ಸೂಚನೆ: ಕೃ. ತಿಳಿ. ಸಂಘದು, ದೊಡ್ಡ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಡಿತ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣದಲ್ಲಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ 21 ಅಕ್ಟುಬರ್ ಹಿಂದಿನ 2011, ಮೌವ್ರಿ 05.08.2011
ನಿರ್ದರ್ಶಣ:
1. ಸಂಭವಿಸುವ ಸಮಯ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಉದ್ದಾನವಿ 21 ಅಕ್ಟುಬರ್ ಹಿಂದಿನ 2011, ಮೌವ್ರಿ 05.08.2011
2. ಸಂಭವಿಸುವ ಸಮಯ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಉದ್ದಾನವಿ 2011, ಮೌವ್ರಿ 30-11-2015.
3. ಸಂಭವಿಸುವ ಸಮಯ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಉದ್ದಾನವಿ 2011, ಮೌವ್ರಿ 06.01.2016.
4. ಸಂಭವಿಸುವ ಸಮಯ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಉದ್ದಾನವಿ 2011, ಮೌವ್ರಿ 06.01.2016.
5. ಸಂಭವಿಸುವ ಸಮಯ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಉದ್ದಾನವಿ 2016, ಮೌವ್ರಿ 03.03.2016.

ಇಂಟರ್ಯೂರಾ: ಕೃ. ತಿಳಿ. ಸಂಘದು, ದೊಡ್ಡ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಡಿತ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣದಲ್ಲಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ 2 (ಮೇ 1957) ಸ್ವರೂಪೇಶು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮೌವ್ರಿ 140 ವರ್ಧಿ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಉದ್ದಾನವಿ 1957 ಸ್ವರೂಪೇಶು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮೌವ್ರಿ 140 ವರ್ಧಿಯ ತಾಂತ್ರಿಕ ಉದ್ದಾನವಿ 1957 ಸ್ವರೂಪೇಶು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮೌವ್ರಿ 140 ವರ್ಧಿಯ.

“ಎಂಬ್ರೆಡಾಡಿಸಿಕೆ:"

“That DGO 1. Sri. H. Kallappa S/o Hanumanthappa and DGO 2 Sri. Anil Kumar Deginal while working as Gram Panchayath Secretary of Mallapur Gram Panchayath and Junior Engineer of Panchayath Raj Engineering subdivision at Channagiri taluk in Davangere District respectively, complainant namely Sri. B M Sridhar of Mallapur village was to get payment of Rs. 5 lakhs for the contract work executed by him under Gram Swaraj Scheme’ in Mallapur village panchayath and then the DGOs 1 and 2 and one Sri.
Prakash pressurized complainant and received bribe of more than Rs. 50,000/- to make payment of bill of Rs. 4 lakhs out of Rs. 5 lakhs and DGOs 1 and 2 were demanding further bribe for passing bill of remaining amount of Rs. 1 lakhs and on 17.7.2008, DGO 1 received bribe of Rs. 7000/-, DGO 2 received bribe of Rs. 6800/- from the complainant to show official favour, failing to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and committed an act which is unbecoming of a Government Servant and thus you are guilty of misconduct under Rule 3(1)(i) to (iii) of KCS (Conduct) Rules 1966.

In the light of the above, the facts and circumstances of the matter, the decision of the Government (1) dated 29-09-2006 with regard to the case of Shri. Prakash, who was the District Government Inspector of 11th grade was upheld by the Department in the meeting of 24-02-2010. 2. The Department was also informed that the decision of the Department was upheld by the Government in the meeting of 27-04-2016. 3. The following decisions were taken in the said meeting:

1. The proceedings of 25-09-2006 and 26-09-2006 were transferred to the Department. The decision of the Department was upheld in the meeting of 24-02-2010.
2. The decision of the Department was upheld by the Government in the meeting of 27-04-2016.
3. The decision of the Department was upheld by the Government in the meeting of 27-04-2016.
4. ಸರಕಾರ ಆಯೋಗ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಸಹಾಯದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸಾಧಿಸಲು ಆಗಿದ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿ ಬಳಸಲು ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಜಾನಿಲು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಸಜ್ಜವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

5. ಸರಕಾರ ಆಯೋಗ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಹಾಯದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸಾಧಿಸಲು ಆಧಾರದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸೇರಿಸಲು (ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಸೇವೆ) ಬಳಸಲು ಮುಂದಿನ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸರಕಾರ ಜಾನಿಲು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಸಜ್ಜವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

6. ಕ್ರಮಾಂಶದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ನೀಡಿದರೂ ಸರಕಾರ: 16.07.2008 ರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಾಂಸ್ಥಿಕ ಸೇವೆಗಳ ಮುಂದಿನ ವಿನಿಮಯವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಳಸಲಾಗುವುದು ಸಹಾಯದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸಾಧಿಸಲು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಜಾನಿಲು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಸಜ್ಜವಾಗಿತ್ತು.


8. ಸರಕಾರ 2 ಸೇವೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಧಾರದ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸರಕಾರ 1 ಸಾಲ ಒಡೆಯುವ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಸಜ್ಜವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

9. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನದ ವಿಶೇಷ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಅಡ್ಡಾಗಿ ಬರುವ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಸಾಲ 2 ಸಾಲಗಳ ಸಾಲ ಸಹಾಯದ ಸಾಲ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಶಮಾಡಲು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಸಜ್ಜವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

10. ಮೊದಲು ತೊಟ್ಟಿಯೂ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗ ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸಾಧಿಸಲು ಸಾಧಿಸುವ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಧಿಸುವ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಾದರೂ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಶಮಾಡಲು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಜಾನಿಲು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಶಮಾಡಲು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಸಜ್ಜವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

11. ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ನೀರಿ ಸಾಧಿಸಬಹುದು 2 ಸಾಲ ತೊಟ್ಟಿಯೂ ಸಾಧಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿದಾಗ ಜಾನಿಲು ಸರಕಾರ ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಆಧಾರದ ಜಾನಿಲು ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಧಿಸಬಹುದು. ಸಾಧಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಸರಕಾರ (ಮೊದಲು ನಾಲ್ಕು) ಕ್ರಮ ಅನುಯೋಧನೆ ಸಾಧಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿ ಸರಕಾರ ಜಾನಿಲು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಸಜ್ಜವಾಗಿತ್ತು.
32. As discussed above, if the work done by the complainant was sub standard, DGOs had to take suitable action against the complainant. But without taking so, the DGOs 1 and 2 demanded bribe amount to clear the balance amount, followed the complainant up to the bank along with the cheque also accompanied the complainant up to the bank along with the cheque also accompanied the complainant in his car went near Santhosh Daba, demanded and received the bribe amount from the complainant.
33. PWs 1 to 3 have clearly deposed that on 17.7.2008, complainant has lodged the complaint Ex P 1, procedure was followed. Police gave instructions to PW1 along with voice recorder. Further PW1 along with voice recorder. Further PW1 has deposed that DGOs asked him to come near the bank stating that they have brought the cheque, asked him to encash them after paying the bribe amount on that day, due to lapse of time he could not encash the cheque. DGOs have clearly stated that both of them had been to the bank and on that day, president and her husband was also present. DGOs have taken the contention that the husband of the president of Gram Panchayath insisted DGO 1 to issue the cheque on the pretext that the complainant will do the needful. As a result he sustained pressure from the president, he was compelling to go to bank along with the cheque. After narrating the entire story, DGO 2 also came to the bank.

34. The president and secretary of Gram Panchayath had to issue the cheque in the office after making corresponding entries and not in the bank. DGOs 1 and 2 were not supposed to yield to the pressure of president or her husband. It was the duty of DGOs 1 and 2 to see that proper procedure is followed while issuing the cheque. But violating the rules, DGOs 1 and 2 had been to the bank.

35. DGO 1 has put his signature on the cheque in the bank. PW1 to 3 have deposed that on 17.7.08, when the complainant presented Rs. 10,000/- before the IO, panchas noted down the note numbers, police applied phenolphthalcin power. PW2 put the money into the shirt pocket of PW1. Police took the hand wash and it turned into pink colour IO gave instructions to the complainant and panch witness. Pre trap mahazar was drawn. PW1 and police left to kerebilchi village near SBM. PW1 and his brother Sri. Vishwanath proceeded in his car, police and panchas followed them in a jeep, when they reached kerebilchi at 1 pm, he could not get the communication. At 1.30 pm, he got a message from DGO 1 that he is at Santhebennur, then he requested the police to wait near Sulikere. When he was 1 km away from Sulekere, he gave a message to police to follow him. He met DGO 1, he told that DGO 2 is at his house in Channagiri and DGO 1 asked him to pick up DGO 2. Complainant and DGO 1 picked up DGO 2, came to Santhosh Dhabba for lunch. Therefore he requested to come near Santhosh dabha.

36. PW 1 has clearly deposed that near Santhosh Dhabba, he stopped the car gave Rs. 7000/- to DGO 1 and Rs 6800/- to DGO 2, gave signal to police. Immediately IO came there, introduced himself to the DGOs, police seized the bribe amount found in the possession of the DGOs, hand wash of DGOs 1 and 2 was turned into pink colour. The pocket portion of DGO 1 was also dipped into sodium carbonate solution which turned into pink colour. Then IO after following the procedure drawn the mahazar in the spot and seized all the articles.

37. DGOs have taken the contention that they were accompanying the complainant in a car to channagiri. At that time, the complainant parked the care near Santhosh Dhabba, complainant took out some money and all of a sudden
passed certain amount of currencies to both of them and retained some currencies in his hand. DGOs accompanying the complainant in his car itself creates serious doubt in respect of their integrity and honesty. Their presence at the bank and also in the car along with the complainant, receipt of money from the complainant clearly probabalises that to clear the balance bill amount of Rs. 1 lakh, DGO 1 has demanded and received Rs. 7000/- and DGO 2 has demanded and received Rs. 6800/-

38. These facts also probabalises the case of Disciplinary Authority that after demand DGOs 1 and 2 have received bribe amount from the complainant. IO trapped both DGOs, 1 and 2 recovered the bribe amount, took the hand wash of DGOs, which turned into pink colour The pocket portion of the DGO 1 was also dipped into solution, it turned into pink colour. The IO has drawn the trap mahazar and seized all the articles. DGO 1 also has not signed the MB book though it was prepared. This fact also probabalises that in order to clear the balance amount, DGOs have demanded for bribe amount. Therefore the contention of DGOs that, ‘due to pressure of the husband of Gram Panchayath President, they had been to bank and all of a sudden near Santhosh Dabba complainant passed certain amount to them to count the same and they never demanded for bribe amount and never received the same cannot be accepted.

39. Even if this version is believed, it can be seen that complainant had to give that entire amount to one person to count them. But in this case, DGO 1 has received Rs. 7000/- and DGO 2 received Rs. 6800/- Therefore the contention of the DGOs that, ‘they never demanded the bribe amount and never received the amount’, cannot be believed.

40. The evidence of PWs 1 to 3 finds support from the contents of the documents. The statement given by the DGOs as per Ex P4 and P5 is against to the facts of the case. There is sufficient corroboration in the evidence of PWs 1 to 3 and Ex P1 to P6. Except the above said defence, DGOs have not placed any material on record in order to disbelieve the evidence of PW1 to 3. Under the circumstances, I find that the evidence of PW1 to 3 remained unchallenged, is unimpeachable evidence.

41. When the questionnaire was recorded, DGOs 1 and 2 have stated that in their car, complainant received a phone call, therefore he handed over money to them to count them. This act clearly strengthens the contention of Disciplinary Authority that DGOs 1 and 2 have received bribe amount from the complainant. In view of the admission of DGOs 1 and 2 and on going through the evidence of PWs 1 to 3 which appears to be natural, cogent and consistent and as there is nothing to discard the evidence of PWs 1 to 3, I have no other go but to accept the evidence in to therefore, the evidence now adduced by the Disciplinary Authority is just and sufficient to prove the charge against DGOs Accordingly I answer point NO.1 in affirmative.
ಈ ಪುಟದ ಪತ್ರದ ವಿಷಯವೊಂದು 2ನೇ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ಉದ್ಯಮವಿದ್ದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗೊಳಾಗುವ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ ಲಾಖ್ಯವು ಸುಲಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದ್ದರು ಪ್ರತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ಉದ್ಯಮವಿದ್ದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗೊಳಾಗುವ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ ಲಾಖ್ಯವು ಸುಲಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಪ್ರತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ಉದ್ಯಮವಿದ್ದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗೊಳಾಗುವ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ ಲಾಖ್ಯವು ಸುಲಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಈ ಪುಟದ ಪತ್ರದ ವಿಷಯವೊಂದು 2ನೇ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ಉದ್ಯಮವಿದ್ದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗೊಳಾಗುವ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ ಲಾಖ್ಯವು ಸುಲಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಪ್ರತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ಉದ್ಯಮವಿದ್ದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗೊಳಾಗುವ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ ಲಾಖ್ಯವು ಸುಲಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

1. ಅವಕಾಶಗೊಳಾಗಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ.
2. ತರಬೇತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ.
3. ತರಬೇತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ.
4. ತರಬೇತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ.
5. ತರಬೇತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ.
6. ತರಬೇತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ.
7. ತರಬೇತಿ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ.
8. ಎಂದರೆ ಇದೆ.
9. ಸೂಪ್ರ ಶುದ್ಧ ಎಂದರೆ ಇದೆ.