



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.VISHWAJITH SHETTY

WRIT PETITION NO. 203041 OF 2025 (S-REG)

BETWEEN:

SHARANAPPA S/O BASAVARAJ K
AGE: 49 YEARS OCC: NOW NIL
R/O H.NO.11-778/2002 BASAVA NAGAR
BRAHMPUR, KALABURAGI-585102

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI B NOOR ILYAS, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED
THROUGH ITS GENERAL MANAGER
KALABURAGI TELECOM DISTRICT
OLD JAIL GARDEN, KALABURAGI-585102
2. THE DIVISIONAL ENGINEER
E10B, BSNL OFFICE, OLD JAIL GARDEN
KALABURAGI-585102
3. THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER
KARNATAKA TELE COMMUNICATION CIRCLE
BSNL, 1ST VIVEKANAND ROAD
HULSOOR, BENGALURU 560008

...RESPONDENTS





THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO, CALL FOR THE RECORDS AND A) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI THEREBY QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT DATED 16.04.2025 IN FILE NO. G-89/UPKEEP/TSM CORR/2024-25 PASSED BY RESPONDENT NO. 1 AS PER ANNEXURE-E IN ENDS OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY; B) ISSUE WRIT OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION OF PETITIONER DATED 17.03.2025 AND REGULARIZE THE SERVICE OF THE PETITIONER BY REINSTATING HIM INTO SERVICES AND ALSO GRANT ALL OTHER CONSEQUENTIAL BENEFITS AS PER LAW, IN ENDS OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY; C) ISSUE ANY WRIT OR ORDER OR DIRECTIONS AS THIS COURT DEEMS FIT IN CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE, IN ENDS OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.VISHWAJITH SHETTY

ORAL ORDER

Petitioner is before this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking for the following reliefs:

"a) Issue a writ of certiorari thereby quashing the impugned endorsement dated 16.04.2025 in file no. G-89/Upkeep/Tsm Corr/2024-25 passed by respondent No.1 as per Annexure-E in ends of justice and equity;

b) Issue writ of mandamus directing the respondent to consider the representation of petitioner dated 17.03.2025 and regularize the service of the petitioner by reinstating him into services and also



grant all other consequential benefits as per law, in ends of justice and equity;

c) Issue any writ or order or directions as this court deems fit in circumstances of the case, in ends of justice and equity."

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he was appointed as a Jeep Driver in the office of respondent No.1 at Kalaburagi by order dated 01.01.1998 and he had worked for a period of four years. Thereafter on 02.06.2004 he was removed from service. It appears that petitioner had filed W.P.No.203748/2017 before this Court seeking regularization of his service. The order passed in the said writ petition would *prima facie* show that in the said proceedings it was not disclosed that the service of the petitioner was terminated on 02.06.2004. It is under these circumstances, this Court disposed of W.P.No.203478/2017 with liberty to the petitioner to submit comprehensive representation to the concerned authority to substantiate his claim for regularization. Subsequently, petitioner has submitted a representation



vide Annexure-D dated 17.03.2025 which was considered by the respondents and his prayer for regularization was rejected vide communication/endorsement at Annexure-E dated 16.04.2025. Assailing the same, the petitioner is before this Court.

4. Since it is the admitted case of the petitioner that his services were terminated with effect from 02.06.2004, as per the order at Annexure-B, the question of regularization of the petitioner's services at this juncture of point does not arise for consideration. This Court in W.P.No.203478/2017 had permitted the petitioner to file a comprehensive representation to the concerned authority to substantiate his claim for regularization and thereafter petitioner has submitted a representation before respondent Nos.2 and 3 on 17.03.2025. In the representation itself he has stated that he was removed from service on 15.06.2004. It is not in dispute that petitioner has not questioned the order of his termination and on the other hand, after a period of more than 20



years from the date of his termination, he is seeking to regularize his services. The competent authority, appreciating the aforesaid aspects of the matter, has rightly rejected the prayer of the petitioner for regularization of his services as a driver in respondent No.1.

5. Under the circumstances, I do not find any illegality or irregularity in the said order. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(S.VISHWAJITH SHETTY)
JUDGE

SWK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 6