



HC-KAR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.100017 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SRI. CHANDRASHEKAR
S/O. PARAMANNA MANAMATTI,
AGE: 59 YEARS, OCC: EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
(ELE), R/O. #2051, NO.2051, VANASIRI NAGAR,
BEHIND AKASHAVANI PRASARA KENDRA,
SATTUR, DHARWAD-580 009.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY MISS. BINDU BANACHARI, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. KARTIK GANACHARI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. VIJAY B.P., DIRECTOR,
ADMIN AND HUMAN RESOURCE,
THE KARNATAKA POWER TRANSMISSION
CORPORATION LIMITED, CORPORATE OFFICE,
KPTCL, KAVERI BHAVAN, BENGALURU-560 009.

...ACCUSED

THIS CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION IS FILED UNDER
SECTION 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS
ACT, 1971, R/W. ARTICLE 215 OF CONSTITUTION OF
INDIA,1950, PLEASED TO, INITIATE CONTEMPT OF
COURT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR
WILLFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE ORDER DATED
14/08/2025 PASSED IN W.P.NO.102643/2025 (S-PRO),
IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR ORDERS THIS
DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD
AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR

VISHAL
NINGAPPA
PATTIHAL

Digitally signed by
VISHAL NINGAPPA
PATTIHAL
Location: HIGH COURT
OF KARNATAKA
DHARWAD BENCH



ORAL ORDER

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD)

The complainant has filed a writ petition in WP No.102643/2025 for consideration of his representation asserting that the first respondent is finalising the seniority list without considering his representation. The writ Court has disposed of the writ petition by its order dated 14.08.2025 with directions that reads as under:

Mandamus is issued, directing the respondents to consider the representations of the petitioner dated 20.07.2024 and 25.07.2024 at Annexures H and H1, before releasing the seniority/promotion list to the post of Superintending Engineer or Chief Engineer.

Smt. Bindu Ganachari, the learned counsel for the complainant, is heard and this Court is not persuaded to opine that there must be notice to the respondent because the writ Court has not stipulated a timeline for compliance. It is trite that no



proceedings for contempt can lie unless there is a timebound direction to be complied with. Hence, the complaint is ***closed*** but without prejudice to the complainant to approach the writ Court with necessary direction for time-bound compliance.

Sd/-
(B.M.SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR)
JUDGE