

Reserved on : 16.02.2026

Pronounced on : 26.02.2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

WRIT PETITION No. 4231 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI RAVINDRA N.,
S/O. M. NANJIAH,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
INSPECTOR OF POLICE (CIVIL)
KIKKERI POLICE STATION,
K.R PETE TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT,
NOW REPORTED FOR DUTY AS
INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
CID SPECIAL WING AND
ECONOMICAL OFFENCES
ENQUIRY DIVISION,
CARLTON BUILDING,
BENGALURU, AND NOW
RESIDING AT No.305,
F BLOCK, RAHAZA PARK APARTMENT
MAGADI MAIN ROAD,
AGRAHARA DASARAHALLI,
BENGALURU-560 079.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI VISHWANATHA BHAT A., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
HOME DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE POLICE ESTABLISHMENT BOARD,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
MEMBER SECRETARY,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BANGALURU - 560 001.
3. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL AND
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
KARNATAKA STATE POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BANGALURU - 560 001.
4. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
MYSURU DISTRICT,
MYSURU-570 010.
5. SRI. JAYARAMA S.N.,
MAJOR, FATHER'S NAME
NOT KNOWN TO PETITIONER,
ON TRANSFERRED TO
KIKKERI POLICE STATION,
K.R. PET TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT-571 423.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI V. SHIVAREDDY, AGA FOR R1 TO R4)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 22/01/2026 IN A.No.4644/2025 ON THE FILE OF THE HON'BLE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AT BENGALURU VIDE ANNEXURE-D AND TO ALLOW THE SAID APPLICATION ON THE FILE OF THE HON'BLE KSAT AT BENGALURU.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, **K.V. ARAVIND J.**, MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

C.A.V. ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND)

The unsuccessful applicant in Application No.4644/2025, assailing the order dated 22.01.2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru (for short, "the Tribunal"), is before this Court.

2. Heard Sri Vishwanatha Bhat A., learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri V. Shivareddy, learned Additional Government Advocate, appearing for respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

3. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner, a Police Inspector (Civil), was posted as Inspector of Police, CID, Bengaluru, by order dated 19.10.2022. Subsequently, by order dated 06.10.2025, he was transferred as Inspector of Police, Kikkeri Police Station, K.R. Pete, Mandya District.

3.1 It is pleaded that the petitioner sought permission to report for duty on 09.10.2025 and that he joined duty at Kikkeri Police Station and discharged his functions. It is further stated that he reported before the Superintendent of Police for joining duty on 09.10.2025. It is also pleaded that the

petitioner reported for duty at Kikkeri Police Station on 05.11.2025, performed official work, and made entries in the case diary. However, on 05.11.2025, the transfer order dated 06.10.2025 came to be cancelled, and the services of the petitioner were continued in the office of the CID, Bengaluru.

3.2 The order dated 06.10.2025 was the subject matter of challenge before the Tribunal. The Tribunal, noticing that the petitioner was relieved on 08.10.2025 and that, before he could join at the transferred post, the transfer order dated 06.10.2025 was cancelled and he was continued at his original place as Inspector, CID Headquarters, rejected the application.

4. Sri Vishwanatha Bhat A., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner was posted as Inspector of Police, CID, Bengaluru, by order dated 19.10.2022 and was thereafter transferred as Inspector of Police, Kikkeri Police Station, Mandya District, by order dated 06.10.2025.

4.1 It is contended that the petitioner reported before the Superintendent of Police, Mandya, and assumed charge as Inspector of Police, Kikkeri Police Station, on 05.11.2025. Learned counsel places reliance on Annexure-A4, stated to be the case diary of Kikkeri Police Station, and submits that the

entries therein, allegedly made by the petitioner, would establish that he had reported for duty. It is further submitted that, in view of the petitioner having reported for duty on 05.11.2025, the cancellation of the transfer order on the very same day, by rescinding the earlier transfer order, is premature, arbitrary, and unsustainable in law.

5. Sri V. Shivareddy, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent Nos. 1 to 4, submits that the petitioner was transferred from CID, Bengaluru, to Kikkeri Police Station, Mandya District, by order dated 06.10.2025. It is contended that the petitioner failed to report for duty at the transferred place.

5.1 It is further submitted that the transfer order dated 06.10.2025 was reviewed on 05.11.2025, and the earlier transfer was cancelled, with the petitioner being continued at CID, Bengaluru. Learned AGA submits that the petitioner did not report at the transferred place for nearly one month; hence, the cancellation of the transfer order is justified and well within the competence of the competent authority.

6. We have considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and perused the writ petition papers.

7. The petitioner was transferred from CID Headquarters, Bengaluru, to Kikkeri Police Station, Mandya District, as Inspector of Police. The said order came to be cancelled by a subsequent order dated 05.11.2025, whereby the petitioner was continued at CID, Bengaluru.

7.1 The petitioner contends that he had reported for duty on 09.10.2025 before the Superintendent of Police, Mandya District, and places reliance on Annexure-A3 in support of the said contention. It is further contended that, since he was posted in the place of Smt. Revathi N. at Kikkeri Police Station and she was relieved only on 05.11.2015, he could report to the said station only on 05.11.2025. The aforesaid submission is unfounded. A perusal of the transfer order dated 06.10.2025 would indicate as under:

" ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಘಟಕಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದಿಂದ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಗೊಳಿಸಿ, ಯಾವುದೇ ಸೇರುವಿಕೆ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ನಿಯುಕ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಲಾದ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ವರದಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಸೂಚಿಸುವುದು ಹಾಗೂ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಗೊಂಡ / ವರದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಪಾಲನಾ ವರದಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವುದು."

8. In view of the above, the petitioner was required to report for duty forthwith, without awaiting a separate relieving order or availing any joining time. There is no material to substantiate the contention of the petitioner that he was posted

in the place of Smt. Revathi N. at Kikkeri Police Station and that she was relieved only on 05.11.2025, thereby enabling him to assume charge on the said date. The said plea is unsupported by any documentary evidence.

9. Annexure-A3, stated to be a letter addressed to the Superintendent of Police, Mandya District, cannot be accepted at face value. The said document does not bear any acknowledgment evidencing its receipt in the office of the Superintendent of Police. In the absence of proof of submission and acknowledgment, the document remains a self-serving piece of correspondence.

10. The petitioner has also relied upon Annexure-A4, said to be the case diary of Kikkeri Police Station, contending that he made entries therein after joining duty on 05.11.2025. However, there is no material placed on record to establish that Annexure-A4 is indeed the official case diary or that the entries therein were made by the petitioner. In the absence of such proof, Annexure-A4 does not advance the case of the petitioner. The further contention that Smt. Revathi N. was relieved from Kikkeri Police Station only on 05.11.2025 is equally without any substantiation.

11. It is not in dispute that the transfer order dated 06.10.2025 came to be cancelled on 05.11.2025 before it was given effect to. Unless the transfer order dated 06.10.2025 had been acted upon and the petitioner had assumed charge at the transferred place, the cancellation of the said order and continuation of the petitioner at CID, Bengaluru, cannot be construed as a re-transfer in violation of the prescribed minimum tenure.

12. When a Government servant has not reported to the transferred place and, prior thereto, the transfer order itself is cancelled, it cannot be termed as a premature transfer, as no transfer in fact had taken effect.

13. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on the decision of this Court in ***Smt. P.V. Poornima v. State of Karnataka and Others [W.P. No. 2661/2020, decided on 29.07.2020]***, to contend that modification or cancellation of a transfer order, once issued, is impermissible and contrary to the Transfer Guidelines. However, it is to be noted that in the said case, the transfer orders were modified after the Government servants had reported at their respective transferred places and had assumed charge. The factual matrix

in the aforesaid decision is thus distinguishable and not identical to the facts of the present case.

14. The reliance placed on the decision of this Court in ***T. Suneel Kumar, IPS v. State of Karnataka and Others, reported in 2013 (3) Kar. L.J. 193 (DB)***, is also misplaced.

In the said case, the Division Bench considered the role of the Police Establishment Board and the issue relating to the minimum tenure of police officers. In the present case, the transfer order came to be cancelled before it was given effect to. Hence, the principles laid down in the aforesaid decision have no application to the facts of the present case.

15. The Tribunal, having considered these aspects, has rightly held that the transfer order dated 06.10.2025 was never given effect to and that the same was modified on 05.11.2025. It has further held that the issuance of the transfer order and its subsequent modification fall within the competence of the Police Establishment Board in exercise of powers under the Karnataka Police (Amendment) Act, 2012.

16. In the light of the foregoing reasons, we find that the order passed by the Tribunal is well reasoned and does not suffer from any infirmity warranting interference by this Court.

17. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, stands ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(S.G.PANDIT)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(K. V. ARAVIND)
JUDGE**

VBS