



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

WRIT APPEAL NO. 1024 OF 2024 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

KARNATAKA FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES
CORPORATION LIMITED
NO.16/1, MILLER TANK BED AREA,
VASANTHANAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 052
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI.MURALIDHAR.H.M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI V J JAVARAIAH
S/O JAVARAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
R/AT NO.33/1,
8TH CROSS, 4TH MAIN,
LAKSHMINARAYANAPURA,
BENGALURU - 560 021.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. .,ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS WRIT
APPEAL, SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER PASSED BY THE
LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN WP No. 19287/2023 DATED
23.11.2023, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE PASS SUCH OTHER





ORDER/s AS THIS HONBLE COURT MAY DEEM FIT TO PASS ON THE FACTS AND IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

ORAL JUDGMENT

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

The present intra Court appeal has been filed impugning the order dated 23.11.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.19287/2023.

2. The parties are referred to as per their ranking before the learned Single Judge.

3. The petitioner was the Procurement Officer in the Karnataka Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited (the State Government Corporation). There was a shortfall of 2,501 quintals of food grains while the petitioner was working as a District Manager at Tumkuru in the Corporation. A charge sheet came to be issued to the



petitioner. 10 witnesses were cited in the charge sheet. However, the inquiry officer examined only two witnesses and submitted the inquiry report exonerating the petitioner from the charges. The disciplinary authority having noted the fact that there were altogether 10 witnesses, and the inquiry officer has examined only two witnesses, asked the inquiry officer to make further inquiry and submit a fresh report.

4. We are of the view that the said order of the disciplinary authority was not required to be interfered with by the learned Single Judge. The learned Single Judge has considered only the observation of the disciplinary authority that there are some other culprits as well and as no charge sheet has been issued against any other person except the petitioner, quashed the notice issued to the petitioner for further inquiry. We are of the considered view that the disciplinary authority is well within the power to ask for further inquiry in accordance with the law. Therefore, we set-aside the order passed by the learned



Single Judge and direct the Corporation to conduct the disciplinary inquiry against the petitioner as directed by the disciplinary authority as expeditiously preferably within the period of six months from today.

5. All the contentions of the parties are kept open. The petitioner should cooperate with the disciplinary inquiry for its early conclusion. The petitioner may file his objection if he has already not filed in response to the impugned show cause notice within 15 days from today.

6. With the above observation, the Writ appeal is ***allowed.***

7. Pending application, if any, does not survive for consideration and the same is disposed of.

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

**Sd/-
(T.M.NADAF)
JUDGE**

TKN
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 22