

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

SLP (CIVIL) NO. 17093 OF 2024

**CHETAN BOGAR & ORS. ...PETITIONER(S)
VERSUS**

**THE STATE OF
KARNATAKA & ORS. ...RESPONDENT(S)**

WITH

**SLP (CIVIL) NO. 15834 OF 2024
AND
SLP (CIVIL) NO. 18413 OF 2024
AND
SLP (CIVIL) NO. 16120 OF 2024
AND
SLP (CIVIL) NO. 16318 OF 2024
AND
SLP (CIVIL) NO. 16376 OF 2024
AND
SLP (CIVIL) NO. 16154 OF 2024
AND
SLP (CIVIL) NO. 21609 OF 2024
AND
SLP (CIVIL) NO. 24415 OF 2024**

O R D E R

1. This group of petitions assails the correctness of detailed interim order passed by the Karnataka High

www.ecourtsindia.com

Court in a pending group of writ petitions challenging the selection conducted by the Karnataka Public Service Commission¹ for the selection of Junior Training Officer in the State of Karnataka. During the pendency of those petitions before the High Court, direction was issued to the KPSC, as also the State Government, to redo the exercise of preparing the Select list after obtaining the necessary clarifications and place it in a sealed cover.

2. By the impugned order, the Division Bench of the High Court directed the opening of the 15 (Fifteen) sealed covers which was carried out in the presence of the learned counsel and further directed the KPSC to give effect to the revised list within a period of three months.
3. This Court, *vide* order dated 02.07.2024, stayed the operation of the impugned order passed by the High Court directing implementation of the revised list. The State of Karnataka has filed an I.A. praying for vacation of the interim order for the reason that as a result of the stay order passed by this Court, the entire appointment procedure is held up and as of date, there are huge vacancies reaching up to a figure

¹ KPSC

of almost 2,000 (Two thousand) and in the absence of such large number of employees, the work in the entire State is suffering. The said I.A. has been opposed by some of the petitioners who have already been appointed and are working. Others have prayed that the revised list be implemented so that other selected candidates may get employment and start working, whereas, one of the group of petitioners is aggrieved by the revised Select list. There is another set of candidates which is opposing the appointments already made on various grounds of illegality and irregularity.

4. We have heard the respective counsels and are of the firm view that these petitions against the interim order should not be continued any further in this Court.
5. Mr. Sibal, learned senior counsel appearing for the State of Karnataka, has submitted that the KPSC and the State may be allowed to publish the revised merit list and also to proceed with the appointments as per the revised merit list in order to facilitate smooth functioning in the State, as in the absence of such large number of employees, the work is greatly hampered.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we dispose of these petitions permitting the State and KPSC to publish the revised merit list and to make appointments as per the revised merit list. However, we clarify that the candidates who have already been appointed and are working may not be disturbed, if found to have been wrongly selected, till such time the writ petitions are finally decided by the High Court. All appointments made would be subject to the final outcome of the writ petitions.
7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

.....J.
[VIKRAM NATH]

.....J.
[PRASANNA B. VARALE]

**NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 17, 2024.**