



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2025

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

WRIT APPEAL NO. 636 OF 2025 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. K RAMAIAH,
S/O. KARIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 77 YEARS,
No.5, 1ST CROSS, 10TH MAIN,
YELACHANALLI WARD,
K S LAYOUT, YELACHANALLI,
BANGALORE - 560 076.
2. G. S. ANANDA KRISHNA
S/O. SUBBA RAO,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
FLAT NO 408, EXPERIA APARTMENT
KOTHNUR MAIN ROAD,
J.P NAGAR, 7TH PHASE
BANGALORE-560 078.
3. B. K. BHAIKAKKANAVAR
S/O. KAMAPPA S. BHAIKAKKANAVAR
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS,
PLOT NO. 82, 'A' BLOCK
MANJUNATH NAGAR,
HAVERI POST, HAVERI TALUK
AND DISTRICT - 581 110.
4. S.C. CHIKKAMATH
S/O. CHANNAVEERA SWAMY CHIKKMATH



AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS,
NO. 348, SWATHI,
BASAVESHVARA NAGAR B BLOCK,
11TH CROSS, HAVERI -581 110

5. K MANJAPPA
S/O LATE KARIBASAPPA GUDVI
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
MANJUGIRI NILAYA,
S.R.S LAYOUT, KELADI ROAD,
SAGARA-57740,
SHIVAMOGA DISTRICT.
6. B.M. THIPPESWAMY
S/O. LATE B.M. UDDANAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS,
D.NO. 138/288,
BASAVESHWARA NAGAR
2ND MAIN, RENUKACHAR ROAD,
BALLARY 583 103.
7. K. LAKSHMANA
S/O. LATE BASANNA
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS,
PLOT NO 13 AND 16M, 19TH WARD,
SRI NAGALINGESHWARA NILAYA,
GOLLANARASAPPA COLONY,
S.N.PETE ROYAL COLONY ROAD,
BALLARY- 583 101.
8. G. VIJAYAKUMAR
S/O. LATE G CHANNABASAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS,
GESCOM, O AND M DIVISION,
SHUBAMANGALA 2ND MAIN, 4TH CROSS,
BASAVESHWAR NAGAR, BALLARY 583 103.
9. Y. ERANNA
S/O. ERAGANNA,
AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS,
O AND M RSD BALLARY ROAD,



GESCOM, 23RD WARD NEAR FIRE OFFICE,
BALLARY ROAD, KARUGOODU

10. D. ERANNA, S/O. LATE CT ERAPPA
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
ALLAM LAYOUT, 5TH CROSS,
MOKA ROAD, BALLARY.
11. ABBDUL SATTAR, S/O. LATA RASSOL SAB
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS,
BATTADAPALLI, MD DIVISION,
BALLARY-583 103.
12. CHANNARAYAPPA
S/o LATE CHIKKADASAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 85 YEARS,
R/a No. E-266, A-BLOCK,
ITI COLONY, DOORVANINAGAR,
NEAR VIDYAMANDIR CENTRAL SCHOOL,
NORTH FIRST LANE,
BANGALORE-560016.

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. SRINIVASA K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
KPTCL, CORPORATE OFFICE,
CAUVERY BHAVAN,
BANGALORE-560 009.
2. THE DIRECTOR (A AND HR)
KPTCL, CAUVERY BHAVAN,
BANGALORE-560 009

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. CHANDRACHUD., ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER



PASSED IN WP No-19420/2024 DATED 21.02.2025 IN SO FAR AS GRANTING OF INCREMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF FIXATION OF PENSION ONLY FROM 01.05.2023 AND DENYING THE BENEFIT OF INCREMENT FROM THE DATE OF THEIR RETIREMENT FOR ALL TERMINAL BENEFITS AS SOUGHT FOR IN THE WP.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH)

The present writ appeal has been filed impugning the judgment and order dated 21.02.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.10703/2024 (S-RES) and connected matters.

2. For the sake of convenience the parties are referred to as per their ranking before the learned Single Judge.

3. The petitioners are retired employees of Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited (for short '**the**



KPTCL'), a State Government undertaking. All the petitioners got retired during different years i.e., in 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2007 etc. The date of retirement and grant of one increment sought for in the writ petition has been taken note of in the impugned judgment at paragraph 3, which is extracted hereunder :-

"3. All the petitioners are retired employees of respondent-KPTCL and their date of retirement and due date of increment of each of the writ petitioner is as follows:

Petitioner/s in	Date of Retirement	Due date of increment
<u>W.P.No.10703/2024</u> Virupakshappa Malakappa Patri	01.05.2006	01.05.2007
<u>W.P.No.28629/2023</u> K.N.Guruprasad	31.12.2020	01.01.2021
<u>W.P.No.13334/2024</u> 1. Sri.C.Ramaiah 2. Smt. Parvathi Bai	(1) 30.06.2003 (2) 31.12.2004	(1) 01.07.2003 (2) 01.01.2005
<u>W.P.No.16939/2024</u> Sri.G.Narayanappa	31.07.2018	01.08.2018



<u>W.P.No.19420/2024</u> <u>Shriyuths</u> 1. K.Ramaiah 2. G.S.Ananda Krishna 3. B.K.Bhairakkanavar 4. S.C.Chikkmath 5. K.Manjappa 6. M.Thippeswamy 7. K.Lakshmana 8. G.Vijayakumar 9. Y.Eranna 10. D.Eranna 11. Abbdul Sattar 12. Channarayappa 13. B.Nandeeshappa	(1) 31.03.2006 (2) 31.03.2014 (3) 30.04.2018 (4) 31.12.2006 (5) 31.12.2021 (6) 30.06.2008 (7) 30.06.2016 (8) 30.06.2011 (9) 30.06.2014 (10) 30.06.2014 (11) 31.07.2010 (12) 31.03.1998 (13) 31.03.2005	(1) 01.04.2006 (2) 01.04.2014 (3) 01.05.2018 (4) 01.01.2007 (5) 01.01.2022 (6) 01.07.2008 (7) 01.07.2016 (8) 01.07.2011 (9) 01.07.2014 (10) 01.07.2014 (11) 01.08.2010 (12) 01.04.1998 (13) 01.04.2005
<u>W.P.No.26593/2023</u> <u>Shriyuths</u> 1. B.Govindaraju 2. B.C.Hanumantharaya 3. Rangaswamy 4. Venkateshaiah.G 5. Gangaiah 6. Hanumanthaiah 7. Basavaraju.M.S 8. Nagarajaiah.N 9. Hanumaiah.K 10. Gangappa N.K. 11. Sathyanarayana Murthy 12. Shivappa.S.G	(1) 30.06.2008 (2) 31.03.2012 (3) 31.03.2016 (4) 31.03.2012 (5) 31.07.2013 (6) 31.03.2014 (7) 31.03.2004 (8) 31.03.2015 (9) 31.03.2014 (10) 30.04.2014 (11) 31.03.2007 (12) 31.03.2004	(1) 01.07.2008 (2) 01.04.2012 (3) 01.04.2016 (4) 01.04.2012 (5) 01.04.2013 (6) 01.04.2014 (7) 01.04.2004 (8) 01.04.2015 (9) 01.04.2014 (10) 01.05.2014 (11) 01.04.2007 (12) 01.04.2004
<u>W.P.No.26793/2023</u> 1. M.N.Basavaraj 2. Shivanandaiah 3. M.Mahadevappa	(1) 31.03.2000 (2) 31.05.2003 (3) 31.03.2013	(1) 01.04.2000 (2) 01.06.2003 (3) 01.04.2013
<u>W.P.No.26505/2023</u> <u>Shriyuths:</u> 1. Varalakshmi Bai 2. H.Madhusudana 3. Siddashetty	(1) 31.12.2022 (2) 31.03.2013 (3) 31.03.2012	(1) 01.01.2023 (2) 01.04.2013 (3) 01.04.2012
<u>W.P.No.20898/2023</u> Sri.Venkataramu.G	31.03.2006	01.04.2006



4. Such belated writ petitions are not liable to be entertained by this Court. We hold that grant of increment cannot be said to be a recurring cause of action, that too 20 years after the date of retirement of an employee. The learned Single Judge having considered the facts and circumstances of the petitions has rightly held that petitioners are not entitled for differential pay as a result of denial of one increment. However, considering the work done by the petitioners, held that they would be entitled to enhanced pension after 31.04.2023.

5. We do not find any error in the impugned judgment and order passed by the learned Single Judge, which calls for interference. Accordingly the instant writ appeals stands ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE**