



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026
PRESENT
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH
WRIT APPEAL NO. 1135 OF 2024 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. P. SHANMUGAM,
S/O LATE H M PATTACHAR,
AGED ABOUT 77 YEARS,
R/AT 1241, HOSOUR MARRAMMA BADAVANE,
HUNUSURU TALUK,
MYSORE DISTRICT – 571 105.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. KALYAN R, ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR (SERVICES)
KPTCL, CAUVERY BHAVAN,
K.G.ROAD, BENGALURU - 01.
2. THE DIRECTOR (HRD)
KPTCL, CAUVERY BHAVAN,
K.G.ROAD, BENGALURU - 01.



3. THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER (ELEC.)
O AND M CIRCLE,
KUVEMPU NAGARA
MYSORE – 571 105.

4. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER (ELEC.)
O AND M DIVISION,
HUNSUR DIVISION,
HUNSUR,
MYSORE DISTRICT – 571 105.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHIRISH KRISHNA, ADVOCATE FOR R1-R2;
R3 & R4 ARE SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED
15/03/2024 IN WP NO.21960/23 PASSED BY THE LEARNED
SINGLE JUDGE AND ETC.,

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 S RACHAIAH



ORAL JUDGMENT

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

1. The present intra-court appeal has been filed impugning the judgment and order dated 15.03.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No.21960/2023, preferred by the appellant/petitioner.
2. The petitioner had earlier approached this Court by filing Writ Petition No.41714/2013, which was disposed of with following observations made in paragraph 6 of the order:-

"6. Upon careful consideration of the facts presented, the petitioner's contention for salary re-fixation from 01.01.1998 cannot be considered in the light of concession made by respondent No.2/company in earlier round of litigation. If the petitioner's representation in previous case implied a limitation on the period for salary re-fixation, the principle of estoppel will prevail the petitioner from asserting a different position. The respondent No.2/company initially conceded to petitioner's request but limited the re-fixation period to three years prior to petitioner's retirement in 2004. This Court taking cognizance of the statement made by the parties, allowed this limited re-fixation and respondent No.2/company calculated and paid the difference amount to the petitioner. Therefore, petitioner having received this payment could not have submitted a fresh representation to respondent No.2 contending that he is entitled to salary re-fixation from 01.01.1998."

3. The petitioner had submitted a fresh representation seeking re-fixation of his salary with effect from



01.04.1985 instead of 01.04.1986. Similar prayer came to be rejected by this Court in Writ Petition No.41714/2013. Once the petitioner's right in respect of re-fixation of salary with effect from 01.04.1985 was rejected and that order had attained finality, there was no occasion for the petitioner to agitate the same issue by filing a fresh representation dated 02.11.2022. Therefore, considering the said fact, learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition. We find no ground to interfere with the impugned judgment passed by the learned Single Judge.

4. The writ appeal is, therefore, ***dismissed***.

Pending application does not survive for consideration and the same is disposed of.

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

**Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE**