

Reserved on : 18.02.2026

Pronounced on : 26.02.2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

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

REVIEW PETITION No. 618 OF 2024

IN

WRIT PETITION No.26318 OF 2023

BETWEEN:

1. S. PURUSHOTHAMA,
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS 3 MONTHS,
S/O LATE SRI T.SONNAPPA,
PERSONAL SECRETARY CUM
JUDGMENT WRITER,
O/O REGISTRAR,
K.S.A.T., 7TH FLOOR,
KANDAYA BHAVANA,
K.G.ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 009.

RESIDING AT
No.52, 3RD FLOOR,
2ND CROSS, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
P.G.HALLI,
BENGALURU 560 003.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI S. PURUSHOTHAMA, PARTY-IN-PERSON)



AND:

1. THE CHAIRMAN
KARNATAKA STATE
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
7TH FLOOR, KANDAYA BHAVANA,
K.G.ROAD, BENGALURU-560009.
2. THE REGISTRAR,
KARNATAKA STATE
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,
7TH FLOOR, KANDAYA BHAVANA,
K.G.ROAD, BENGALURU-560 009.
3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
D.P.A.R., VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI RAGHAVENDRA G. GAYATHRI, ADV., FOR R1 & R2;
SRI V. SHIVAREDDY, AGA FOR R3)

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER ORDER 47 RULE
1 R/W SECTION 114 OF CPC, 1908, PRAYING TO REVIEW THE
ORDER DATED 21.11.2024 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT
IN WRIT PETITION No.26318/2023 (ANNEXURE A), IN THE
INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED
FOR JUDGMENT, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS
DAY, **K.V. ARAVIND J.**, MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

C.A.V. ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND)

Heard Sri S. Purushothama, petitioner appearing as party-in-person and Sri Raghavendra G. Gayatri, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

2. The unsuccessful petitioner in W.P. No. 26318/2023 (S-KSAT) has filed the present review petition seeking review of the order dated 21.11.2024 passed by this Court.

3. The petitioner filed Application No. 3564/2022 before the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Belagavi Bench (for short, "the Tribunal"), challenging the order of suspension and the order of punishment whereby two annual increments were withheld with cumulative effect. The Tribunal rejected the application by order dated 02.03.2023. Thereafter, the petitioner filed Review Application No. 25/2023 before the Tribunal, which also came to be dismissed by order dated 09.10.2023. Aggrieved by the aforesaid orders, the petitioner filed the writ petition before this Court.

4. It was primarily contended that the Chairman of the Tribunal had no authority to deploy the petitioner to the

Belagavi Bench. This Court, upon noticing that the petitioner had failed to report for duty at the Belagavi Bench, had signed the attendance register maintained at the Principal Bench, Bengaluru, despite having been relieved, and had disobeyed the instructions of the Chairman of the Tribunal by using intemperate language, held that such conduct amounted to insubordination and indiscipline. This Court further held that the disciplinary enquiry having culminated in the imposition of a major penalty, namely withholding of two annual increments with cumulative effect, was justified.

4.1 With regard to the contention concerning the power of the Chairman to transfer/deploy the petitioner to other Benches of the Tribunal, this Court, by reference to Section 13(1A) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, held that the power of general superintendence over the employees is vested in the Chairman. Upon consideration of the aforesaid aspects and for detailed reasons assigned therein, this Court dismissed the writ petition.

5. The petitioner, appearing as party-in-person, submits that this Court has failed to properly appreciate the contention that the Chairman of the Tribunal lacks the jurisdiction and

authority to deploy the petitioner to the Belagavi Bench. It is further contended that such power is not vested in the Chairman and that the said contention has not been duly considered by this Court.

6. We have considered the submissions urged by the petitioner - party-in-person.

7. The grounds urged in support of the review petition are a reiteration of the grounds urged in the writ petition, which have already been considered and answered by this Court. The contentions advanced in the present review petition, in substance, amount to re-arguing the very grounds that were examined and adjudicated in the writ proceedings.

8. It is a settled position of law that a review petition can be entertained only to correct an error apparent on the face of the record, without necessitating a detailed re-hearing of the matter. Under the guise of seeking review, it is impermissible to re-argue the case or to reiterate the grounds that have already been considered and answered in the writ petition.

9. We find no error apparent on the face of the record warranting interference in exercise of review jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the review petition stands ***dismissed***.

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

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

MV