



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY

WRIT PETITION NO.200908 OF 2026 (S-KSAT)

BETWEEN:

SRI HANUMANT
S/O BAJJAPPA RATHOD,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
WORKING AS EDUCATION OFFICER,
PRIME MINISTER POSHAN ABHIYAAN,
ZILLA PANCHAYAT, YADGIRI DISTRICT,
R/AT: GDA LAYOUT, NEAR RAM MANDIR,
KALABURAGI – 585 102.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI MARUTHI S., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION,
6TH FLOOR, M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU – 560 001.
2. THE COMMISSIONER,
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD, BENGALURU – 560 002.
3. THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
ZILLA PANCHAYAT,
YADGIRI DISTRICT – 585 201.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT MAYA T.R., HCGP FOR R1 AND R2)





THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 30.01.2026 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, KALABURAGI BENCH, IN APPLICATION NO.20040/2026 (ANNEXURE-A) AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ)

The petitioner has challenged an order dated 30.01.2026 passed by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal at Kalaburagi in Application No.20040/2026.

2. The petitioner was working as a Education Officer, Prime Minister Poshan Abhiyaan, Zilla Panchayat, Yadgiri since 31.01.2025. It is stated that due to certain alleged lapses in the quality of food being supplied under the scheme, the petitioner was suspended from service vide Order dated 08.01.2026. The petitioner then challenged the said order before the Tribunal in Application No.20040/2026. The Tribunal in terms of an Order dated 30.01.2026 rejected an application for stay of the order of suspension on the ground that "*the respondents before it*



after appreciating the material had passed the order of suspension". The petitioner being aggrieved by the said order is before this Court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that several show cause notices were issued to the petitioner to which, he had replied. However, without considering the reply submitted to the show cause notices, an order of suspension is passed. He contends that the Tribunal must have considered the contentions urged by the petitioner before rejecting the application for stay of the order of suspension. He thus prays that pending disposal of the proceedings before the Tribunal, the impugned order of suspension be stayed. He also contends that that in similar circumstances, orders of suspension passed by the State Government were stayed by the Tribunal and the said benefit was not granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned High Court Government Pleader on the other hand submitted that order of suspension is neither a punishment nor a penalty and the service conditions of the petitioner would not be affected. She contends that the order of suspension is to only ensure that the petitioner is removed



from the zone of mischief and therefore submits that the impugned order of suspension is just and proper and the Tribunal was right in not staying the order of suspension.

5. We have considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned High Court Government Pleader for the respondent Nos.1 and 2.

6. The allegations against the petitioner was that as per his job chart, he had failed to maintain the quality of food supplied under the scheme. The respondents have initiated a disciplinary action against the petitioner and pending such action, the respondents have suspended the petitioner. As rightly contended by learned High Court Government Pleader, an order of suspension does not affect the service conditions of an employee. It is also not a penalty but is only designed to ensure that the petitioner does not interfere or obstruct the enquiry. The Tribunal has considered the material that weighed in the mind of the disciplinary authority before suspending the petitioner. The Tribunal was also satisfied that having regard to the facts and circumstances, there was no need to stay the order of suspension of the petitioner. Since the Tribunal has



exercised its discretion in refusing to stay the order of suspension, we do not find it appropriate to interfere with the said exercise of discretion. The contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioner that similar orders were stayed by the Tribunal, does not appeal to our mind as there can be no precedential value in so far as interim orders are concerned and the Tribunal can take a different view depending upon the facts and circumstances of a case.

7. In that view of the matter, this petition fails and is ***dismissed.***

8. However, the Tribunal is requested to consider the expeditious disposal of the application which shall be at any rate be within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

**Sd/-
(R.NATARAJ)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY)
JUDGE**