HC-KAR
NC: 2026:KHC-K:10920-DB
WP No. 200507 of 2026
CNR: KAHC030016412026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA**

**KALABURAGI BENCH**

**DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026**

**PRESENT**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S. KINAGI**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMANYA RANGARAO**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 200507 OF 2026 (S-KAT)**

**BETWEEN:**

SURYAKANTH
S/O RAMACHANDRA KATTIMANI,
AGE:44 YEARS, OCC: PHOTOGRAPHER,
ADDRESS- S. B. COLLEGE ROAD,
BEHIND SARASWATI GUDI,
RAMANAGAR, KALABURAGI-585103,

ADDRESS FOR THE SERVICE OF COUNSEL,
FOR THE APPLICANT,
SHANKAR R. KATTIMANI ADVOCATES,
HOUSE NO. 11-1906/12/2,
LAXMIKANTH NIVAS, S.B. COLLEGE ROAD,
BEHIND GOUTAM BUDDHA SCHOOL,
RAMANAGARA, KALABURAGI-585103.

Digitally signed by B NAGAVENI
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SHANKAR KATTIMANI, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. SECRETARY,
   KARNATAKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
   UDYOG SOUDHA, BANGALORE-560001.

2. PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560001.

3. NAVINAKUMAR N. (40004794),
MATANGAPURA VILLAGE,
HULADENAHALLI POST,
MALURU TALUK, DIST. KOLAR- 563101.

4. RAKSHITA B. L (40004955),
LAXMIKANT, BAGESAHAPURA VILLAGE,
AND POST GANDASI HOBLI ARASIKERE TALUK,
DIST.HASSAN-573201.

5. PUSHPA C. (40003120),
NO.151/4, VISMAYA NEELAYA,
AKKAMADEVI ROAD, GAVIPURAM WEST,
HANUMANTHA NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560019.

6. LAVANYA K (40007308),
NO.002, WEST SIDE APARTMENT,
VIDHAN SOUDHA LAYOUT CIRCLE,
LAGGERE, BANGALORE- 560058.

7. POOJA (40003766),
NO.35 6$^{TH}$ CROSS, PRAGATI LAYOUT,
JAYANTI NAGAR HORAMAVU,
NEAR DON BOSCO SCHOOL,
BANGALORE-560043.

…RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO

1. THE PETITIONER REQUESTS TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER MADE BY THE KARNATAKA STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL JUDGE DATED 05TH JUNE 2025 IN IA.NO.02/2025 IN O.A.NO.219/2025 AS ANNEXURE-A,

2. THE PETITIONER REQUESTING THE HON'BLE KARNATAKA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL IN I.A.NO.02/2025, PLEASE FILE THE CASE FILE IN O.A.NO.219/2025 IN KANNADA AND ALSO REQUEST TO ALLOW ME TO SPEAK IN KANNADA.

3. THE PETITIONER REQUESTS TO ISSUE A WRIT ORDER OR DIRECTION IN THE FORM OF A WRIT OF MANDAMUS DIRECTED TO K.A.T. THE K.A.T. RULES OF PRACTICE, 1990 IN CHAPTER-3 SCRUTINY IN SECTION 9(3) ALL PLEADINGS, AFFIDAVITS, MEMORANDA AND LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND DOCUMENTS PRESENTED TO OR FILED IN THE TRIBUNAL SHALL BE FAIRLY AND LEGIBLY TYPEWRITTEN (IN ENGLISH OR KANNADA)

4. GRANT ANY OTHER RELIEF THAT THIS COURT DEEMS FIT.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S. KINAGI
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMANYA RANGARAO

CNR: KAHC030016412026

**ORAL ORDER**

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S. KINAGI)

1. This petition is filed by the petitioner challenging the order dated 05.06.2025 passed on I.A. No.2 of 2025 in O.A. No.219 of 2025 by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Kalaburagi (for short, '***the Tribunal***').

2. Brief facts leading rise to the filing of this appeal are as follows:

3. The petitioner filed an application in I.A. No.2 of 2025 in O.A. No.219 of 2025 with a prayer to file the Application in Kannada language. However, the Tribunal passed an order on 05.06.2025 rejecting the application by referring to Rule 3 of the *Karnataka Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1986* (for short, '***the 1986 Rules***'), observing that the proceedings of the Tribunal can be conducted in Kannada language with the prior permission of the Bench, however, every application should be in

English language only and hence, the Tribunal returned the application to the petitioner to present in the language, as prescribed under Rule 3 of the 1986 Rules.

4. The petitioner, aggrieved by the same, has filed this writ petition.

5. Heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondents-State.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Rule 3 of the *1986 Rules* stipulates that the language of the Tribunal shall be in English, provided that the parties to the proceedings before the Tribunal may file documents drawn up in Kannada, if they so desire and the proviso thereunder further provides that the Tribunal may in its discretion permit the use of Kannada in the proceedings, however, the final order shall be in English. He submits that the Tribunal

committed an error in returning the petition. Hence, he prays to allow the petition.

7. On the other hand, learned Addl. Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State submits that the pleadings has to be presented in the English language before the Tribunal, as such, the Tribunal was justified in passing the impugned order. Hence, on this ground, prays to dismiss the petition.

8. Perused the records and considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties.

9. It is an undisputed fact that the petitioner submitted an Application in Kannada language before the Tribunal challenging the additional selection list on their office website.

10. In order to consider the case on hand, it is necessary to examine Rule 3 of the 1986 Rules, which reads as follows:

> "**3. Language of the Tribunal.-** (1) The language of the Tribunal shall be in English;
>
> Provided that the parties to a proceeding before the Tribunal may file documents drawn up in Kannada, if they so desire;
>
> Provided further that a Bench may, in its discretion, permit the use of Kannada in the proceeding, however, the final order shall be in English."

11. On perusal, it is clear that Rule 3 provides for language of the Tribunal and sub-Rule (1) thereof delineates that the language of the Tribunal shall be in English, provided that the parties to the proceedings before the Tribunal may file a document drawn up in Kannada, if they so desire. Further, the proviso provides that the Tribunal may, in its discretion, permit the use of Kannada in the proceedings, however the final order shall be in English.

12. From the bare reading of Rule 3 provides that the applicant may be permitted to use Kannada in the proceedings but the final order should be in English.

13. The word "***proceedings***" is defined in Concise English Dictionary and Black's Law Dictionary as follows:

> (a) "*An event or series of activities with a set procedure or law action taken in a court to settle a dispute" (*Concise Oxford English Dictionary).
>
> (b) "*The regular and orderly progression of a law suit, including all acts and events between the time of commencement and the entry of judgment." (*Black's Law Dictionary (8th Edition 2004) page 3808);

14. From the perusal of the definition of the word "proceedings", it is clear that "*the action taken in a Court to settle a dispute*" and "*all acts and events between the time of commencement and the entry of judgment*" includes the filing of an application before

the Tribunal. Thus, the pleadings in an application can be filed in Kannada language before the Tribunal as per Rule 3 of 1986 Rules.

15. Further, in order to consider the case on hand, it is also necessary to examine clause (iii) of Rule 9 of the Karnataka Administrative Tribunal Rules of Practice, 1990, which reads as follows:

> "**9**(i) x x x
>
> **(iii)** All pleadings, affidavits, memoranda and list of documents and documents presented to, or filed in the ***Tribunal shall be*** fairly and legibly typewritten ***(in English or Kannada)*** on durable paper of Metric A4 Size (30.5 cms. Long & 21.5 cms. wide), weighing not less than 4.9 Kgs. a ream; in the case of documents other than pleadings on paper of not less than 3.0 K.gms., a Ream, and with outer margin 6.5 cms. wide and inner margin 2.5 cms. wide, in the form of a paper book as provided under Procedure Rules of 1986."
>
> ***(emphasis supplied)***

16. From the perusal of clause (iii) of Rule 9, it unambiguously stipulates that all the pleadings, affidavits memoranda and list of documents to be filed in the Tribunal shall be legible in English or Kannada.

17. From a bare reading of clause (iii) of Rule 9, it clearly discloses that the pleadings shall be English or Kannada. As such, the petitioner has rightly filed the application in Kannada language in terms of clause (iii) of Rule 9 of Rules of 1990.

18. In this view of the matter, we are of the considered view that the Tribunal, while passing the impugned order, has not taken into consideration Rule 9 of 1990 Rules.

19. The 1990 Rules were enacted with an object of regulating its own procedure, prescribing such forms and registers to regulate the proceedings before the Karnataka Administrative Tribunal for expeditious

disposal of the cases and for smooth and effective running of day-to-day administration in the Tribunal. There is no complete embargo on the part of the litigants to file an application in Kannada. The parties can file an application in Kannada in terms of Rule 9(iii) of 1990 Rules and the 1986 Rules provides that the Bench, in its discretion, may permit the use of Kannada in the proceedings, subject to the condition that the final order should be in English.

20. As we have already considered the meaning of the word *proceedings* and in view of clause (iii) of Rule 9 of 1990 Rules, all pleadings, shall include the Application. Such a basic aspect was not properly considered by the Tribunal and committed an error in passing the impugned order.

21. In view of the above discussion, we proceed to pass the following:

CNR: KAHC030016412026

**ORDER**

(i) The writ petition is ***allowed***.

(ii) The impugned order dated 05.06.2025 passed on I.A. No.2 of 2025 in O.A. No.219 of 2025 by the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Kalaburagi is hereby ***quashed***. I.A. No.2 of 2025 is ***allowed***.

(iii) Application No.219 of 2025 is hereby restored to its original file.

(iv) The Tribunal is directed to dispose of the Application, in accordance with law.

**Sd/-**
**(ASHOK S. KINAGI)**
**JUDGE**

**Sd/-**
**(SUBRAMANYA RANGARAO)**
**JUDGE**

RK
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 6
Ct: pk