



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 27TH 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. 4435 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

R. PRABHAVATHI,
W/O. M.G. JAYARAM ARAVIND,
D/O. K. RAJANNA,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
WORKING AS SR. SUB REGISTRAR,
OFFICE OF HALASURU SUB REGISTRAR,
BENGALURU,
(NOW UNDER SUSPENSION).

R/AT NO.677, 2ND PHASE,
NTI LAYOUT,
NEAR SAHAKARNAGAR UNDERPASS,
VIDYARANYAPURA POST,
BENGALURU-560 097.

(BY SRI. G.B. SHARATH GOWDA, ADV.)

...PETITIONER

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
(REGISTRATION AND STAMPS),
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560 001.
2. THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
OF REGISTRATIONS,
DEPARTMENT OF REGISTRATION





AND STAMPS,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
KANDAYA BHAVAN, K.G.ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 009.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V SHIVAREDDY, AGA FOR R1 & R2)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER WRIT/S OR DIRECTION OR ORDER QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 28/01/2026 PASSED BY THE KARNATAKA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU IN APPLICATION NO.103/2026 AT ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

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

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT)

Petitioner, a suspended Senior Sub-Registrar is before this Court aggrieved by order dated 28.01.2026 in Application No.103/2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at Bengaluru (for short, 'the Tribunal') refusing to stay the order of suspension dated 02.01.2026 (Annexure-A), keeping the petition under suspension.



2. Heard learned counsel Sri.G.B.Sharath Gowda for petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate Sri.V.Shivareddy for respondent Nos.1 and 2. Perused the entire writ petition papers.

3. The petitioner is before the Tribunal in the above stated application questioning the order of suspension dated 02.01.2026 on the allegation of violation of circulars while registering some of the documents.

4. Learned counsel Sri.G.B.Sharath Gowda for petitioner has urged several grounds and further submits that the Tribunal recorded certain facts which were not available before the Tribunal, as no statement of objections was filed by the State, rejected the interim prayer of the petitioner. Learned counsel would contend that the petitioner has not caused any loss to the State Exchequer or illegality affecting the validity of instruments registered by the petitioner. Further, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the suspension could be



in terms of Section 10(3) of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957. A Government servant could be kept under suspension if there is any prima-facie material evidence on record. In the instant case, learned counsel would submit that there are no material whatsoever on the petitioner to keep under suspension. However, he submits that the petitioner has followed the circular and registered the documents.

5. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate Sri.V.Shivareddy would submit that the respondents/State has filed certain documents along with memo before the Tribunal while considering the interim prayer of the petitioner. Looking into those documents, the Tribunal has recorded the findings which are in accordance with law. Further, learned Additional Government Advocate would submit that the main application is pending before the Tribunal and on filing of statement of objections by the State, the Tribunal could be directed to dispose of the main application itself.



6. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the entire writ petition papers, we are not inclined to interfere with the interim order passed by the Tribunal refusing to stay the order of suspension dated 02.01.2026.

7. We have gone through the interim order passed by the Tribunal. At this stage, while considering the interim prayer to stay the order of suspension, the Tribunal's observation made at paragraph (6) were unnecessary as the same would affect either of the parties while considering the main application. However, we refuse to interfere with the interim order passed by the Tribunal.

8. Learned Additional Government Advocate Sri.V.Shivareddy would submit that the State would file objections on the next date of hearing i.e., 10.03.2026. If the statement of objections are filed on the next date of hearing, the Tribunal is requested to hear the matter and



dispose of the same within fifteen days thereafter, without being influenced by any of the findings in the interim order passed by the Tribunal.

9. With the above observations, writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(S.G.PANDIT)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(K. V. ARAVIND)
JUDGE

NC
CT:bms
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 1