



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH 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. 18849 OF 2025 (S-KSAT)

C/W

WRIT PETITION NO. 6390 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

IN WP No. 18849/2025

BETWEEN:

SRI. M.P.RAVIKUMAR,
S/O M.S.PUTTANNAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
PRESENTLY WORKING AS
SURVEY SUPERVISOR,
TALUK OFFICE, KOLAR - 563 101.
RESIDING AT
NO.25, 81ST CROSS,
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT, 1ST STAGE,
BANGALORE - 560 078.
PHONE. NO. 9620992185
EMAIL ID. ravikumarmp74@gmail.com

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAGHAVENDRA G GAYATRI., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,





REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE - 560 001.

2. THE COMMISSIONER FOR SURVEY,
SETTLEMENT AND LAND RECORDS,
NEW PUBLIC OFFICES,
K R CIRCLE, BENGALURU - 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.B.RAVINDRANATH, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND SET ASIDE THE ORDER OF THE HONBLE KSAT IN A.No-927/2024 PASSED ON 03.09.2024 IN SO FAR AS NOT GRANTING ANY RELIEF RELATING TO THE PRAYER No-1 AND 2 AND ALLOW THE ABOVE WP AS PRAYED FOR.

IN WP NO. 6390/2026

BETWEEN:

SRI. M.P.RAVIKUMAR,
S/O M.S. PUTTANNAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
W/A SURVEY SUPERVISOR,
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
OF LAND RECORDS, MALUR TALUK,
KOLAR - 563 130.
R/A-NO. 25, 81ST CROSS,
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT 1ST STAGE,
BANGALORE - 560 078.
PHONE NO. 9620992185
E-MAIL ID - RAVIKUMARM74@GMAIL.COM



...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAGHAVENDRA G GAYATRI.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
ADDL. CHIEF SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA, BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE COMMISSIONER FOR SURVEY,
SETTLEMENT AND LAND RECORDS,
NEW PUBLIC OFFICES, KR CIRCLE,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.B.RAVINDRANATH, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO a) ISSUE A WRIT OR ORDER IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER WRIT QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER OF THE HONBLE TRIBUNAL DATED 13/02.2026 IN A.NO.927/2024 (VIDE ANNEXURE-A) AND CONSEQUENTLY DISMISS THE INTERIM APPLICATION viz., IA II DATED 09/01/2025 (VIDE ANNEXURE-L).

THESE PETITIONS, 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 K. V. ARAVIND)

Heard Sri Raghavendra G. Gayatri, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri B. Ravindranath, learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents, in both the petitions.

2. These petitions, involving common questions of fact, are interconnected; accordingly, they are disposed of by this common order.

3. While the petitioner was working as a Surveyor in the Office of the Assistant Director of Land Records, K.K. Pura, a complaint came to be lodged alleging that he had prepared a bogus sketch pertaining to land in Sy. No. 10 of Heggadagere Village, Bidadi Hobli, Ramanagara Taluk. Pursuant thereto, a show-cause notice was issued and an enquiry was initiated.

3.1 The petitioner challenged the articles of charge by filing Application No. 927/2024 before the Tribunal. The Tribunal, by order dated 03.09.2024, noticing that the enquiry report had concluded that the charges against the petitioner stood proved



HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:17086-DB
WP No. 18849 of 2025
C/W WP No. 6390 of 2026

and that a show-cause notice had been issued, set aside the order of penalty on the ground that the reply filed by the petitioner had not been considered. The Disciplinary Authority was directed to pass a final order within a period of two months. The Tribunal further clarified that the proceedings shall be completed within the stipulated period without seeking any extension of time.

3.2 The said order is assailed in W.P. No. 18849/2025. In the meanwhile, the respondent-Authorities filed an application before the Tribunal seeking extension of time. The Tribunal, by order dated 13.02.2026, extended the time for compliance of its earlier direction dated 03.09.2024 by six weeks. The said order of extension is impugned in W.P. No. 6390/2026.

3.3 In the interregnum, the Disciplinary Authority, in purported compliance of the Tribunal's direction, passed a final order dated 26.02.2026 imposing the penalty of withholding four annual increments with cumulative effect.



4. Sri. Raghavendra G. Gayatri, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, submits that though the Tribunal, by order dated 03.09.2024, had granted two months' time for passing a fresh order of penalty, the Disciplinary Authority failed to pass any order until 26.02.2026. It is further submitted that the application seeking extension of time was filed only on 08.01.2026, well beyond the stipulated period.

4.1 Learned counsel contends that no justifiable reasons were assigned in the application seeking extension of time and that the reasons, in any event, lack bona fides. It is urged that the Tribunal, without properly considering the grounds urged in the application, has erred in granting extension of time. It is also pointed out that in its earlier order dated 03.09.2024, the Tribunal had categorically observed that no further extension of time would be granted; hence, the impugned order extending time is unsustainable.

4.2 Learned counsel further submits that the articles of charge are, on the face of it, unsustainable and disclose non-application of mind. It is contended that the enquiry report is



not supported by any cogent evidence and, consequently, the order of penalty is also devoid of any justifiable reasons.

5. *Per contra*, Sri. B. Ravindranath, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondents, submits that the order of the Tribunal dated 03.09.2024 was not brought to the notice of respondent No. 2 until certain observations were made by this Court in W.P. No. 18849/2025 on 09.07.2025. It is further submitted that the concerned case workers, who committed default in not placing the Tribunal's order before respondent No. 2 for appropriate action, have been proceeded against by issuance of articles of charge and that an enquiry in that regard is pending, though they have neither been suspended nor transferred.

5.1 Learned Additional Government Advocate contends that, having regard to the seriousness of the charges involved, the Tribunal has rightly granted extension of time, and the order of penalty dated 26.02.2026 has been passed within the extended period so granted. It is submitted that the delay in giving effect to the Tribunal's order dated 03.09.2024 stands duly explained in the affidavit filed before the Tribunal.



5.2 It is lastly contended that mere delay cannot be a ground to examine, exonerate, or set aside the order of penalty, particularly in view of the nature and gravity of the charges involved.

6. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondents, this Court is inclined to interfere in the matter.

7. The adjudication of W.P. No. 18849/2025 is contingent upon the outcome of W.P. No. 6390/2026; hence, this Court proceeds to consider W.P. No. 6390/2026 in the first instance.

7.1 The order of the Tribunal directing the Disciplinary Authority to pass a fresh order of penalty is dated 03.09.2024. It is not in dispute that respondent No. 2 failed to complete or comply with the said direction within the stipulated period of two months. When the order of remand came up for consideration before this Court in W.P. No. 18849/2025, a query was raised regarding the outcome of the Tribunal's order.



7.2 The application dated 08.01.2026 filed before the Tribunal, as well as the affidavit dated 11.07.2025 filed by respondent No. 2 before this Court, seek to explain the non-compliance and the delay in implementing the Tribunal's direction.

7.3 In the application filed before the Tribunal by the Assistant Director in the Office of the Commissioner for Survey, Settlement and Land Records, it is stated that it was only upon a direction issued to respondent No. 2 on 09.07.2025 in W.P. No. 18849/2025 that the order of the Tribunal dated 03.09.2024 was brought to his notice. It is further stated that, thereafter, the concerned case workers were placed under suspension and two of them were transferred, and that articles of charge have been issued against them and an enquiry is pending.

7.4 The application seeking extension of time was filed on 08.01.2026, though the alleged knowledge of the Tribunal's order is stated to be on 09.07.2025. The affidavit, however, is conspicuously silent in explaining the delay either in complying with the Tribunal's order dated 03.09.2024 or for the period



between 09.07.2025 and 08.01.2026. This Court finds no bona fides in the explanation offered.

7.5 If the reasons assigned in the affidavit, attributing blame to the case workers, are to be accepted, and if respondent No. 2 was otherwise diligent, two courses were available: firstly, to comply with the Tribunal's direction by completing the exercise at least within two months from 09.07.2025; or alternatively, to promptly approach the Tribunal seeking extension of time. Respondent No. 2 has failed to adopt either course. Such failure, coupled with the attempt to attribute blame to subordinate officers, can only be construed as a bureaucratic excuse.

7.6 This Court also takes serious note of the manner in which the affidavit has been filed. The direction of the Tribunal was issued to respondent No. 2, namely the Commissioner for Survey, Settlement and Land Records, and the default in compliance is attributable to him. The explanation for such non-compliance ought to have been furnished by the Commissioner himself while seeking extension of time before the Tribunal.



However, the affidavit has been filed by the Assistant Director in the Office of respondent No. 2.

7.7 The affidavit dated 11.07.2025 filed before this Court in W.P. No. 18849/2025 in purported compliance with the directions is no better than the application filed before the Tribunal. The said affidavit dated 11.07.2025, in fact, clearly admits knowledge of the Tribunal's order dated 03.09.2024. Nevertheless, neither the affidavit filed before this Court nor the application before the Tribunal offers any explanation for the delay from 11.07.2025 till January 2026. The reasons assigned, therefore, lack bona fides.

7.8 This Court deems it appropriate to observe that while the Commissioner has initiated disciplinary proceedings against the case workers for failing to place the Tribunal's order before him, his own conduct falls within the same realm of dereliction of duty. Accordingly, it is considered appropriate to direct that necessary action be considered against respondent No. 2- Commissioner for failure to give effect to the Tribunal's order and for permitting inordinate delay.



8. In view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Uttar Pradesh vs. Ram Prakash Singh (2025 SCC OnLine SC 891)***, an extension of time is required to be sought before the expiry of the period originally granted. In exceptional circumstances, such extension may be sought even thereafter, provided sufficient and bona fide reasons are assigned not only for the inability to conclude the proceedings within the stipulated time, but also for the failure to seek extension prior to the expiry of such period.

8.1 The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further observed that if orders of courts or tribunals are not complied with, appropriate extension must be sought; failing which, the sanctity of such orders cannot be permitted to be undermined by the parties. It has been emphasized that disregard of judicial orders would erode the dignity of the judicial process and strike at the very root of the rule of law. Any indulgence in such disobedience would amount to encouraging non-compliance.

8.2 It has also been held that where a tribunal or court stipulates a fixed time for completion of an enquiry or disciplinary proceedings, coupled with a condition that upon



default the proceedings shall stand lapsed, the Disciplinary Authority would cease to have jurisdiction to proceed further. However, in appropriate cases, upon showing genuine and sufficient cause, it would be open to seek recall or modification of such condition and proceed thereafter in accordance with law.

9. If the order dated 03.09.2024 is examined in the light of the aforesaid principles, it is evident that the Tribunal had categorically observed that the respondent-Authorities would not be entitled to seek any further extension of time. In the absence of any challenge to, or modification or recall of, the said observation, the filing of a fresh application on 08.01.2026 seeking extension of time was clearly impermissible. The order granting extension of time passed by the Tribunal, therefore, overlooks and runs contrary to its own earlier observations contained in the order dated 03.09.2024.

10. In the light of the above, the following:

ORDER

- (i) The WP.No.6390/2026 is ***allowed***, the order dated 13.02.2026 in Application No.927/2024 is



**NC: 2026:KHC:17086-DB
WP No. 18849 of 2025
C/W WP No. 6390 of 2026**

set aside. Consequently WP.No.18849/2025 does not survive for further consideration.

- (ii) In the light of the above directions and findings, the representation dated 30.01.2025 is required to be considered by the Competent Authority.
- (iii) The representation shall be considered within three months in accordance with law.
- (iv) No order as to costs.

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

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