



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE
WRIT PETITION NO. 4489 OF 2026 (L-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI K PARANDHAMA REDDY,
S/O SRI KAMBHAM RAMIREDDY,
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
RETIRED SFW (TS), CENTRAL SILK BOARD,
REGIONAL SERICULTURAL RESEARCH STATION,
ANANTHAPUR, ANDHRA PRADESH-515 101
R/AT C/O MUDALAIAH, NO.121-A,
10TH 'B' CROSS, SHANTHI GARDEN,
MUDULAPALYA,
BENGALURU- 560 072.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI V.S.NAIK, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. CENTRAL SILK BOARD,
BTM LAYOUT, MADIWALA,
BANGALORE -560 068.
REP. BY ITS MEMBER SECRETARY,
2. THE DIRECTOR,
CENTRAL SERICULTURAL RESEARCH AND
TRAINING INSTITUTE,
CENTRAL SILK BOARD,
MANANDAVADI ROAD,
SRIRAMPURA,
MYSURU-570 008.
3. THE SCIENTIST-D AND HEAD,
REGIONAL SERICULTURAL RESEARCH STATION,
CENTRAL SILK BOARD,
POST BOX NO.50, ANANTAPUR,





ANDHRA PRADESH-515 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI NARASIMHA SWAMY, ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE MEMORANDUM BEARING NO.CSB/RSRS/ATP/PF/KPR, SFW(TS)/2010011/3 DTD. 07.04.2025 ISSUED BY THE R-3 THE ORIGINAL OF WHICH IS PRODUCED AND MARKED AS ANNEX-C TO THIS WRIT PETITION.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed seeking writ of mandamus to direct the respondents to consider the petitioner's oral representation to continue in service under the respondents till the petitioner completes the age of 60 years, which according to the petitioner is the age of superannuation.

2. The petitioner had filed the petition in the light of the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in ***Central Silk Board vs Employees Union of Central Silk Board & Another***¹ wherein, in terms of the order dated 04.09.2024, this Court has dismissed the petition filed by first

¹ W.P. No.18693/2014



respondent Central Silk Board and confirmed the award passed by the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court.

3. In terms of the award dated 01.04.2013, the Tribunal has held that age of superannuation of the Timescale Farm Workers of the respondent establishment would be 60 years and not 55 years as contended by the respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court confirming the award passed by the Tribunal is not questioned by the respondents and it has attained finality.

5. Learned counsel for respondents would submit that though the Board of first respondent has passed a resolution to implement the order, with effect from the date of the order passed in **Central Silk Board** (supra), the Board is yet to receive the approval from the Union of India for the decision taken by the Board. It is further submitted that since respondents are awaiting the decision of Union of India, from the perspective of the respondents the award passed by the



Central Government Industrial Tribunal has not yet attained finality.

6. This Court has considered the contentions raised at the bar and perused the records.

7. It is not in dispute that the award passed by the Tribunal enhancing the age of retirement to 60 years from 55 years is confirmed by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Central Silk Board** (supra). It is further not in dispute that the petitioner worked as Timescale Farm Worker with respondent No.1. The petitioner has completed 58 years after the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court confirming the award passed by the Tribunal.

8. This being the position, the award passed by the Tribunal which is confirmed by the Division Bench of this Court comes to the aid of the petitioner and the petitioner is entitled to the following relief:-

(i) It is declared that the petitioner's age of superannuation is 60 years.



(ii) Thus, the petitioner is entitled to continue in employment as Timescale Farm Worker under first respondent till the age of superannuation at 60 subject to all the Rules and Regulations applicable to the employment of the petitioner.

9. The Writ Petition is accordingly ***disposed of*** with the above observations and findings.

**Sd/-
(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)
JUDGE**

MR
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 32