



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M

WRIT PETITION NO. 26987 OF 2017 (L-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. ARUN SHASTRY,
MANAGING DIRECTOR,
M/S. BINARY DATA SOURCE INDIA PVT. LTD.,
NO.435, RAJ KUMAR ROAD, 4TH BLOCK,
RAJAJINAGAR, BENGALURU-560 022.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PREETHAM KUMAR J., ADVOCATE FOR
SMT. USHA M.V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MRS. REKHA KUMARI B.,
NO.711, 42ND CROSS,
3RD BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR,
BENGALURU-560 010.

2. ASSISTANT LABOUR COMMISSIONER,
APPOINTED UNDER WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT,
ZONE -1, BENGALURU-560029.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. RAJASHEKER M.B., ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SRI. K.P.YOGANNA, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, SEEKING CERTAIN
RELIEFS.





THIS WRIT PETITION IS LISTED FOR FINAL HEARING,
THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:

ORAL ORDER

Sri.Preetham Kumar J., counsel on behalf of Smt.Usha M.V., for the petitioner, Sri.Rajasheker M.B., counsel for respondent No.1 and Sri.K.P.Yoganna., Additional Government Advocate for respondent No.2 appeared in person.

2. The order passed by the second respondent dated 24.01.2017 is called into question in this writ petition on several grounds as set out in the memorandum of writ petition.

3. Counsel for the respective parties urged several contentions.

Counsel for the petitioner while presenting his arguments submits that opportunity was not accorded to the petitioner and it is also stated that the second respondent has not assigned any reasons in allowing the claim of the first respondent. Urging other grounds, submits that the order may be set aside.



Counsel for respondent No.1 and Additional Government Advocate for respondent No.2 justified the order. Accordingly, prayed for the dismissal of the writ petition.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the papers with care.

5. Suffice it to note that the first respondent Smt.Rekha Kumari.B., submitted an application before the second respondent claiming the arrears of salary.

Taking note of the absence of the petitioner, the second respondent proceeded to allow the claim without assigning any reasons. The impugned order is not a speaking order. In the absence of reasons justifying the allowance of the claim, the matter warrants remand for fresh consideration. Accordingly, the order dated 24.01.2017 passed by the second respondent is hereby quashed. The petitioner and the first respondent are directed to appear before the second respondent on 21.07.2026, without awaiting any further notice from the second respondent.

6. Accordingly, the petition is **allowed**.



Because of disposal the Writ Petition, interim order granted if any stands discharged and pending interlocutory applications if any are disposed of.

**Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE**

SS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 70