



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

WRIT PETITION NO.28264 OF 2025 (LA-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

MR. PANDURANGA SRINIVASA REDDY
S/O SRINIVASA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.21, SINDHURAM,
A.Y.R. ROAD, 1ST CROSS,
SHETTIHALLI, JALAHALLI EAST,
BENGALURU-560051.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI AJAY J. NANDALIKE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.
2. KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL AREAS
DEVELOPMENT BOARD (KIADB),
#14/3, II FLOOR, R.P. BUILDING,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE
OFFICER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER.
3. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL AREAS
DEVELOPMENT BOARD, (K-RIDE),
I FLOOR, R.P. BUILDING,

Digitally signed by
MAHALAKSHMI B M
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI RAJKUMAR M., ADVOCATE FOR R-1;
SRI H.L. PRADEEP KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R-2 & R-3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 01/03/2024 PASSED BY THE PRICE FIXATION COMMITTEE (PRODUCED IN ANNEXURE-L); DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NO.3 TO FIX THE RATE OF COMPENSATION FOR ACQUISITION OF 1078.04 SQ. MTRS OF LAND OF THE PETITIONER AS PER THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 16/05/2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-Y AND ACCORDINGLY DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NO.3 TO PAY THE BALANCE AMOUNT AFTER FRESH DETERMINATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR HEARING - INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has approached this Court calling in question the action of the respondent in relation to the fixation of compensation for the land acquired under the provisions of Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Act, 1966 ('KIAD Act' for short), and is seeking a direction for reconsideration of the objection raised by the petitioner with respect to the price fixation committee.



Brief facts:

2. The petitioner claims to be the owner of the land which has been acquired for the purpose of Bangaluru Su-urban Railway Project. Pursuant to the preliminary and final notifications issued under KIAD Act, meeting of the price fixation committee was held on 01.03.2024 for fixation of compensation in respect of the land situated at Shetihalli and Maydarahalli Villages, which included the land of the petitioner as well as several other landowners.

3. In the said meeting, the compensation was fixed uniformly for the lands covered under the acquisition. Aggrieved by the rate so fixed, the petitioner submitted representation contending that the compensation does not reflect the prevailing market value and according to him, his land deserved higher valuation, as the grievance remained unresolved, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

Contention of the petitioner:

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the compensation fixed on 01.03.2024 is inadequate and



arbitrary. The petitioner's objections highlighting parity, location of land and guideline value was not specifically considered and the petitioner seeks an opportunity for reconsideration of his objections by the competent authority in accordance with law.

Contention of the respondent:

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the price fixation carried out on 01.03.2024 was duly constituted by a price fixation committee and was applicable to several landowners and not confined to the petitioner alone. The fixation was done in accordance with the statutory framework and prevailing guideline values.

6. Having considered the submission of the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the material on record, this Court notes that the price fixation impugned in the present petition was undertaken in respect of multiple landowners, including the petitioner and was not confined exclusively to the petitioner's land. The grievance of the



petitioner essentially relates to non-consideration of his objections regarding valuation.

7. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the petitioner's claim for enhancement or parity, this Court is of the view that it would be appropriate to permit the petitioner to place an objection afresh before the competent authority. At the same time, in order to maintain certainty in acquisition proceedings, it is necessary to clarify that the price fixed by the fixation committee on 01.03.2024 shall not be disturbed.

8. The Special Land Acquisition Officer shall examine whether the objections raised by the petitioner are capable of consideration in accordance with law and to pass appropriate orders thereafter. Accordingly, this Court pass the following:

ORDER

- i. The writ petition is ***disposed of***.
- ii. The petitioner is at liberty to submit fresh representation/objections before the Special Land



Acquisition Officer within two weeks from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.

- iii. Upon such representation being submitted, Special Land Acquisition Officer shall examine and consider whether the objections raised by the petitioner are capable of consideration in accordance with law and thereafter pass appropriate orders after affording the opportunity to the petitioner.
- iv. It is clarified that the price fixed by the price fixation committee in its meeting dated 01.03.2024 shall not be disturbed by virtue of this order.
- v. Contentions of the parties are kept open.

Pending IAs, if any, do not survive for consideration.

Sd/-

JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA