



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 12700 OF 2025 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. INDRAJEET LAMANI
S/O. KOMALASHEKHAR
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
WORKING AS ASSISTANT REVENUE OFFICER
HORAMAVU SUB-DIVISION
BRUHATH BENGALURU MAHANAGARA PALIKE
N R SQUARE, BANGALORE - 560 002.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SATISH K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE BRUHATH BENGALURU MAHANAGARA PALIKE
REP. BY ITS CHIEF COMMISSIONER
BRUHATH BENGALURU MAHANAGARA PALIKE
N. R. SQUARE, BANGALORE - 560 002.

2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER (ADMINISTRATION)
BRUHATH BENGALURU MAHANAGARA PALIKE
N. R. SQUARE, BANGALORE - 560 002.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B L SANJEEV., ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR THE
RECORDS FROM THE R2 IN RESPECT OF THE IMPUGNED
ORDER DATED: 22/04/20258 (ANNEXURE-G) AND ISSUE A
WRIT OR ORDER QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER OF
SUSPENSION DATED:22/04/2025 BEARING NO. B12(1)





PR/14/2025-26 PASSED BY THE R2 (ANNEXURE-G) AND GRANT ALL CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

1. In this writ petition, the petitioner has called in question the suspension order dated 22.04.2025 issued by respondent No.2 vide Annexure-G, whereby the petitioner has been kept under suspension.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he was an employee of respondent No.1, working as an Assistant Revenue Officer. While he was in service, the impugned suspension order came to be issued by respondent No.2. As on today, no departmental enquiry has been initiated against the petitioner.

3. As per Rule 10(5)(b) of the Karnataka Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957



(hereinafter referred to as 'Rules' for short), if the departmental inquiry is not commenced against the delinquent Government Servant or if the charge sheet is not filed in the Court within a period of six months from the date of suspension, the Competent Authority shall decide whether to revoke or continue the suspension of such Government Servant and unless decided and ordered for continuation within this period, the suspension shall be deemed to have been revoked from the date of the suspension order.

4. The impugned order vide Annexure-G was passed on 22.04.2025. As six months have elapsed from the date of the said suspension order, it is deemed to have been revoked. Hence, the impugned order is liable to be quashed.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***allowed***. The impugned order of suspension dated 22.04.2025 issued by respondent No.2 vide Annexure-G is hereby quashed.



6. It is made clear that this order will not come in the way of the respondents initiating departmental enquiry against the petitioner, in accordance with law.

All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE

HA
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 54