



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 2911 OF 2026 (LA-BDA)

BETWEEN:

SMT. JAYALAKSHMI
W/O. LATE N.NARASIMHAMURTHY
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT NO.28/26, 9TH CROSS,
PARIMALA NAGAR,
BENGALURU-560 096

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. NANDINI B., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE - 560001
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY
2. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560020,
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
3. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560020

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ADITYA DIWAKAR, ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
FOR RESPONDENT NO.1;

Digitally signed
by
HEMALATHA J
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



SRI. VENUGOPALA GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT NOS.2 AND 3)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO ISSUE A FORMAL DE-NOTIFICATION OR CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE BY CONSIDERING THE REPRESENTATION DATED 19.12.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-A IN RESPECT OF THE SCHEDULE PROPERTY WITH IN A TIME BOUND STIPULATED PERIOD OF 30 DAYS.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondents to issue a formal de-notification or clearance certificate by considering her representation dated 19.12.2025.

2. (i) The petitioner contends that she is the owner of site No.28/26 situate on Kanteerava Studio Road, Parimala Nagara, Bengaluru - 560096, measuring 50 feet x 30 feet. She claims that her husband purchased the aforesaid site in terms of a sale deed dated 08.07.1991. She contends that respondent No.3 issued a preliminary notification dated 26.07.2013 to acquire various properties including the property of the petitioner for a grade separator at chainage 60.850 kilometres



at Sri. Kanteerava Studio between Magadi Road Junction and Tumkur road Junction (NH-4) in Nandini Layout, Bengaluru. Following this, a notice dated 23.09.2013 was issued intimating the petitioner about the proposed acquisition. Thereafter, award proceedings were initiated by issuance of a notice dated 31.03.2015.

(ii) The petitioner claims that she submitted a representation dated 19.01.2023 to respondent No.3 seeking clarification whether her property is required for the project, as there was ambiguity regarding the same. As there was no reply, she preferred an appeal under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005. However, no information was furnished even by the appellate authority. She claims that she tried all possible ways to secure the information, which were of no avail. She claims that she came across an article in a newspaper published on 16.12.2025, where it was stated that the respondent No.2 had reduced the number of properties required for the grade separator from chainage 60 kms. to 43 kms. She therefore submitted a representation on 19.12.2025 seeking information whether her property is required for the



proposed project and also sought dropping of the acquisition in respect of her property, if it is not required. The petitioner claims that the said representation is not considered and therefore the petitioner is before this Court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in view of the newspaper article, the respondents are bound to clarify whether the property of the petitioner is required for the project by considering her representation dated 19.12.2025.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent Nos.2 and 3 submitted that though the petitioner had submitted a representation, the same was as bald as it could be, as there is no mention as to the survey number within which the site claimed by the petitioner was situate. He therefore contends that the respondent Nos.2 and 3 were at a handicap to inform the petitioner whether her property was required for the project or not. He submits that if a representation is filed by the petitioner with full particulars of the survey number and other necessary particulars, respondent Nos.2 and 3 will take



necessary steps to inform the petitioner whether her property is required for the project or not.

5. The learned Additional Government Advocate submitted that if the respondent Nos.2 and 3 give information and also recommend for de-notification of the land belonging to the petitioner, respondent No.1 will take necessary steps in that regard.

6. In view of the aforesaid submission, this writ petition is ***disposed of*** directing the petitioner to submit a fresh representation furnishing the full particulars of the survey number within which her property is situate. The said representation shall be filed within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. The respondent No.2 shall consider the representation and pass appropriate orders within a period of two months thereafter.

**Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE**