Sri B.R. Salotagi, the DGO while working as Development Officer of Nitte Grama Panchayathi in Karkala Taluk of Udupi District, the complainant namely Sandeep Kumar of Nadalike in Karkala Taluk approached on 07.09.2010 to enquire about permission to start ice-cream factory in the rented building of Sri Sadashiva Hegde at Nitte and then asked the complainant to pay bribe of Rs.2,000/- and on 09/09/2010 received bribe of Rs.1,000/- from the complainant to show official favour, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, which act as unbecoming of a Government servant and thus committed misconduct as enumerated under rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of the Karnataka Civil Service(conduct)Rules 1966.
It is further submits that he was working as PDO in relevant point of time. He neither demanded nor accepted any illegal gratification and he never met the complainant and not demanded any illegal gratification as alleged by the complainant. As per the alleged date of apprehension i.e., 09.09.2010 no work was pending before him, as the concerned file of the complainant was already completed i.e., 08.09.2010 by signing the licence certificate of the complainant.

The complainant tried to thrust the bribe amount to my pocket and I have refused to receive the same. The complainant to fix me, he handed over the bribe money to Sri vijaya who was bill collector and assisting me in my work and made me and Sri.Vijaya as scapegoat. I was not present in the scene of occurrence.

It is the evidence of the complainant that when he met this DGO, this DGO only asked to pay the legal amount/government fees to issue trade licence and never demanded illegal gratification at any point of time.

It is further submitted that as per the documentary evidence, it is cryystal clear that the secretary/this DGO had no power to issue trade licence on his own.

It is submitted that, there is not even one of evidence produced by the prosecution either oral or documentary to prove the case against this DGO but the evidence which is on record totally contradicts the entire charges leveled against this DGO. Basing on all these aspects, the contention of prosecution that there was a demand and acceptance of the bribe by this DGO from the complainant is unacceptable and there is no direct or circumstantial evidence to prove the same though they had several opportunities to prove the case.
• That on keen perusal of Entrustment Mahazar, it is crystal clear that apart from converying about the payment of Government Fees there is no single utterance of demand for bribe in the entire conversion. Be that as it may, the another instance to prove my innocence in this case is that, the demand of bribe but the complainant himself gave the complaint that he has to give Rs.1000/- as bribe since no material is produced for the same and the overt act of the complainant itself shows that he wanted this DGO to fix a criminal case by hook and crook. Further more the over-tact of the complainant is only because of enmity development since he was a member of Gram panchayat of Belmannu village best known to him.

• It is submitted that, the complainant PW.3 in this enquiry proceedings is the PW2 in the criminal special case no.6/2012 on the file of Prl.sessions and Special Judge Udupi District at Udupi in the cross examination has elicited thus,

• When this being the deposition of the complainant, his evidence in the present disciplinary proceedings is contrary to the said deposition. Thus, the evidence of PW3/complainant before the enquiry officer in this proceedings is not reliable and contrary to the deposition given before the criminal court on the same allegations. Hence, the findings of the Enquiry Officer that the charges are proved against this DGO relying upon the evidence of PW.3 complainant is unsustainable.

• The findings of the enquiry officer that I being the Government servant failed to maintain absolute integrity besides devotion to duty and acted in a manner unbecoming of Government Servant is incorrect and unsustainable. So also the proposed recommendation of Hon’ble Upaloakayukta based on the findings of the enquiry officer is also unsustainable.
Wherefore, it is submitted that, this is an eminently fit case for the Hon’ble Government not to accept the enquiry report and the recommendation of the Upalokayukta and this Hon’ble authority may kindly be pleased to drop the proceedings against me (DGO), in the interest of justice and equity.

“The DGO has taken a contention that he was not at all presented the scene of occurrence. He was in the training program in Taluk Panchayat Office. Therefore there was no occasion for him to demand and receive the bribe amount from the complainant. If that is so there would have been no occasion to the bill collector Vijay to be present near Taluk Panchayat Office. The facts and record show that bill collector Vijay was present at the time of trap, when the complainant approached DGO, the DGO asked the complainant to hand over the money to Vijay. On the instructions of DGO, Vijay has received the money and kept it in his shirt pocket. Therefore this contention of DGO cannot accepted.

The oral and documentary evidence on the record shows that on 08.09.2010 on the instructions of the instructions of IO, complainant went and enquired the DGO, at the time the DGO demanded for bribe amount, the complainant recorded the voice conversation came back and lodged Ex P3 on 09/09/2010. The IO secured the presence panchas, introduced the complainant and explained the contents of the complaint. Complainant presented Rs.1000(500X2). Panchas noted down the numbers. Police staff applied phenolphthalcin powder to the notes. Pancha Nagesh kept the tainted amount into the shirt pocket of the complainant. Handwash of pancha Nagesh was taken in sodium carbonate solution and it turned into pink color. IO has taken the photograph and handed over the voice recorder to the complainant and panchas and then drawn the entrustment mahazar Ex.P1.  

Then all of them went to Karkala Taluk Panchayat, but DGO was not present. Then all of them went near Taluk Panchayat Office the complainant and PW-1 went to meet the DGO. DGO gave instructions to the complainant to hand over the money to Vijay. Accordingly the complainant gave the money to Vijay, Vijay received the same and had kept it in his shirt pocket. The handwash of Vijay was turned into pink color. The IO seized the bribe amount in the presence of panchas from the possession of Vijay. According to Ex.D.1 the prescribed fee was only Rs.500/- but the tainted amount received from Vijay was Rs.1000/-. The complainant had already paid the requisite fee and shown the receipt to the DGO, at that time the DGO has put the signature to the form. If he had no intention to demand and receive the bribe amount, the DGO
would have not called the complainant to come to Taluk Panchayath Office, Karkala along with form and receipt.

Therefore I hold that DGO while working as Development Officer of Nitte Grama Panchayat in Karkala Taluk of Udupi District, the complainant namely Sandeepkumar of Nandalike in Karkala Taluk approached on 07.09.2010 to enquire about permission to start ice cream factory in the rented building of Sri. Sadashiva Hegde at Nitte and then asked the complainant to pay bribe of Rs.2,000/- and on 09.09.2010 received bribe of Rs.1,000/- from the complainant to show the official favour.

Thereby DGO has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty, acted in a manner of unbecoming of a Government Servant as enumerated U/R 3 (1)(i) to (iii) of Karnataka Civil Service(Conduct)Rules 1966. Hence, I proceed to answer this point in the affirmative.

The disciplinary Authority has proved the charges as framed against the DGO Sri. B.R.Salotagi, the then Panchayath Development officer, Nitte Grama Panchayath, Karkala Taluk, Udupi District.

In this regard, 25th of January 1966 the complainant himself approached the Development Officer regarding the possibility of opening an ice cream factory in the rented building of Sri. Sadashiva Hegde at Nitte and then asked how to get official permission. The Development Officer explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information.

The Development Officer informed the complainant that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information. The Development Officer also explained that he would require certain documents and provided all the necessary information.
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