



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

WRIT PETITION No. 25224 OF 2024 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI PUNDARIKA G.,
S/O SRI GANGA NAIK,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
WORKING AS PRINCIPAL GOVERNMENT
ENGINEERING COLLEGE,
RAMANAGARA 562 159,
R/A No.39, KRUPANIDHI,
REFLEX HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY,
UTTARAHALLI KENGERI ROAD,
OPP. JSSATE, BANGALORE 560060,
EMAIL ID: GPKBMS@GMAIL.COM.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI MANOJ GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI PRABHAKAR R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
M. S. BUILDING,
BANGALORE 560001.





2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
FINANCE DEPARTMENT,
REP BY THE SECRETARY,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE 01.
3. THE CHAIRMAN,
AICTE, NELSON MANDELA MARG,
VASANT KUNJ,
NEW DELHI 110070.
4. THE COMMISSIONER,
DEPARTMENT OF COLLEGIATE
AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION,
PALACE ROAD,
BANGALORE 560001.
5. DIRECTOR
DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION,
PALACE ROAD,
BANGALORE 560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI K.R. RAJENDRA, AGA FOR R1, R2, R4 & R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH AND SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 26/03/2024 IN OA No.2217 AND 2218/2023 IN ANNEXURE-S PASSED BY HON'BLE KSAT BENGALURU.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS 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 Manoj Gowda, learned counsel appearing for Sri R. Prabhakar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri K.R. Rajendra, learned Additional Government Advocate for respondent Nos.1, 2, 4 and 5.

2. The applicant in Application Nos.2217 and 2218 of 2023 is before this Court impugning the order dated 26.03.2024 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru (for short, 'the Tribunal').

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed to the post of Principal with a pay scale of Rs.18,400-500-22,400 as per the Government Order dated 16.02.2000. The petitioner was appointed as Principal of the Government Engineering College, Ramanagara, by order dated 15.11.2010, and reported for duty on 29.11.2010. It is contended that the basic pay was fixed at Rs.18,400/- instead of Rs.19,400/-, as contemplated under the Government Order dated 16.06.2000.



3.1 It is further submitted that the State Government extended the benefits of the Government of India Notification dated 05.03.2010 by order dated 07.03.2011, revising the pay scale of the Principal to Rs.37,400-67,000/- plus AGP of Rs.10,000/-, retrospectively with effect from 01.01.2006. Learned counsel further submits that, in view of the clarification issued by AICTE through Notification dated 04.01.2016, the pay scale of the Principal in Engineering Colleges was fixed at Rs.43,000/- plus AGP of Rs.10,000/-, along with an allowance of Rs.5,000/-, from the date of appointment.

3.2 It is contended that the State, while giving effect to the notification issued by AICTE, without adhering to the said clarification, has failed to provide the increment of Rs.500/-. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a direct recruit under the 5th CPC and was in service at the time of the 6th CPC, and therefore the pay is required to be fixed at Rs.43,000/- from the date of appointment.

3.3 It is further submitted that, in terms of the 7th AICTE Notification dated 01.03.2019, which has been given retrospective effect from 01.01.2016, the petitioner is entitled



to a special allowance of Rs.6,750/- instead of Rs.5,000/-, with a pay scale of Rs.1,44,200-2,18,200/-. Learned counsel further submits that the State has reduced the special allowance from Rs.5,000/- to Rs.3,000/-, instead of granting Rs.6,750/- as contemplated.

3.4 Lastly, it is prayed to issue a direction to fix the pay of the petitioner in the pay scale of Rs.37,400-67,000/- plus AGP of Rs.10,000/- with effect from 29.11.2010.

4. Learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent Nos.1, 2, 4 and 5 submits that the petitioner's appointment was made in the pay scale of Rs.18,400-22,400 as provided in the order dated 16.06.2000. It is submitted that, in respect of appointments made prior to 01.01.1996, the pay scale was fixed at Rs.19,400/-, and since the petitioner was appointed in November 2010, he is not entitled to pay fixation at Rs.19,400/-.

5. Learned Additional Government Advocate further submits that the order dated 07.03.2011 was given effect from 01.01.2006, and accordingly the pay was fixed at the minimum



basic pay in the scale of Rs.37,400–67,000/-. It is further submitted that the grant of other allowances, in terms of the Government Order dated 24.03.2000 relating to the adoption of the 7th CPC, is justified.

6. We have considered the submissions made, pleadings and the findings recorded by the Tribunal in the impugned order.

7. The petitioner was appointed as Principal in November 2010 in the pay scale of Rs.18,400–22,400, in terms of the Government Order dated 16.06.2010. It is the contention of the State that the pay of Rs.19,400/- is applicable only to appointments made prior to 01.01.1996, and therefore the same is not applicable to the petitioner.

7.1 The Tribunal further held that there was no challenge to the Government Order dated 06.06.2010 providing the pay scale of Rs.18,400/-. The Tribunal also held that though the pay scale for the post of Principal was revised to Rs.37,400–67,000/- with Grade Pay of Rs.10,000/- with effect from 01.01.2006 by order dated 07.03.2011. The petitioner is not entitled to the said scale from 01.01.2006. It was held that the



petitioner is entitled only to notional pay fixation at Rs.37,400/- with notional increments in the said pay scale until 07.03.2011.

7.2 The Tribunal further held that since the petitioner was not entitled to pay fixation at Rs.19,400/-, the claim for revised pay fixation based on Rs.19,400/- is not permissible. The Tribunal also held that the allowances payable are governed by the Government Order dated 24.03.2020, and in the absence of a challenge to the said Government Order, the claim for allowance of Rs.6,750/- with retrospective effect from 01.01.2016 is not permissible.

7.3 The Tribunal further observed that, in the absence of any challenge to the Government Orders fixing the pay scale, granting notional benefits, and prescribing the allowances, the prayers made for consideration of representations contrary to the Government Orders and for further directions in the application are frivolous. For the aforesaid reasons, the Tribunal dismissed the application by imposing costs of Rs.10,000/-.

8. According to the State Government, the original pay scale, revision of pay scale, and allowances have been fixed in



HC-KAR

**NC: 2026:KHC:13127-DB
WP No. 25224 of 2024**

terms of the Government Orders, which have not been challenged. In the absence of a challenge to the Government Orders governing the pay scale and allowances, it is not open to the petitioner to seek a direction for consideration of representations claiming a higher pay scale.

8.1 The Tribunal is justified in observing that the application was frivolous. The present writ petition also does not stand on a different footing. The petitioner has neither made out any grounds in support of the prayers sought in the application nor demonstrated any infirmity in the findings and conclusions reached by the Tribunal.

8.2 When the petitioner seeks revised pay scales and allowances contrary to the Notifications/Government Orders, unless a challenge is made to those Notifications/Government Orders, the making of a series of representations amounts to a frivolous attempt and can only be regarded as an abuse of the process. The petitioner is working as a Principal in a Government Engineering College and is expected to possess the minimum knowledge required to understand the reasons assigned by the Tribunal.



8.3 We are also of the view that the present writ petition is frivolous and founded on unsustainable grounds. Though it is a fit case for the imposition of heavy costs, we refrain from imposing any costs.

9. The writ petition is devoid of merit and is, accordingly, ***dismissed.***

Pending I.As., if any, stand disposed of.

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

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