-150A and opponent was then SLAO for the said acquisition and award was passed. That she had been to his office on 25.08.2021 and having met him personally requested him to disburse the compensation. Then this opponent directed her to approach the Manager-Mr. Mohan Kumar (arrayed as accused No.1 in the charge sheet) and when she met the latter, he told that there is kharab in her said lands, so she would get lesser compensation. When she stated that no such kharab is there in her lands, he asked her to get the documents and having collected those documents she gave them to him and again met him on 31.08.2021 and asked about the compensation to be paid to her. Then the said Mohan asked her to get some more documents as per list furnished by him and upon collecting all those documents on 03.09.2021 she approached him and gave all those documents as required and also put her signature. Thereafter on 2-3 occasions she having visited the said office, when nothing realized, she met the opponent and he told that he will send a message to her soon. In the meanwhile on 12.09.2021 at about 4.00 pm the driver of the office of the opponent by name Mansoor and another person by name Shivashankarappa came to the house of PW.1 and introducing themselves and stating that they have come to her house as per instructions of this

opponent and assuring that they would mediate and get release the compensation amount as early as possible, they went away and on 13.09.2021 at 7.30 pm the said duo again came to her house and stating that they have already discussed with the opponent, demanded Rs.6,00,000/- as bribe for the same. When she expressed her inability to pay such huge sum unless she receives the compensation, they politely stated that unless she makes arrangement for that sum, they will not be able to get the things done and if she pays amount within 3-4 days her bank account will be credited with the compensastion amount. Unwilling to pay the bribe, she recorded the conversation between herself and the said duo in her mobile and on 14.09.2021 at about 9.30 am when again Mansoor and Shivashankarappa came and told that the opponent will be there for two more days in the office and if she does not make arrangement for the amount they are not responsible for the same, they asked her to expedite the things atleast by borrowing loan from others. Thus they put forth demand for bribe allegedly on behalf of the opponent. The PW.1 recorded the conversation between her and Mansoor and Shiva shankarappa when they visited to her house on 14.09.2021. Thus realizing that the opponent as a SLAO has engaged Mansoor to collect the amount through them she having no interest to pay the bribe, filed the complaint in ACB Police Station, Chitradurga on 14.09.2021 at 11.30 am. It was registered by the then Dy.S.P. Basavaraj R. Magadum (CW.26) and he having summoned shadow

witnesses Vinay Kumaar and Rakesh (CW.2 & 3) appraised them of contents of the complaint and in presence of PW.1, Vinay Kumar (PW.2) and Rakesh (CW.3) held pre-trap mahazar, took the photographs and on the very same day they left the ACB office in the evening hours and as per instructions of Mansoor, they proceeded to the house of PW.1 at Hiriyyuru and in her house when the said Mansoor collected the amount and left on his bike to the house of Mohan, following him along with shadow witnesses, the said Dy.S.P. Basavaraj caught hold Mansoor once he handed over the amount to Mohan in his residence situating at Challakere road. Then introducing themselves to Mansoor as well as Mohan seized the amount of Rs.5,30,000/- in the house of Mohan itself and the said Dy.S.P. as well as others noticed that when Mohan informed the opponent over the mobile call having collected the amount from Mansoor, disconnecting the same the opponent called him over Whatsapp call and accusing him for improper handling of things asked him to retain that amount with him and as per his instructions Rs.5,00,000/- was retained by Mohan towards share of himself and opponent and Rs.30,000/- was paid to Mansoor and the said sum were recovered by the Dy.S.P. Then the said Mansoor and Mohan led the IO and shadow witnesses to the office of the opponent at Hiriyyuru and in the said office, further proceedings were held. The trap mahazar was also prepared and photographs were taken out. It is also on record that the opponent, Mohan and Mansoor gave their

written versions on the very same day i.e., on the date of trap (14.09.2021).

6. The order sheet evidences that after completion of all preliminary investigation and subjecting them to medical examination, they were produced before this court on 15.09.2021 and they were remanded. As could be seen from the further order sheet, they were released on bail in terms of the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court in CrI.P.No.7657/2021 C/W 7693/2021 & 7660/2021. Thus right from the complaint (Ex.P.1) and in FIR issued on the very same day, this opponent was arrayed as accused No.1, Mohan as accused No.2 and Mansoor as accused No.3 and Shivashankarappa as accused No.4. However after investigation the incharge Dy.S.P. Mr. Manjunath. R. (CW.27) dropped both the opponent and Shivashankarappa arraying Mohan Kumar as accused No.1 and Mansoor as accused No.2 and filed charge sheet against them for the offences punishable U/Sec.7(a), 7A of PC Act and Sec.120B of IPC.

7. On receipt of the charge sheet cognizance of the offences was taken by my predecessor in office and the said accused No.1 and 2 were directed to appear and on their appearance by furnishing copies of the charge sheet they were heard, charge was framed and trial was commenced. During the trial so far the prosecution has examined Nethra as PW.1, Vinay Kumar as PW.2 and it has got

marked the documents and material objects as explained above. Still PW.1 and 2 are not cross examined. At this stage learned Spl. Public Prosecutor came up with this application U/Sec.319 of Cr.P.C. to proceed against the opponent stating that there are sufficient materials against him also.

8. On the other hand in response to the court notice having appeared through his counsel by filing his detailed objection statement the opponent contends that unnecessarily he has been involved in the case and there is no evidence to show that he ever made any demand for bribe to PW.1 nor he received that amount from her and evidence placed by the prosecution at this stage does not indicate his direct involvement and if somebody misuses his name or on the strength of versions of accused No.1 and 2 i.e., Mohan and Mansoor, he cannot be proceeded against. It is also contended by him that even assuming for a moment that there is any pinch of material against him, in the absence of sanction as required U/Sec.19 of PC Act, he cannot be arrayed as co-accused. It is his submission that taking cognizance of the offence by this court against the accused on record, does not extend to involve him in the case in hand in the absence of sanction. In support of his said submissions he has relied on the decisions cited above.

9. On the other hand learned Spl. Public Prosecutor contend that since there is sufficient oral and documentary evidence to show that this opponent is the key person in demanding such huge bribe, he cannot be allowed to go scot-free. In the light of these rival submissions, I have carefully gone through the evidence and also relevant provisions of PC Act. For the sake of convenience I would like to reproduce Sec.7 of PC Act as under:

Sec.7: Offence relating to public servant being bribed.

Any public servant who,- (a) obtains or accepts or “attempts to obtain” from any person, an undue advantage, with the intention to perform or cause performance of public duty improperly or dishonestly or to forbear or cause forbearance to perform such duty “either by himself or by another public servant”; or

(b) obtains or accepts or attempts to obtain, an undue advantage from any person “as a reward” for the improper or dishonest performance of a public duty or for forbearing to perform such duty either by himself or another public servant; or

(c) performs or induces another public servant to perform improperly or dishonestly a public duty or to forbear performance of such duty in anticipation of or in consequence of accepting an undue

advantage from any person, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than three years but which may extend to seven years and shall also be liable to fine.

Explanation 1. - For the purpose of this section, the obtaining, accepting, or the “attempting to obtain” an undue advantage shall itself constitute an offence even if the performance of a public duty by public servant, is not or has not been improper.

Illustration. - A public servant, 'S' asks a person, 'P' to give him an amount of five thousand rupees to process his routine ration card application on time. 'S' is guilty of an offence under this section.

Explanation 2. - For the purpose of this section,-
(i) the expressions "obtains" or "accepts" or "**attempts to obtain**" shall cover cases where a person being a public servant, obtains or "accepts" or "**attempts to obtain**", any undue advantage for himself or "**for another person**", by abusing his position as a public servant or by "**using his personal influence over another public servant**"; or by any other corrupt or illegal means;

(ii) it shall be immaterial whether such person being a public servant obtains or accepts, or attempts to obtain the undue advantage directly or through a third party.

From the bare reading of the above section with the emphasis supplied by me, what can be gathered is that it is not necessary that a public servant is required to accept the bribe by personally so as to attract the completion of the offence. Similarly it is not necessary that the demand should directly come from the mouth of such public servant for bribe. Understanding the crooked mind of dishonest and corrupt officers, the parliamentarians have in their wisdom while enacting the said section have taken enough caution to include even an attempt to obtain bribe as an offence and not only that if a public servant either by himself or through some other person or public servant receives or accepts or attempts to obtain, then also it amounts to offence. That is why reproducing the said provision I have highlighted the relevant parts of it.

10. As could be seen from the Explanation-I appended to the said section for the purpose of said section even attempt to obtain is also an offence and it is not necessary that the bribe amount should be passed on from the hands of the complainant to the dishonest or corrupt public servant. Then by giving an illustration to the very section legislatures have made amply clear that even making a demand for bribe would attracts the ingredients of that section. Therefore it is not possible to accept the submission of the opponent that since there was no direct demand from him for bribe and he did not receive the bribe

amount or any part of it personally he cannot be proceeded against.

11. Even as per Sec.7A of PC Act a demand by public servant to obtain any undue advantage by exercising his personal influence amounts to an offence. I would extract the said section and reproduce the same with the following emphasis:

Sec.7A: Taking undue advantage to influence public servant by corrupt or illegal means or by exercise of personal influence.--Whoever accepts or obtains or attempts to obtain from another person for himself or for any other person any undue advantage as a motive or reward to induce a public servant, by corrupt or illegal means or by exercise of his personal influence to perform or to cause performance of a public duty improperly or dishonestly or to forbear or to cause to forbear such public duty by such public servant or by another public servant, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than three years but which may extend to seven years and shall also be liable to fine.

Emphasis supplied by me would show that if a public servant by using his influence makes demand or attempts to make demand for bribe, then also he can be proceeded

against for the offence punishable U/Sec.7A of PC Act. Thus having made reference to the relevant provisions of PC Act, now I would take to oral and documentary evidence the prosecution seeks to rely upon. I would refer to them one after the other.

i) in the complaint as well as in the FIR the name of this opponent is very much described by stating that demand was made by him through his subordinates giving no scope for any reason to doubt or to claim ambiguity in identifying him.

ii) It is not in dispute that this opponent was the SLAO of Hiriyuru and was engaged for the purpose of acquiring of land and disbursing of compensation.

iii) It is also not in dispute that lands belonging to PW.1 in Sy.No.13 and 372/1 of Hiriyuru were acquired for the aforesaid purpose and she was waiting to receive her compensation amount.

iv) It is also not in dispute that file pertaining to her for disbursal of compensation was very much with the opponent.

v) It is not the submission of opponent that no part of work belonging to PW.1 was pending with him so there was no question of making any demand for bribe by him.

vi) It is further not in dispute that Mohan was working as a Manager in the said office and this Mansoor was the car driver engaged by that office.

vii) It is also not in dispute that the opponent is an officer of KAS rank, whereas Mohan and Mansoor are ordinary public servants as Manager and outsourced car driver.

12. With these inputs if one looks at the pre-trap mahazar marked as Ex.P.21 through PW.1 in conjunction with the trap mahazar marked at Ex.P.24, the recitals of the said mahazar on Page No.2 would show that when Mansoor was caught redhandedly once he came out from the house of Mohan having handed over Rs.5,00,000/- to him, the Mansoor stated that he had retained Rs.30,000/- with him and has paid Rs.5,00,000/- to Mohan as per instructions of this opponent. This can be seen at 9th line onwards on the said page and at last three lines of the said paragraphs after entering the house of Mohan when the IO introduced himself to him, during that very period this opponent makes a Whatsapp call and said call was made to be heard by all others who had gathered there by keeping it in speaker mode and conversation between Mohan and opponent was recorded by the IO in their Sony voice recorder. The said conversation is reduced in to writing and it is the part of said trap mahazar and it is at page No.8 & 9. It is important to note that after completion of preliminary steps in the house of Mohan, IO proceeds to

the office of the opponent and he was taken there by Mansoor and Mohan along with shadow witnesses and in the first floor of the said office this opponent was residing in a room and he was found there and in presence of very opponent both Mansoor and Mohan stated that they received that amount from PW.1 as per his instructions. The statements given by the opponent, Mohan and Mansoor are part of trap mahazar and they are at Page No.10, 11 & 12.

13. Added to that the defence version of opponent is marked at Ex.P.39; that of Mohan as per Ex.P.40 and of Mansoor as Ex.P.41, it is crucial to note that Whatsapp calls of mobile phone belonging to Mohan is also captured by the IO and it is at Ex.P.42 and said Ex.P.42 shows calls were made by the opponent exactly at the time of raiding of the house of Mohan and also calls made by Mansoor to Mohan. So these exchange of calls amongst Mansoor to Mohan; Mohan to opponent and from opponent to Mohan at the relevant time show that all the three conjointly hatched to rob PW.1 when she deserved compensation for loosing her land. The photographs at Ex.P.25 to 37 taken out in the room of the opponent show his presence there and he was very much part of the trap mahazar. Wherefore his signature is also obtained to it not as a witness but as an accused.

14. It is important to note that in his explanation at Ex.P.40 Mohan categorically stated that as per instructions of opponent believing that it is personal amount of the opponent he received it. Whereas according to the version of Mansoor which is at Ex.P.41, he is working as driver in the office of SLAO and he did not receive the salary for months together, therefore he was in dire need of money and by calling him to their chamber both Mohan and opponent asked him to do certain things and he acted as per their instructions. He has taken the name of the opponent in his statement without any ambiguity.

15. During the arguments attacking the said Ex.P.40 and 41 Smt. PMH advocate canvassed that the statements of the co-accused cannot be relied as evidence and on the basis of such evidence this opponent cannot be proceeded against. Expecting this kind of argument I have reproduced Sec.7(a) and 7A of PC Act to demonstrate that one cannot simply submit that statement of co-accused is inadmissible in a case of this nature. As I pointed out opponent being SLAO one cannot expect him to make demand directly to PW.1, therefore by retaining the file with him, he asked her to meet Mohan and through Mohan and Mansoor, he made demand for bribe. Otherwise there was no need for this opponent to make Whatsapp call as evidenced by Ex.P.42. It may be noted that the prosecution is not relying on the said Ex.P.40 and 41 at the inception. According to it they are only connecting link to show that

this opponent is also involved in the conspiracy to take bribe and as such he made the Whatsapp conversation with Mohan and IO has recorded the same in their in Sony voice recorder. Added to that IO collected sample voice of opponent by asking him to read the very same conversation as evidenced by Ex.P.43 and recorded the same in CD. M.O.13 is the CD which contains sample voices of opponent and M.O.18 is the CD containing conversation between opponent and Mohan. When the said articles at 15 and 20 were sent to FSL, Bengaluru, having subjected them to different tests, Scientific Officer-Dr. Imran Pasha has given his opinion and among four opinions rendered by him opinion No.2 is pertaining to Article No.15 & 20 and he opined that as per tests he followed the sample voice contained in Article 15 matched with conversation contained in Article 20 pertaining to this opponent and Mohan. According to me this is also a crucial piece of evidence to show that this opponent is a person who is the root cause for this whole episode.

16. The conversation between opponent and Mohan is reduced in to writing and it is marked as Ex.P.48. If one looks at the said conversation all the allegations of demand for bribe by this opponent can be gathered when he cautioned Mohan to handle the situation carefully otherwise there will be problem for them. If at all no demand was there from this opponent there was no necessity for him to make such utterances that too by

making Whatsapp call to Mohan and more precisely at the time of raid.

17. Therefore the submission of Smt. PMH advocate that there is no pinch of legally acceptable evidence to rope in this opponent in the offences alleged cannot be accepted. According to me it is this opponent he is the basis for all this episode and everything points out at him, even then unfortunately ACB keeps him away by recording his statement U/Sec.161 of Cr.P.C. and arraying him as CW.7 in the charge sheet. It was also canvassed by Smt. PMH advocate that very supplementary statement of PW.1 recorded by the IO would show that under wrong notion she filed complaint against the opponent and later she withdrew her allegation against him. In this regard less said the better. When a complaint signed by PW.1 is very much available on record, it would be too unjust to look at her so called statement said to have been recorded by the IO as per his whims and fancies.

18. May be for the said reason division bench of our High Court attacking very creation of ACB by an executive order so as to take away powers of Lokayuktha in its decision reported at (2022) 5 KLJ 193 (Chidananda Urs. B.G. V/s State of Karnataka) struck down the said executive order and restored power to Lokayuktha. According to me this is the classic example to show how ACB was managing the things just to save the corrupt

officers. Looking at the final report and attempt made by the IO, I am remained of an adage “fence itself eating away the yield”. The ACB which was constituted for the purpose of catching corrupt officers, leaving sharks it was catching fishes and this final report is one such an instance.

19. If at all this opponent was innocent and if his hands are tainted and if he is not involved in the offences alleged, he ought to have proceeded against erring officials who made him to suffer imprisonment from 15.09.2021 to 11.10.2021 I.e., from the date of his arrest till the date of his release. Instead he felt it convenient to win over the IO and get a final report which suits him. Therefore viewed from any angle, again and again I hold that there is enough material to proceed against the opponent.

20. Having made reference to the documents, now I turn to the testimony of PW.1. In accordance with the contents of her complaint she stated that when she personally met the opponent he had assured that he would make payment of compensation and asked her to meet Mohan and she also stated that on 24.08.2021 Shivashankarappa and Veeresh Kumar came and demanded Rs.6,00,000/- by stating that Rs.5,00,000/- is to be paid to opponent and Rs.1,00,000/- to Mohan, therefore she filed complaint against them all. She has also stated about the demand made by the opponent through his subordinates and receipt of Rs.5,30,000/- from her by Mansoor in her

residence against Rs.6,00,000/- demanded and handing over of copies of her file by the opponent in his office from his office cupboard. She also stated regarding Article No.15 & 20. I have already made reference them marked as M.O.13 & 18 and her version is corroborated by the shadow witness PW.2.

21. Even PW.2 also stated that when they were in the house of Mohan this opponent made Whatsapp call to him. It is true that still PW.1 and 2 are not cross examined by the accused on record, however their versions on oath are supported by the documents.

22. In view of this elaborate discussion, I hold that the ratio laid down in Babubhai Bhimabhai Bohiria's case will not come to the aid of the opponent. The discussion made in the above paragraphs would show that it is not prima-facie material like in the stage of taking of cognizance of offence, but there is a sufficient evidence and if it is not rebutted, it would end in conviction of the opponent as this court is proceeding against him U/Sec.319 of Cr.P.C. This court is very much aware of extraordinary power it enjoys and it has to sparingly exercise its power under this provision if circumstances really so warrant. I think the observation made by me is enough to do away the doubts raised by the opponent, therefore even Ramesh Chandra's case will not come to his aid.

23. In Neeraj Dutta's case expressing its displeasure with raising corruption in our country constitution bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court at para.71 reiterating the observation made in the Swatantar Singh's case reported at (1997) 4 SCC 14 held as under;

“Corruption is corroding, like cancerous lymph nodes, the vital veins of the body politic, social fabric of efficiency in the public service and demoralizing the honest officers. The efficiency in public service would improve only when the public servant devotes his sincere attention and does the duty diligently, truthfully, honestly and devotes himself assiduously to the performance of the duties of his post. The reputation of corruption would gather thick and unchaseable clouds around the conduct of the officer and gain notoriety much faster than the smoke”

One has to understand the concern expressed by the constitution bench. Laws cannot be made helpless, instead long arms of the law have to be shown and it has to be demonstrated that nobody is above it, how so ever he may be high. Unless this message is sent, I do not think that we cannot correct the system.

24. Now a question would raise whether this court can proceed against the opponent straight away? Here I feel that because of Sec.19 of PC Act, this court cannot run fast, it has to wait for according of sanction to proceed

against him also. In the light of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Prathap Singh's case Sec.19 of PC Act has to be met with before this opponent is proceeded against, however that does not mean that this court has to wait for the same indefinitely.

25. This episode took place in the month of September-2021 then BNSS was not in force so one has to go by the provisions of Cr.P.C. Intentionally I am making this observation for the reason that in Sec.218 of BNSS by making certain improvements the legislatures have fixed the time limit within which the competent authority has to accord its sanction, otherwise it deemed to have been accorded. However the said principle cannot be borrowed and applied in the case in hand. Looking to the tainted investigation by CW.27, then in-charge of Dy.S.P. ACB, Chitradudrga I feel that now SP, Lokayuktha has to be entrusted with the task of getting the sanction to prosecute the opponent as no longer ACB in existence. Then only this opponent can be proceeded against.

26. Even for that matter it is necessary to fix the time limit. According to me as this court has made reference to so much of evidence which is available on record to proceed against the opponent, SP has to move the competent authority within 30 days from the date of this order with all necessary documents and the said authority shall take its decision within four months from the date of receipt of such requisition by SP, Lokayuktha, Chitradurga.

With this I answer point No.1 in the affirmative and with respect to point No.2 I make the observation in terms of the above discussion.

27. **Point No.3:-** In the result, I proceed to make the following:-

O R D E R

Superintendent of Police, Lokayuktha, Chitradurga is directed to move the competent authority to seek sanction to prosecute the opponent with all necessary documents within **one month** from the date of this order.

The said competent authority shall take decision in the matter within **four months** from the date of receipt of requisition by Superintendent of Police, Lokayuktha, Chitradurga.

Based on the decision to be taken by the sanctioning authority, the prosecution to take necessary steps thereafter.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-III, transcribed and computerized by her, script corrected, signed and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 16th day of April, 2026).

(RON VASUDEV)

Prl. District & Sessions Judge,
Chitradurga.

* TD*

* * *