CITIZEN RIGHTS FOUNDATION

Stands for Social Justice...

Reg-No-187/2019-2020

R/O No.158, B.M. Layout, Venkateshpuram, Bengaluru - 560 045.

E-mail : citizenrightsblr@gmail.com, citizenrightsind@yahoo.com Mobile No : +91 9481147777

REF-NO-CRF/REP/BLR/134/2026 **DATED: 12.11.2026**

TO,

1. **The Chief Secretary,**
   Government of Karnataka
   Vidhana Soudha, Bengaluru – 560001.

   ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯವರ ಕಛೇರಿ
   ಪತ್ರ / ಮನವಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ
   ದಿನಾಂಕ: 12/11/26.

2. **The Additional Chief Secretary**
   Urban Development Department
   Government of Karnataka
   Vikasa Soudha, Bengaluru – 560001.

   12/11/26
   ನಗರಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಇಲಾಖೆ
   (ಸ್ವೀಕೃತಿ ಮತ್ತು ರವಾನೆ ಶಾಖೆ)
   ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ದಿನಾಂಕ:
   ವಿಕಾಸ ಸೌಧ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-1

3. **The Additional Chief Secretary,**
   Finance Department,
   Government of Karnataka,
   Vidhana Soudha, Bengaluru – 560001.

   ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ:
   ದಿನಾಂಕ: 12-11-26

4. **The Chief Commissioner**
   Greater Bengaluru Authority (GBA),
   N.R. Square, Bengaluru – 560002.

   ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಎ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು ರವರ ಆಪ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ
   ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ( )
   ದಿನಾಂಕ 12/11/26

5. **The Managing Director,**
   Bengaluru Solid Waste Management Limited (BSWML),
   No. 30/1, 1st & 2nd Floor, UNI Building,
   Thimmaiah Road, Millers Tank Bund Area,
   Vasanth Nagar, Bengaluru – 560051.

   Bengaluru Solid Waste Management Limited
   Received
   12/11/26

6. **The Principal Secretary to Government**
   Forest, Ecology and Environment Department,
   (Government of Karnataka)
   Room No. 709, 7th Floor, 4th Gate,
   M.S. Building, Bengaluru – 560001.

   12/11/26
   ಸ್ವೀಕೃತಿ ಮತ್ತು ರವಾನೆ ಸಹಾಯಕರು
   ಅರಣ್ಯ, ಜೀವಿಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪರಿಸರ ಇಲಾಖೆ
   (ಸ್ವೀಕೃತಿ ಮತ್ತು ರವಾನೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಮನ್ವಯ) ಶಾಖೆ
   ಬಹುಮಹಡಿಗಳ ಕಟ್ಟಡ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-1
   4:30pm

7. **The Member Secretary**
   Karnataka State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB),
   Parisara Bhavan, No. 49, 4th & 5th Floor,
   Church Street, Bengaluru – 560001.

   RECEIVED
   12 NOV 2026
   KSPCB, Bangalore

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Representation Seeking an Independent High-Level Government Investigation into Alleged Financial Irregularities, Possible Collusion, Abuse of Official Position, Favouritism, Violations of the Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements Act, 1999 and Rules, and Alleged Violations of the Model Code of Conduct in Connection with BSWML Tender Notification No. DGM-

1/BSWML/TEND/08/2025-26 Dated 30.07.2025, Covering 33 Packages, and Subsequent Tender Notifications Issued During September and October 2026; Involving an Alleged Financial Implication of Approximately ₹350 Crore of Public Money; Seeking an Independent Financial and Technical Audit, Examination of Finance Department Objections, Government Committee Reports, Tender Addendums, Corrigendum's, Letters of Acceptance and Work Orders, and Appropriate Government Action, Including Withdrawal, Modification, Cancellation, Fresh Tendering and Referral to the Competent Investigative Agencies, Wherever Warranted by the Evidence.

REFERENCES:

1. BSWML Tender Notification No. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/08/2025-26 dated 30.07.2025 concerning municipal solid-waste collection and transportation services covering 33 packages, Call-2.
2. Complete Request for Proposal, tender schedules, eligibility conditions, financial and technical qualification requirements, addendums, corrigendum's, clarifications and subsequent communications relating to the above tender.
3. Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka dated 22.04.2025 in W.P. No. 26089/2023 and connected matters, including W.P. No. 2935/2023.
4. Order dated 30.07.2025 in Review Petition No. 239/2025.
5. Judgment dated 03.11.2025 in W.P. No. 27474/2025, NC: 2025: KHC:44337, B.S. Kiran Kumar and 17 Others v. State of Karnataka and Others.
6. Judgment dated 02.06.2026 in W.P. Nos. 1749/2023 and 7629/2023.
7. Judgment dated 01.04.2026 in W.P. Nos. 8524/2026, 8667/2026, 8670/2026 and 8672/2026.
8. Judgment dated 16.10.2026 in W.P. No. 8976/2026, NC: 2026: KHC:59240.
9. Judgment dated 05.10.2026 in W.P. No. 31195/2026 and connected matters, NC: 2026: KHC:55100.

10. Government Order dated 04.06.2026 reportedly constituting a sub-committee to review tenders awarded by BSWML.

11. Government committee reportedly constituted under the chairmanship of Mr. Anjum Parvez, Senior IAS Officer, to examine allegations concerning BSWML tender proceedings.

12. Finance Department objections, observations, file notings, financial scrutiny reports and related correspondence concerning the BSWML tender.

13. Karnataka Legislative Council elections from the Teachers' and Graduates' Constituencies, for which the Model Code of Conduct was brought into force with effect from 22.09.2026.

14. BSWML tender notifications dated 19.09.2026, 23.09.2026 and 08.10.2026 concerning various municipal solid-waste-management packages.

15. Work orders reportedly issued in respect of Packages 8, 11, 12, 13 and 15 under the original 30.07.2025 tender.

16. Relevant proceedings before the National Green Tribunal, including O.A. No. 606/2018 and O.A. No. 608/2022.

17. Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements Act, 1999, as amended, and Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements Rules, 2000, as amended.

18. Election Commission of India instructions concerning the Model Code of Conduct and government procurement during the election period.

Respected Sir/Madam,

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE REPRESENTATION:

1. Our foundation, the Dutiful Citizens group, is a movement working to prevent the injustice caused to the public by white collar workers through our advocacy, campaign and research on issues with the greatest impact on people's lives and hold the powerful account for the common good. The motto of our foundation is to expose the system and networks that enabled white collar workers to thrive; our aim is to

demand greatest transparency and integrity in all areas of public life and our organization is fighting against the social evil and rights of people. We request your immediate intervention in this matter and urge you to take appropriate action in accordance with the law.

2. The foundation respectfully submits this comprehensive representation seeking the immediate intervention of the Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka, for an independent, impartial and time-bound investigation into serious allegations of financial irregularities, possible collusion, favouritism, abuse of official position, procedural violations and non-compliance with statutory procurement requirements in the tender proceedings undertaken by Bengaluru Solid Waste Management Limited (hereinafter referred to as "BSWML"), a Government of Karnataka company.

3. The principal subject matter concerns BSWML Tender Notification No. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/08/2025-26 dated 30.07.2025, covering 33 packages relating to municipal solid-waste collection and transportation services, together with the subsequent addendums, corrigendum's, clarifications, tender evaluation proceedings, financial bids, Letters of Acceptance, work orders and subsequent tender notifications issued during September and October 2026.

4. The allegations are concern, inter alia, the alleged award or proposed award of contracts at rates approximately 14% above the estimated tender values, resulting in an alleged aggregate financial implication of approximately ₹350 crore of public taxpayers' money; reported objections raised by the Finance Department; alleged non-compliance with the observations and directions of the Government-appointed committees; possible manipulation or relaxation of eligibility requirements; alleged departures from prescribed online procurement procedures; and the issuance of work orders and progression of fresh tender proceedings during the enforcement of the Model Code of Conduct.

5. The conduct and decision-making of Mr. Chandrashekar, Deputy General Manager-1, BSWML, Mr. S.V. Rajesh, Chief General Manager, BSWML, and Mr. Karee

Gowda, Chief Executive Officer, BSWML, require independent examination in relation to their respective official responsibilities, approval processes, recommendations, communications and decisions concerning the above procurement proceedings.

6. The foundation further requests examination of the roles of the successful bidders, participating contractors, consortium members and other persons, if any, who may have participated in or benefited from any irregular procurement arrangement. The allegations concerning individual officers, contractors and other persons are placed before the Government solely for independent verification and investigation and shall not be construed as established findings of criminality or misconduct.

7. The foundation further submits that the problems surrounding Bengaluru's solid-waste-management administration are not merely recent or isolated incidents but reflect a persistent pattern of alleged administrative failures, contractual irregularities, inadequate oversight and lack of accountability extending over more than 15 years. Successive contractual arrangements, the involvement of private contractors, political functionaries and public officials, and repeated changes in procurement and implementation mechanisms warrant a comprehensive investigation into whether vested interests have exercised undue influence over the city's waste-management system. The establishment of BSWML was expected to introduce transparency, institutional accountability and scientific waste management; however, the continuing controversies and alleged irregularities raise serious concerns as to whether the system has instead become vulnerable to contractual interests, financial impropriety and administrative interference. Bengaluru's natural environment, public spaces, lakes, land resources and public health cannot be permitted to suffer further in the name of municipal waste management. The Government must investigate whether public funds, public land and essential municipal services have been subjected to misuse, mismanagement or undue private influence, identify the persons responsible wherever evidence establishes wrongdoing, and bring an end to any entrenched nexus between vested contractual interests and public administration. The citizens of Bengaluru deserve a

transparent, environmentally sustainable and corruption-free waste-management system, not a procurement mechanism that repeatedly gives rise to allegations of irregularities and loss to the public exchequer.

8. The present representation is intended to secure accountability in the expenditure of public money, ensure compliance with the statutory procurement framework, safeguard the financial interests of the State and protect the public interest in the delivery of essential municipal solid-waste-management services. It is not intended to interfere with any concluded judicial determination or to substitute the Government's administrative discretion with the opinion of the foundation.

II. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF BSWML TENDER PROCEEDINGS:

1. The procurement history of BSWML has witnessed multiple tender notifications, modifications, withdrawals, judicial proceedings, changes in package structures and subsequent fresh tendering exercises. The sequence of events warrants a consolidated examination by the State Government to determine whether the procurement process has consistently complied with statutory requirements and whether public expenditure has been protected.

2. The earlier procurement process commenced with tender notifications covering 89 packages for 243 wards, followed by further tender proceedings during 2022 and 2023. The initial tender was issued on 28.09.2022, followed by an addendum dated 18.10.2022 and subsequent tender proceedings during January 2023. The process became the subject matter of several proceedings before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, including W.P. No. 21876/2022, W.P. No. 26089/2023 and W.P. No. 2935/2023.

3. The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, by its judgment dated 22.04.2025 in W.P. No. 26089/2023 and connected matters, considered the earlier procurement history, disputes concerning tender evaluation and the decision of BSWML to undertake a fresh integrated solid-waste-management tender process. The Court sustained the

subsequent tender arrangement on the material placed before it and directed the State authorities to redraw the timeline for completion of the tender process.

4. Thereafter, Review Petition No. 239/2025 was considered by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, which passed an order dated 30.07.2025 recording the affidavit and submissions made on behalf of the authorities and requiring adherence to the position stated before the Court.

5. Subsequently, BSWML issued Tender Notification No. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/08/2025-26 dated 30.07.2025, covering 33 packages. The procurement involved consolidation of multiple wards into larger packages and corresponding changes in the financial and technical qualification requirements.

6. The said tender was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P. No. 27474/2025. By judgment dated 03.11.2025, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka dismissed the writ petition, accepting the administrative justification placed before it for consolidation of the packages and observing that the petitioners had not established that the changes were made with an intention to favour any particular bidder. The Court also considered the consortium arrangements permitted under the tender.

7. The foundation fully acknowledges the above judicial determination and does not seek to reopen the findings rendered by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka on the material then available. However, the subsequent implementation of the tender, the actual application of eligibility requirements, Finance Department objections, tender evaluation proceedings, Letters of Acceptance, work orders, financial implications and subsequent tender notifications constitute matters requiring examination on the basis of their respective records and subsequent developments.

8. The Government is therefore requested to examine the entire procurement history as one continuous administrative and financial exercise, rather than examining individual tender notifications in isolation.

III. ALLEGED EXCESS OF APPROXIMATELY 14% OVER ESTIMATED TENDER VALUE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATION OF ₹350 CRORE:

1. It has been brought to the notice of the foundation that the contracts under the above BSWML tender have allegedly been processed, accepted or proposed to be awarded at rates approximately 14% higher than the estimated tender amounts, resulting in an alleged aggregate financial implication of approximately ₹350 crore of public taxpayers' money.

2. The above allegation raises serious questions concerning the reasonableness of the estimated contract values, the methodology adopted for arriving at the financial estimates, the comparative financial bids submitted by participating contractors, the justification for accepting rates exceeding the estimates and the potential additional financial burden upon the Government and municipal bodies.

3. The Government is therefore requested to undertake a package-wise financial examination to establish the original estimated value, revised estimated value, quoted financial bid, accepted rate, percentage variation from the estimate, contract duration, escalation provisions, projected total expenditure and actual financial commitment arising from each package.

4. The investigation should specifically establish whether the alleged 14% excess represents a comparison with the original estimates, revised estimates or final approved estimates and whether the alleged ₹350 crore represents a projected additional expenditure, an amount proposed for award, a contractual commitment or an amount already paid.

5. It is further necessary to examine whether any changes were made to the estimated tender values after publication of the original tender notification and, if so, whether such changes were supported by technical studies, financial justification, revised quantities, market-rate analysis and approval of the competent authority.

6. The Government should also examine whether the acceptance of rates above the estimated values was supported by a comparative market assessment, independent

rate analysis, prevailing municipal contract rates and objective financial justification, or whether any departure from the estimated values occurred without sufficient reasons being recorded in the procurement files.

7. The foundation respectfully submits that the alleged financial implication of approximately ₹350 crore is sufficiently substantial to warrant a special independent financial and technical audit. The investigation should determine the actual financial exposure to the public exchequer and identify whether any avoidable, excessive or unjustified expenditure has been incurred or is likely to be incurred.

IV. REPORTED FINANCE DEPARTMENT OBJECTIONS AND ALLEGED FAILURE TO ADDRESS FINANCIAL SCRUTINY:

1. It is understood that the Finance Department, Government of Karnataka, raised several objections and observations concerning the BSWML tender process, particularly in relation to consortium formation, dilution or alteration of work-experience requirements, financial-capacity qualification criteria, eligibility and experience of consortium lead members and alleged alteration of estimated tender amounts after invitation of tenders.

2. The foundation further understands that the Finance Department reportedly expressed concerns regarding the manner in which the consortium eligibility requirements were formulated, the adequacy of the qualifications of lead consortium members and the extent to which the prescribed experience and financial-capacity requirements were consistent with the nature and magnitude of the contracts.

3. It is also alleged that the Finance Department observed that the matter had not been brought to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the concerned department. The relevant official records must establish the exact nature of this observation, the applicable approval procedure and whether the matter was required to be placed before the competent political or administrative authority.

4. These observations are of considerable significance because the procurement concerns essential municipal services involving substantial public expenditure and long-term contractual obligations.

5. The Government is therefore requested to obtain the complete Finance Department file, including all objections, observations, internal communications, financial scrutiny notes, correspondence with BSWML, replies submitted by the concerned officers, subsequent clarifications and final decisions taken on each objection.

6. The investigation should establish whether the objections were adequately considered before proceeding with the procurement, whether the competent authority granted approval for any departure from the original conditions, whether the reasons for accepting or rejecting the Finance Department's observations were properly recorded and whether any officer proceeded contrary to a binding Government direction or mandatory financial instruction.

7. It is further alleged that, notwithstanding the objections raised by the Finance Department, certain modifications and decisions were proceeded with in a manner that may have benefited particular contractors or consortium arrangements. This allegation requires verification through examination of the original tender documents, comparative statements, consortium agreements, financial credentials, evaluation proceedings and relevant official communications.

8. The Government should also ascertain whether any additional contractor profit or financial advantage was incorporated into the accepted rates without adequate justification and whether such decisions contributed to the alleged ₹350 crore financial implication.

9. No adverse finding should be drawn merely from the existence of a Finance Department objection. The material question is whether the objection concerned a mandatory legal or financial requirement, whether it was resolved by the competent authority and whether the final decision was lawful, transparent and supported by recorded reasons.

V. GOVERNMENT-APPOINTED COMMITTEE HEADED BY MR. ANJUM PARVEZ AND ALLEGED NON-COMPLIANCE WITH ITS FINDINGS:

1. It is understood that the Government of Karnataka constituted a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Anjum Parvez, Senior IAS Officer, along with other concerned officials, to examine allegations and issues relating to BSWML tender proceedings.

2. The constitution of the committee and the findings, if any, are material to determining whether the procurement process was independently reviewed by the State Government before further contractual and financial commitments were undertaken.

3. It is alleged that BSWML proceeded with the tender process despite concerns reportedly raised before or by the Government-appointed committee and without adequately addressing the applicable statutory requirements, Government directions or recommendations.

4. The Government is therefore requested to obtain the original Government Order constituting the committee, the terms of reference, the names and designations of its members, the minutes of meetings, records of evidence considered, reports submitted, findings, recommendations and action-taken proceedings.

5. The Government should specifically establish whether the committee submitted its report, whether its recommendations were accepted or rejected, whether the competent authority passed any reasoned order on the findings and whether BSWML implemented the recommendations before issuing Letters of Acceptance or further tender notifications.

6. The Government should also clarify whether this committee is the same as, or distinct from, the sub-committee reportedly constituted under Government Order dated 04.06.2026, as referred to in the judgment dated 05.10.2026 in W.P. No. 31195/2026 and connected matters.

7. If these are separate committees, their respective constitution orders, jurisdiction, terms of reference and reports should be examined independently. If they are the same committee, the Government should clarify the continuity of its proceedings and the action taken on its recommendations.

8. The failure, if any, to consider or implement binding Government directions or mandatory recommendations before proceeding with a substantial public procurement exercise would require appropriate administrative examination and responsibility should be fixed wherever a violation is established.

VI. ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE KTPP ACT AND RULES AND DEPARTURE FROM PRESCRIBED ONLINE PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES:

1. The BSWML tender is required to comply with the Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements Act, 1999, and the Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements Rules, 2000, as amended, together with the applicable Government financial instructions and the conditions contained in the original tender documents.

2. Section 5 of the KTPP Act prohibits procurement otherwise than through the prescribed tender process, subject to the statutory framework. Section 6 requires procurement entities to follow the procedure prescribed under the Act and Rules. Section 9 deals with appointment of the Tender Inviting Authority and Tender Accepting Authority. Section 10 provides for the Tender Scrutiny Committee. Section 13 governs acceptance of tenders and requires the prescribed procedure to be followed, including communication of the acceptance information, comparative analysis and reasons for acceptance. Section 14 deals with rejection of tenders before an order of acceptance. Section 15 empowers the State Government to issue appropriate directions to secure and maintain transparency at any stage of procurement. Sections 17 and 18 empower the Government to obtain information and call for the complete procurement records.

3. It is specifically alleged that the prescribed online procedure governing tender negotiations, evaluation, finalisation and issuance or communication of Letters of

Acceptance may not have been followed in the manner required by the applicable statutory provisions, Rules, Government instructions and tender conditions.

4. The Government should therefore examine the complete electronic procurement trail to ascertain whether all relevant actions were undertaken through the prescribed Karnataka Public Procurement Portal, whether any negotiation was conducted outside the prescribed procedure, whether the financial bids were opened and evaluated in the prescribed manner, whether the Tender Accepting Authority was properly constituted and authorised and whether the final Letters of Acceptance were issued after completion of all mandatory statutory requirements.

5. The Government should further ascertain whether any negotiation was conducted with selected bidders, whether such negotiation was legally permissible, whether the necessary Government orders or instructions were followed and whether the resulting financial terms were properly recorded and communicated.

6. The relevant records should establish whether any offline or separate communication was used to alter, influence or supplement the online procurement process and whether all bidders were treated equally in relation to clarifications, negotiations, financial evaluation and final acceptance.

7. The investigation should also determine whether the tender evaluation was conducted strictly in accordance with the published criteria and whether any relaxation, waiver or modification was granted to any bidder or consortium without a lawful basis.

8. Any departure from the prescribed online procedure, if established, should be examined to determine its materiality, effect on competition, financial consequences and the responsibility of the officers concerned.

9. The Government is specifically requested to verify whether any action was taken with the object or effect of conferring an undue advantage upon particular contractors, and whether the available records disclose evidence of improper

coordination, preferential treatment, manipulation of eligibility conditions or collusive arrangements.

VII. EXAMINATION OF THE ROLES AND OFFICIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONCERNED BSWML OFFICERS:

1. The foundation respectfully requests an independent examination of the official roles, responsibilities and decisions of **Mr. Chandrashekar, Deputy General Manager-1, BSWML; Mr. S.V. Rajesh, Chief General Manager, BSWML; and Mr. Karee Gowda, Chief Executive Officer, BSWML,** in connection with the tender proceedings under reference.

2. The investigation should examine the respective responsibilities of these officers in the preparation and publication of tender notifications, formulation and modification of eligibility requirements, preparation and revision of estimates, submission and consideration of Finance Department objections, processing of consortium arrangements, technical and financial evaluation, recommendation and approval of successful bidders, issuance of Letters of Acceptance, issuance of work orders and subsequent fresh tender proceedings.

3. The Government should obtain the complete file notings, internal recommendations, approval sheets, meeting minutes, electronic communications, correspondence with bidders, instructions issued to subordinate officers and all other records evidencing the role played by each concerned officer.

4. The investigation should establish whether the concerned officers acted within their delegated authority, whether they complied with the applicable procurement framework, whether any Government directions or Finance Department objections were disregarded without lawful justification and whether any decision was taken for an improper purpose or resulted in an undue advantage to any particular bidder.

5. The investigation should also examine whether any conflict of interest, undisclosed relationship, improper communication or other circumstance existed that could have compromised the fairness and impartiality of the procurement process.

6. The foundation does not request that any officer be presumed guilty merely because of his official position or participation in the procurement process. Responsibility should be determined individually on the basis of documentary evidence, statutory duties, actual decision-making authority and the principles of natural justice.

VIII. EXAMINATION OF SUCCESSFUL BIDDERS, CONSORTIUM MEMBERS AND ALLEGED COLLUSIVE ARRANGEMENTS:

1. The Government is requested to examine the participation, eligibility, consortium arrangements, financial credentials and contractual benefits of the bidders who participated in the 33-package tender and subsequent procurement proceedings.

2. The examination should specifically cover the following participating contractors and entities, whose roles have been brought to the notice of the foundation:

3. Mr. M. Shivakumar and OLN Enterprises; Mr. Ganesh Shankar and M/s Ganesh Shankar Environmental Solutions Pvt. Ltd.; Mr. Cheluvaraju and M/s Ganga Enterprises; Mr. M.V. Venkatesha and M/s Shodashi Enterprises; Mr. Ramu V. and M/s Sri Venkateshwara Enterprises; Mr. Kamalesh Jain and M/s Global Waste Management Cell Pvt. Ltd.; Mr. Niteesha T.R.; Mr. Anumakonda Anjan Kumar and M/s Hasper Pvt. Ltd.; and Mr. Ranganath and M/s SLN Cleaning & Services.

4. The Government should verify whether the above entities participated independently or through consortium arrangements, whether the consortium agreements complied with the tender conditions, whether the lead members possessed the prescribed qualifications and financial capacity and whether the experience and turnover credentials submitted by consortium members were genuine and independently verifiable.

5. The investigation should further examine whether any common directors, partners, authorised representatives, addresses, financial relationships, shared resources, common interests or other relevant connections existed among participating entities,

to the extent legally permissible and relevant to determining whether any improper coordination or collusion occurred.

6. The financial bids should be examined for unusual similarities, unexplained bidding patterns, common pricing behaviour, reciprocal bidding arrangements or other objective indicators of possible bid coordination. Any such indicators should be assessed with due regard to the complete procurement record and should not, by themselves, be treated as proof of collusion.

7. The Government should determine whether any contractor received preferential treatment, whether any bidder was permitted to rely upon credentials contrary to the tender conditions and whether any improper understanding between bidders and officials affected the integrity of the procurement process.

IX. ALLEGED ISSUANCE OF WORK ORDERS DURING THE MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT:

1. The foundation submits that elections to the Karnataka Legislative Council from the Teachers' and Graduates' Constituencies were announced in September 2026 and the Model Code of Conduct came into force with effect from 22.09.2026, continuing until completion of the election process, which was scheduled to conclude by 31.10.2026.

2. It is alleged that, notwithstanding the enforcement of the Model Code of Conduct, work orders were issued or proceeded with in respect of certain packages under the original BSWML Tender Notification No. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/08/2025-26 dated 30.07.2025.

3. The packages and contractors identified for verification are as follows:
   a. **Package No. 8 – Mr. Narase Gowda.**
   b. **Package No. 15 – Mr. K.N. Soundiran.**
   c. **Package No. 11 – Mr. Cheluvaraju.**
   d. **Package No. 12 – Mr. Ganesh Shankar.**
   e. **Package No. 13 – Mr. Manjunath.**

4. The circumstances surrounding the alleged issuance of these work orders require examination, particularly with reference to the actual dates of approval, acceptance, execution of agreements, issuance of work orders, commencement of work, availability of prior administrative and financial sanctions and any permission or approval obtained from the competent election authorities.

5. The Government should specifically establish whether the tender proceedings had reached the stage of valid award before commencement of the Model Code of Conduct, whether all necessary sanctions had been obtained before the announcement of the election schedule, whether any contractual obligation to commence work already existed and whether any further approval from the Election Commission was required.

6. The Election Commission's instructions concerning procurement during the Model Code of Conduct distinguish between tenders already floated and new tenders. Non-global tenders already floated may be evaluated during the election period but ordinarily cannot be finalised without prior approval of the Commission. Tenders not already floated cannot ordinarily be floated without the requisite prior approval. The applicability of these instructions to each package must therefore be determined from the actual dates and procedural status of the relevant tender.

7. The Government should also verify whether any work order issued during the said period was merely the completion of a pre-existing contractual process or amounted to a fresh award or finalisation requiring prior election-authority approval.

8. If any work order or award is found to have been issued contrary to the applicable Election Commission instructions, the Government should take appropriate corrective and administrative action and refer the matter to the competent election authority wherever necessary.

X. TENDER NOTIFICATIONS DATED 19.09.2026 AND ALLEGED PROCESSING DURING THE MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT:

1. It is further submitted that BSWML issued several fresh tender notifications dated 19.09.2026 relating to municipal solid-waste collection and transportation packages.

2. The tender notifications identified for examination are as follows:
   a. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/14/2025-26 – Package No. 6.**
   b. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/15/2025-26 – Package No. 7.**
   c. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/16/2025-26 – Package No. 9.**
   d. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/17/2025-26 – Package No. 10.**
   e. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/20/2025-26 – Package No. 18.**
   f. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/21/2025-26 – Package No. 19.**

3. It is alleged that the technical evaluation and qualification proceedings concerning these tenders were completed and financial bids were opened during the period when the Model Code of Conduct was in force.

4. The Government should examine whether the technical evaluation was undertaken strictly in accordance with the published tender conditions, whether the financial bids were opened in compliance with the prescribed online process and whether any final acceptance, award or other irreversible procurement action was undertaken without obtaining the requisite prior approval of the Election Commission.

5. The participation of the contractors and entities identified in the preceding paragraph should also be examined in relation to these tender proceedings, including the roles of the concerned officials in the technical evaluation, financial-bid opening and subsequent decision-making.

6. The fact that the tender notifications were dated 19.09.2026, two days before the commencement of the Model Code of Conduct, does not by itself establish a violation. However, the subsequent evaluation and finalisation of the procurement during the election period require examination in accordance with the specific Election Commission instructions applicable to tenders already floated before the commencement of the Model Code.

7. The Government should obtain the original Election Commission instructions, any approval or correspondence issued by the competent election authority and the complete portal audit trail to establish whether the procurement process was legally permitted to proceed at each stage.

XI. TENDER NOTIFICATIONS DATED 23.09.2026 DURING THE MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT:

1. It is further alleged that BSWML issued the following tender notifications dated 23.09.2026, after commencement of the Model Code of Conduct:
    a. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/22/2025-26 – Package No. 24.**
    b. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/23/2025-26 – Package No. 25.**
    c. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/24/2025-26 – Package No. 29.**
    d. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/25/2025-26 – Package No. 31.**

2. The issuance of these fresh tender notifications during the enforcement of the Model Code of Conduct raises a specific question concerning compliance with the Election Commission's restrictions on floating new tenders in areas where the election process is underway.

3. The Government is requested to ascertain whether these tenders were issued pursuant to prior approval or permission of the competent election authority and whether any specific exemption or administrative direction was obtained.

4. The Government should also examine whether these tenders were issued for genuinely essential and unavoidable municipal services, whether the procurement had already received the necessary administrative, technical and financial sanctions before the commencement of the Model Code of Conduct and whether the conditions prescribed by the Election Commission for proceeding with such procurement were satisfied.

5. The complete records concerning the date of preparation, approval, publication and opening of each tender should be obtained, together with the relevant electronic timestamps and correspondence with the election authorities.

6. If the issuance of any tender is established to be contrary to the applicable Model Code of Conduct instructions, appropriate action should be taken in accordance with law.

XII. TENDER NOTIFICATIONS DATED 08.10.2026 DURING THE MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT:

1. The foundation further submits that the following tender notifications were reportedly issued by BSWML on 08.10.2026, during the continuing enforcement of the Model Code of Conduct:
   a. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/26/2025-26 – Package No. 06.**
   b. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/27/2025-26 – Package No. 16.**
   c. **DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/28/2025-26 – Package No. 17.**

2. The issuance of these tender notifications during the election period requires particular examination in view of the Election Commission's instructions concerning new tenders and procurement activities during the Model Code of Conduct.

3. The Government should establish whether these tenders were supported by prior approval from the competent election authority, whether the procurement was covered by any applicable exception and whether the decision to invite fresh tenders during the election period was supported by recorded administrative necessity and lawful authority.

4. The Government should also examine whether the issuance of these tenders was consistent with the status of the earlier tender proceedings concerning the corresponding packages and whether any duplication, overlapping contractual commitment or avoidable financial liability arose as a consequence.

5. The foundation respectfully requests that all procurement actions undertaken in respect of the above packages during the election period be examined together, including publication, technical evaluation, financial-bid opening, acceptance, issuance of Letters of Acceptance and work orders.

XIII. ALLEGED IMPROPER COORDINATION BETWEEN OFFICIALS AND CONTRACTORS:

1. The foundation has received information and representations raising concerns about possible improper coordination between certain BSWML officials and participating contractors in relation to the 33-package tender and subsequent procurement proceedings.

2. The allegations specifically concern the possibility of preferential treatment, relaxation of eligibility requirements, acceptance of financial credentials, changes in estimated values, consortium arrangements, financial-bid evaluation and the subsequent processing of work orders and fresh tenders.

3. The names of the concerned officers and contractors have been identified in this representation for the limited purpose of enabling the competent authority to examine the relevant official and commercial records.

4. The Government is requested to determine whether any communications, meetings, recommendations, common financial interests or other circumstances indicate an improper understanding or arrangement intended to influence the procurement process or confer an undue advantage upon selected contractors.

5. The investigation should include examination of official email correspondence, electronic communications maintained in official systems, meeting records, bid submission data, consortium agreements, financial documents and all other lawfully obtainable evidence relevant to the procurement.

6. If the material discloses prima facie evidence of offences involving corruption, criminal conspiracy, cheating, abuse of official position or other cognisable

offences, the matter should be referred to the competent police, vigilance or anti-corruption investigating agency for action under the applicable law.

XIV. RELEVANCE OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER DATED 04.06.2026 AND JUDGMENT DATED 05.10.2026:

1. The judgment dated 05.10.2026 in W.P. No. 31195/2026 and connected matters, NC: 2026: KHC:55100, refers to a Government Order dated 04.06.2026 under which a sub-committee was reportedly constituted to review various tenders awarded by BSWML.
2. The said judicial proceedings also record that Letters of Acceptance dated 04.09.2026 had been issued to successful bidders pursuant to the earlier tender process and that subsequent fresh tender notifications dated 19.09.2026 came to be issued.
3. The circumstances leading to the issuance of fresh tenders despite the earlier Letters of Acceptance require examination with reference to the tender conditions, bid validity, acceptance procedures, contractual obligations and the recommendations of the Government-appointed review mechanism.
4. The Government is requested to obtain the entire file relating to the Government Order dated 04.06.2026, including the terms of reference, constitution of the committee, minutes, reports, recommendations and action-taken proceedings.
5. It should also be established whether the committee examined the alleged excess over estimated tender values, Finance Department objections, consortium arrangements, eligibility conditions, procurement procedures and the conduct of the concerned officials.
6. The Government should further determine whether the findings of the committee were placed before the competent authority and whether the subsequent procurement decisions were taken after considering those findings.

7. The Government should not permit any administrative review or committee proceeding to remain merely formal or inconclusive where the issues concern substantial public expenditure and the integrity of public procurement.

XV. JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS AND THE NEED TO EXAMINE SUBSEQUENT EVENTS:

1. The procurement history has been the subject matter of several proceedings before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka of Karnataka, including W.P. No. 27474/2025, W.P. Nos. 1749/2023 and 7629/2023, W.P. Nos. 8524/2026, 8667/2026, 8670/2026 and 8672/2026, W.P. No. 8976/2026 and W.P. No. 31195/2026 and connected matters.

2. The judgment dated 02.06.2026 in W.P. Nos. 1749/2023 and 7629/2023 concerned earlier BSWML procurement proceedings and the petitions were dismissed as infructuous.

3. The judgment dated 01.04.2026 in W.P. Nos. 8524/2026, 8667/2026, 8670/2026 and 8672/2026 dealt with challenges relating to orders of the appellate authority under the KTPP Act and the eligibility of successful bidders. The Court set aside the appellate orders in the circumstances recorded therein and permitted the tendering authority to proceed further in accordance with law.

4. The judgment dated 16.10.2026 in W.P. No. 8976/2026 concerned challenges to the evaluation and eligibility of bidders in Packages 5, 14 and 23 under the 30.07.2025 tender. The writ petition was dismissed in view of the material placed before the Court and the failure to establish the alleged violations.

5. The judgment dated 05.10.2026 in W.P. No. 31195/2026 and connected matters concerned subsequent tender notifications and the circumstances surrounding the earlier Letters of Acceptance and fresh tender proceedings.

6. The foundation respectfully acknowledges all the above judicial proceedings and does not seek administrative reconsideration of matters finally adjudicated by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka.

7. However, the existence of earlier judicial proceedings does not dispense with the Government's statutory responsibility to examine new facts, subsequent administrative decisions, financial implications, Government committee reports, alleged non-compliance with Finance Department objections and the applicability of Election Commission instructions to subsequent tender proceedings, to the extent such matters have not been conclusively adjudicated.

8. The Government is therefore requested to conduct the proposed review strictly within its lawful jurisdiction, without interfering with binding judicial directions or reopening issues already decided by the competent Court.

XVI. MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT – APPLICABLE LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PRINCIPLES:

1. The Model Code of Conduct is intended to ensure free and fair elections and prevent misuse of official machinery or public resources for electoral advantage.

2. The Election Commission of India has clarified that the Code comes into force upon announcement of the election schedule and remains operative until completion of the election process. Its instructions regulate new works, fresh sanctions, award of contracts and the continuation or finalisation of procurement proceedings during the election period.

3. The relevant Election Commission instructions distinguish between new tenders, tenders already floated and tenders that had already been evaluated and awarded before commencement of the Model Code of Conduct.

4. The applicable instructions ordinarily permit evaluation of non-global tenders already floated but restrict their finalisation without prior approval of the Commission. New tenders not already floated ordinarily require prior approval. The

Commission's instructions also provide specific conditions for continuation of certain projects where all necessary sanctions, funding, tender award and contractual obligations were completed before commencement of the Code.

5. Accordingly, the Government should not treat every action during the Model Code of Conduct as automatically unlawful. Instead, each identified tender and work order must be examined against its actual procedural status on 22.09.2026, the date of commencement of the Code, and the specific instructions issued by the Election Commission.

6. The investigation should determine whether the relevant tenders had been validly floated before the Code commenced, whether technical evaluation and financial-bid opening were permitted, whether final acceptance or award took place during the restricted period and whether prior approval of the Election Commission was obtained wherever required.

7. The Government should obtain the original Election Commission communication concerning the Karnataka Legislative Council elections, the instructions circulated by the Chief Electoral Officer, Karnataka, and all approvals or permissions obtained by BSWML.

8. If any official is found to have knowingly proceeded contrary to applicable election instructions, the matter should be referred to the competent election authority and appropriate administrative or other legal proceedings should be initiated in accordance with law.

XVII. ENVIRONMENTAL AND PUBLIC-HEALTH OBLIGATIONS:

1. The procurement concerns municipal solid-waste collection and transportation, which is an essential public service directly connected with sanitation, public health, environmental protection and the constitutional right to a clean and healthy environment.

2. The Government must ensure that the contractual arrangements are consistent with the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016, the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, applicable pollution-control requirements and directions issued by the National Green Tribunal.

3. The proceedings in O.A. No. 606/2018 concerning the State of Karnataka and O.A. No. 608/2022 concerning the Chikkanagamangala waste-processing facility are relevant to the broader obligations of public authorities in relation to waste generation, collection, transportation, segregation, processing and scientific disposal.

4. The Government should examine whether the tender conditions and actual contractual obligations provide adequate mechanisms for GPS-based vehicle monitoring, weighbridge integration, segregation at source, transportation to authorised processing facilities, scientific disposal, prevention of illegal dumping, leachate management and verifiable performance-based payments.

5. The Government should also determine whether the procurement structure and package arrangements are consistent with the integrated solid-waste-management framework directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P. No. 27474/2025.

6. The objective of public procurement must be the effective delivery of municipal services and environmental protection, rather than merely the execution of high-value contracts.

XVIII. LEGAL POSITION AND JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS GOVERNING PUBLIC PROCUREMENT:

1. The principles governing public procurement are firmly established by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Public authorities are required to act fairly, reasonably, transparently and without arbitrariness when inviting tenders, evaluating bids and awarding public contracts.

2. In ***Ramana Dayaram Shetty v. International Airport Authority of India*, (1979) 3 SCC 489,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that State action in contractual matters is subject to Article 14 of the Constitution and must satisfy the requirements of fairness, equality and non-arbitrariness.

3. In ***Tata Cellular v. Union of India*, (1994) 6 SCC 651,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court explained the principles governing judicial review of administrative decisions, particularly in tender matters, and held that the decision-making process must be lawful, reasonable and free from arbitrariness.

4. In ***Jagdish Mandal v. State of Orissa*, (2007) 14 SCC 517,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that judicial review in tender matters is intended to prevent arbitrariness, irrationality, unreasonableness, bias and mala fides, particularly where the decision-making process affects public interest.

5. In ***Michigan Rubber (India) Ltd. v. State of Karnataka*, (2012) 8 SCC 216,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated that tender conditions and procurement decisions must satisfy the constitutional requirements of fairness, reasonableness and non-arbitrariness.

6. In ***Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Nagpur Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.*, (2016) 16 SCC 818,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court recognised the importance of respecting the tendering authority's interpretation of its own tender conditions, subject to the absence of perversity, arbitrariness or mala fides.

7. In ***Uflex Ltd. v. Government of Tamil Nadu*, (2022) 1 SCC 165,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated the limited scope of judicial interference in tender matters and the necessity of substantiating allegations of arbitrariness or improper conduct with relevant material.

8. In ***Centre for Public Interest Litigation v. Union of India*, (2012) 3 SCC 1,** concerning allocation of natural resources, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasised

transparency, fairness and the public-interest dimension of governmental allocation decisions.

9. The above judgments are relied upon to emphasise that public procurement must be supported by objective criteria, recorded reasons, transparent evaluation and protection of the public exchequer. They also make clear that allegations must be established by relevant evidence and that administrative and judicial intervention must remain within the applicable legal framework.

XIX. PRESERVATION OF ORIGINAL RECORDS AND ELECTRONIC EVIDENCE:

1. The foundation submits that the preservation of original procurement records is essential to ensure an independent and credible investigation.

2. The Government should immediately direct BSWML to preserve the complete physical and electronic records relating to the original 30.07.2025 tender and all subsequent tender proceedings, including the original Request for Proposal, every addendum and corrigendum, internal approvals, Finance Department objections, committee reports, technical studies, estimated cost calculations, tender scrutiny proceedings, bid-opening records, technical evaluation reports, financial comparative statements, consortium documents, Letters of Acceptance, work orders, agreements, correspondence with bidders and electronic communications.

3. The Government should also ensure preservation of the Karnataka Public Procurement Portal audit trail, original publication timestamps, bid-submission records, document-version histories, electronic approvals, user-access logs, file movement records and relevant official email communications.

4. The concerned authorities should be instructed not to alter, destroy, overwrite or otherwise interfere with any original procurement record during the pendency of the proposed investigation.

5. Where any relevant record is maintained electronically, the investigating authority should secure it in a manner that preserves its authenticity, integrity and admissibility in accordance with applicable law.

XX. CONSTITUTION OF AN INDEPENDENT HIGH-LEVEL INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE:

1. Considering the magnitude of the alleged financial implications, the number of procurement proceedings, the involvement of several Government departments and the existence of earlier judicial proceedings, the foundation respectfully requests the constitution of an independent high-level committee under the supervision of the Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka.

2. The committee should comprise senior officers from the Finance Department, Urban Development Department, Law Department and other relevant departments, together with independent procurement, financial, technical and environmental experts.

3. The committee should not be controlled by officers who were directly involved in the preparation, evaluation, approval or implementation of the tender under examination, in order to avoid any conflict of interest or apprehension of institutional bias.

4. The committee should conduct an independent examination of the complete procurement history, Finance Department objections, Government committee reports, package-wise estimates, bid evaluation, accepted rates, consortium eligibility, Letters of Acceptance, work orders, subsequent tender notifications and alleged Model Code of Conduct violations.

5. The committee should submit a detailed report identifying the applicable legal provisions, relevant documents, specific procedural deficiencies, financial implications, individual administrative responsibilities and corrective action required.

6. Where the examination discloses prima facie evidence of criminal offences or corruption, the relevant records should be referred to the competent investigating agency rather than being confined to an internal administrative inquiry.

XXI. PRAYER AND RELIEFS SOUGHT:

In view of the facts, circumstances, statutory provisions, judicial pronouncements and public-interest considerations stated above, the foundation most respectfully requests the Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka, to exercise the powers and authority available under the Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements Act, 1999, applicable Government financial rules and other relevant laws and issue appropriate directions for the following:

1. Take this representation on record as a comprehensive complaint seeking independent investigation into the alleged financial irregularities, procurement violations, possible collusion, favouritism, abuse of official position and alleged violations of the Model Code of Conduct in connection with BSWML Tender Notification No. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/08/2025-26 dated 30.07.2025 and subsequent tender proceedings.

2. Exercise the statutory powers under Sections 15, 17 and 18 of the KTPP Act, 1999, and direct BSWML and the concerned authorities to furnish the complete original procurement records, financial estimates, tender documents, comparative statements, evaluation reports, approvals, committee proceedings and relevant electronic records.

3. Constitute an independent high-level committee under the supervision of the Chief Secretary or the Additional Chief Secretary, Urban Development Department, with representation from the Finance Department, Law Department, procurement experts, financial auditors, technical experts and environmental specialists, ensuring that officers directly involved in the disputed procurement do not control the investigation.

4. Conduct an independent financial and technical audit to verify the alleged 14% excess over estimated tender values and the alleged aggregate financial implication of approximately ₹350 crore, establishing the original estimates, revised estimates, quoted rates, accepted rates, actual contractual commitments, projected expenditure and amounts already paid.

5. Obtain and examine all objections, observations and recommendations of the Finance Department, including the concerns relating to consortium formation, work-experience requirements, financial capacity, qualifications of lead consortium members, alteration of estimates and the reported failure to place the matter before the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the concerned department.

6. Obtain and examine the complete Government Order, terms of reference, minutes, reports, findings and recommendations of the committee reportedly headed by Mr. Anjum Parvez, Senior IAS Officer, and determine whether its findings were properly considered and implemented before further procurement decisions were taken.

7. Obtain and examine the Government Order dated 04.06.2026 and all proceedings of the sub-committee reportedly constituted to review tenders awarded by BSWML, as referred to in the judgment dated 05.10.2026 in W.P. No. 31195/2026 and connected matters.

8. Conduct a clause-by-clause examination of every addendum, corrigendum, clarification and amendment issued in connection with the original 30.07.2025 tender, including the competent authority responsible for its issuance, the recorded reasons, publication through the prescribed portal and compliance with the applicable tender rules.

9. Examine whether the eligibility conditions, consortium arrangements, experience requirements, turnover criteria, financial capacity requirements and technical qualifications were altered, relaxed or interpreted in a manner that conferred an undue advantage upon any particular bidder or consortium.

10. Examine the technical and financial evaluation proceedings, including the constitution and functioning of the Tender Scrutiny Committee, comparative statements, disqualification decisions, financial bids, accepted rates, Letters of Acceptance and work orders, and establish whether the tender conditions were uniformly applied to all participating bidders.

11. Examine the roles and responsibilities of Mr. Chandrashekar, Deputy General Manager-1, BSWML, Mr. S.V. Rajesh, Chief General Manager, BSWML, and Mr. Karee Gowda, Chief Executive Officer, BSWML, with reference to their respective official duties, file notings, recommendations, approvals, communications and decisions concerning the procurement process.

12. Examine the participation and eligibility of the contractors and entities identified in this representation, including their consortium arrangements, financial credentials, technical qualifications and relevant relationships, and determine whether any evidence establishes improper coordination, bid manipulation, collusion or preferential treatment.

13. Examine the circumstances surrounding the issuance of work orders in Packages 8, 11, 12, 13 and 15, identified with the names of Mr. Narase Gowda, Mr. K.N. Soundiran, Mr. Cheluvaraju, Mr. Ganesh Shankar and Mr. Manjunath respectively, and determine whether the issuance and implementation of such work orders complied with the applicable Model Code of Conduct instructions.

14. Obtain the complete records concerning tender notifications dated 19.09.2026, bearing Nos. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/14/2025-26, 15/2025-26, 16/2025-26, 17/2025-26, 20/2025-26 and 21/2025-26, and examine the technical evaluation, financial-bid opening and finalisation proceedings undertaken during the Model Code of Conduct.

15. Examine tender notifications dated 23.09.2026, bearing Nos. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/22/2025-26, 23/2025-26, 24/2025-26 and 25/2025-26, and

establish whether the issuance of fresh tenders during the election period was supported by the requisite prior approval of the competent election authority.

16. Examine tender notifications dated 08.10.2026, bearing Nos. DGM-1/BSWML/TEND/26/2025-26, 27/2025-26 and 28/2025-26, and determine whether their issuance and subsequent processing complied with the Election Commission's instructions and applicable procurement laws.

17. Obtain the relevant Election Commission of India instructions, communications of the Chief Electoral Officer, Karnataka, permissions, approvals and correspondence concerning BSWML's procurement activities during the Model Code of Conduct period from 22.09.2026 to 31.10.2026.

18. Examine the circumstances surrounding the Letters of Acceptance dated 04.09.2026 and the subsequent issuance of fresh tender notifications dated 19.09.2026, including the status of bid validity, contractual acceptance, financial commitments, approval of the competent authority and reasons for the subsequent retendering.

19. Verify compliance with the directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P. No. 27474/2025 concerning the Nodal Oversight and Implementation Committee, integrated digital platform, GIS-based mapping, GPS monitoring, CCTV surveillance, standard operating procedures, public grievance redressal and periodic compliance reporting.

20. Examine the environmental and operational obligations under the Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016, the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and relevant National Green Tribunal proceedings and ensure that the contractual arrangements provide for scientific waste collection, segregation, transportation, processing, disposal and performance-based payments.

21. Direct BSWML to preserve all original physical and electronic records, including portal audit trails, financial bids, comparative statements, committee proceedings,

internal communications, approval records, Letters of Acceptance and work orders, and ensure that no relevant record is altered, destroyed or withheld during the investigation.

22. Where prima facie evidence establishes corruption, criminal conspiracy, abuse of official position, manipulation of procurement proceedings, illegal financial benefit or other cognisable offences, refer the matter to the competent anti-corruption, vigilance, police or other statutory investigating agency for registration and investigation in accordance with law.

23. Where any material defect, statutory violation or procedural illegality is established in relation to a tender that has not resulted in a concluded contract, direct the competent authority to take appropriate action, including withdrawal, cancellation, modification or fresh tendering, as legally warranted.

24. In respect of packages where contracts have already been concluded, examine the matter separately in accordance with the applicable contract, procurement law, principles of natural justice and accrued contractual rights, and take such corrective action as is legally permissible.

25. Pending completion of the independent examination, consider maintaining the status quo in respect of further irreversible procurement actions in affected packages where no concluded contractual rights have arisen, to the extent legally permissible, without disrupting essential municipal sanitation, waste collection and transportation services or valid subsisting contractual obligations.

26. If violations of the Model Code of Conduct are established, forward the relevant findings and supporting records to the Chief Electoral Officer, Karnataka, and the Election Commission of India for appropriate action within their respective jurisdictions.

27. Direct the competent authorities to identify the officers responsible for any established procedural, statutory, financial or administrative violations and

initiate appropriate disciplinary, recovery or other proceedings in accordance with law.

XXII. RESERVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND OTHER LEGAL REMEDIES:

1. The **Citizen Rights Foundation,** respectfully submits that this representation is made bona fide and in the larger public interest with the object of protecting public funds, ensuring transparency in public procurement, maintaining accountability in Government companies and securing effective municipal solid-waste-management services for the citizens of Bengaluru.

2. The allegations concerning the officers, contractors, consortium members and other persons identified herein are submitted for independent investigation and verification. No allegation should be treated as an established finding of guilt, corruption, collusion, criminal conspiracy or misconduct unless supported by admissible evidence and determined by the competent authority in accordance with law.

3. The foundation acknowledges the judgments and orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka of Karnataka in the above-mentioned proceedings and does not seek to reopen, contradict or administratively reverse any judicial determination. The present representation is confined to requesting examination of subsequent events, financial implications, Government committee proceedings, Finance Department objections, procurement records, tender amendments, alleged deviations from prescribed online procedures and compliance with the Model Code of Conduct, to the extent such matters fall within the lawful jurisdiction of the State Government.

4. The foundation further submits that public procurement involving substantial expenditure of taxpayers' money must be supported by transparent procedures, objectively justified estimates, fair competition, proper financial scrutiny and compliance with statutory requirements. Any failure to examine credible documentary material concerning such procurement would undermine public

CITIZEN RIGHTS FOUNDATION
Stands for Social Justice...
Reg-No-187/2019-2020
R/O No.158, B.M. Layout, Venkateshpuram, Bengaluru - 560 045.
E-mail : citizenrightsblr@gmail.com, citizenrightsind@yahoo.com Mobile No : +91 9481147777

confidence in the administrative system and the integrity of Government institutions.

5. The foundation also reserves the right to place this representation, the supporting documents and the response of the Government before the competent judicial forum, wherever legally permissible and necessary. The Government of Karnataka is therefore respectfully requested to treat this matter with the seriousness it deserves, order an independent and impartial investigation and take appropriate corrective, administrative, financial and legal action wherever violations are established.

Thanking you

Yours faithfully,

(K.A. PAUL)
CHAIRMAN
For, CITIZEN RIGHTS FOUNDATION

Place: Bengaluru.
Date : 12.11.2026