The DGO Smt. Madhuri C. Mayachari, working as a PDO, Sheegihalli Grama Panchayath, Hanagal Taluk, Haveri District by taking approval from the Grama Panchayath, has illegally taken up excess work of planting trees on both sides of the Kere Angala Road without getting technical and administrative sanction from the higher officers and also without getting post-facto sanction from the Chief Executive Officer, ZP, Haveri and thereby the DGO has failed to maintained absolute integrity and devotion to duty and thus DGO is guilty of misconduct under rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of KCS (conduct) Rules 1966.
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242.  "charge of negligence, inadvertence or unintentional acts would not culminate into case of doubtful integrity" अर्थात “Misconduct – Generally – Held, it cannot be left to vagaries of employer to say ex post facto that some acts of omission or commission not enumerated in relevant rules, would nonetheless amount to misconduct.”
13. DGO has not disputed the fact that Rs.77,000/- was spent for planting saplings by Sheegihalli GP, where she was working as PDO. The DGO also not disputed the fact that 171 saplings were planted on either side of the road leading to tank bed from hindu burial ground of Shankarikoppa village and no prior approval from the ZP was taken to plant the saplings on either side of the road. From the evidence produced in the case it is crystal clear that prior approval of the ZP, Haveri was obtained only to plant saplings in the burial ground area, but the DGO along with the concerned Range Forest Officer, planted another 171 saplings outside the burials ground on either side of the road leading to tank bund from the burial ground. As pointed out supra, the DGO has contended that she obtained post facto approval from the CEO of ZP, Haveri as per EX.D-2. It is to be noted that the post facto sanction is accorded by the CEO of ZP on 09.01.2012, where as the planting of saplings was carried out during the year 2010. This makes it abundantly clear that no prior approval from the CEO of ZP, Haveri was obtained by the DGO before spending amount to plant saplings on either side of the road. Further it is clear that though estimate was prepared for planting saplings in burial ground required number of saplings could not be planted in the burial ground required. Hence, it is clear that the DGO has committed technical error in spending the funds of Panchyat for planting saplings on either side of the road without obtaining prior sanction from CEO of ZP, Haveri. Therefore, this is a serious financial irregularity committed by the DGO. He evidence on record shows that till the Ombudsman under MGNREGA Scheme visited the spot to investigate the allegation, the DGO had not taken any steps to get the approval from CEO of ZP, Haveri for deviating the work from burial ground to either side of the road. Though the deocument at EX.D-2 produced by the DGO shows that post Tacto approval of the CEO is obtained by the DGO, in my opinion the DGO had committed financial irregularity in spending the amount without obtaining the prior sanction before spending the amount for digging pits and planting saplings on either side of the road from burial ground to tank bed in Shankarikoppa Village.

14. After careful scrutiny of the oral and documentary evidence produced in the case, I am of the view that the disciplinary authority has clearly proved that the DGO while working as Panchayat Development Officer, Sheegihalli Grama Panchayat, hanagal taluk, Haveri District has committed financial irregularity in
planting saplings in the place other than the place for which prior sanction from the CEO was obtained and had spent the amount without prior approval from the CEO. Though, the DGO has obtained post subsequent to the investigation by Lokayukta, I am of the view that it will not absolve the DGO from committing technical and administrative irregularity committed in planting saplings on either side of the road. Therefore, The DGO has committed official misconduct as defined under rule 3(i) to (iii) of the KCS(Conduct) Rules 1957. Hence, I have answered the point formulated above in the affirmative and proceed to pass the following order.”


dated 880 stock 2016, date: 10.04.2018
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5) ಅವೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬುಧವಾರ, ತರದೆ ನಮೂನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು, ಕಾರಣ.
6) ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಂದಾ, ಕಾರಣೇ ಅಂದರೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು, ಕಾರಣೇ, ಕಾರಣೇ ಅಂದಾ. 
(ಅಂದರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಂದಾ ಅಂದಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು, ಕಾರಣೇ ಅಂದಾ ಅಂದಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಂದಾ.)
7) ದೃಢವಾದವೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಂದಾ, ಹೊಂದಿರುತ್ತಿದೆ ಅಂದಾ, ಹೊಂದಿರುತ್ತಿದೆ ಅಂದಾ, ಹೊಂದಿರುತ್ತಿದೆ ಅಂದಾ.
8) ದೃಢವಾದವೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಂದಾ. 
9) ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಂದಾ/ಅಂದಾ ಅಂದಾ.