



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 8937 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI RAJKUMAR MULIMUNI
S/O KALLAPPA MULAMANI,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
WORKING AS PANCHAYAT
DEVELOPMENT OFFICER,
PRESENTLY POSTED AT
GRAM PANCHAYAT HONNUTAGI,
TALUK VIJAYAPURA,
DISTRICT VIJAYAPURA
RESIDING AT HONNUTAGI,
VIJAYAPURA TALUK
VIJAYAPURA DISTRICT-586127.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. KASHINATH J. D., ADV.)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND
PANCHAYAT RAJ DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE COMMISSIONER
KARNATAKA PANCHAYAT RAJ
COMMISSIONERATE,
RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND
PANCHAYAT RAJ DEPARTMENT,





GANDHINAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 009.

3. THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
ZILLA PANCHAYAT VIJAYAPURA
KANAKADASA COLONY,
JALANAGAR,
VIJAYAPURA-586101.
4. SMT. SUDHA REBINAL
PANCHAYAT DEVELOPMENT OFFICER,
HAIREKALLU GRAMA PANCHAYATH,
BILAGI TALUK,
BAGALAKOTE DISTRICT-587101.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B RAVINDRANATH, AGA FOR R1 AND R2)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO I) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 26/02/2026 PASSED BY THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU IN APPLICATION NO.4134/2025 AS PER ANNEXURE-A AS BEING ILLEGAL, ARBITRARY, PERVERSE, AND VITIATED BY NON-APPLICATION OF MIND. ACCORDINGLY ALLOW THE APPLICATION BY GRANTING RELIEFS AS PRAYED BY THE APPLICANT BOTH IN THE MAIN APPLICATION AS WELL AS IN THE REJOINDER 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)

The petitioner, i.e. unsuccessful applicant before the Tribunal is before this Court questioning the order dated 26.02.2026 in Application No.4134/2025 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru (for short "Tribunal"), rejecting his challenge to Notification dated 05.08.2025 (Annexure-A7) initiating transfer counseling and Corrigendum dated 16.08.2025 (Annexure-A8) and also Revised Corrigendum dated 26.08.2025 (Annexure-A10) and also Order dated 04.09.2025 whereunder, the fourth respondent is posted as Panchayath Development Officer (for short "PDO"), Grama Panchayath Honnutagi, Vijayapura Taluk and Vijayapura District.

2. Heard Sri. Kashinath J D, learned counsel appearing for petitioner and Sri. B Ravindranath, learned AGA appearing for respondents No. 1 and 2. Perused the entire writ petition papers.



3. Learned counsel Sri. Kashinath J D for petitioner would submit that the petitioner was posted to work as PDO, Grama Panchayath Honnutagi, Vijayapura Taluk and Vijayapura District by order dated 22.02.2019. Petitioner being Group-C official is provided with four years tenure at a place. The respondent – authorities initiated transfer counseling in terms of The Karnataka State Civil Services (Regulation of Transfers of Senior PDOs, PDOs, Secretaries, and Rural Development Assistants) (Grade I and II) Rules 2024, (for short '2024 Rules'). The name of the petitioner was included in the priority list published in terms of Annexure – A6. The name of the petitioner is found at Sl.No.967. The petitioner questioning the process of transfer counseling and posting of respondent No.4 in his place approached the Tribunal in the above stated application. The Tribunal under impugned order rejected the petitioner's application. Questioning the same, petitioner is before this Court.



4. Learned counsel Sri. Kashinath J D would contend that the initiation of transfer counseling and posting of respondent No.4 in petitioner's place is totally opposed to 2024 Rules, more particularly, Rules 3, 4 and 6. Learned counsel would submit that Priority List as required under Rule 6 is not published and that transfers are effected to more than 15% of the cadre strength which is opposed to 6(1) of the 2024 Rules. Learned counsel would submit that if the transfer of PDOs were limited to 15% of the cadre strength, the petitioner would not have fallen within the transfer zone. As such, he submits that posting of respondent No.4 and transferring of petitioner is liable to be interfered with.

5. However, it is noticed that petitioner has not placed on record his transfer from Grama Panchayath Honnutagi and he has also not mentioned in the whole of the petition where he has been posted/transferred.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner has completed his tenure of four years at the present place of posting i.e.,



Grama Panchayath, Honnutagi, Vijayapura Taluk and District. A person who has completed his tenure at a particular place of posting, has no right to stick to the said post forever on completion of prescribed tenure. Moreover, a Government servant is liable for transfer even before completion of transfer under administrative exigencies. In the instant case, the petitioner is posted to the present place in the year 2019 and as on this day he has completed more than 6 years. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim that he shall be continued in the same place for whatever reason. Having completed his tenure, it is not open for the petitioner to contend that Priority List is not in accordance with the Rule 6 of 2024 Rules or that the transfer is in excess of 15% of the cadre strength.

We do not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly, petition stands ***rejected***.

The petitioner shall report at the place of posting, forthwith.



**NC: 2026:KHC:17674-DB
WP No. 8937 of 2026**

If the petitioner is not provided with posting, the respondent – State shall provide posting within fifteen days from today.

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

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

BSV
CT:bms
List No.: 1 SI No.: 25