



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 11<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 5538 OF 2026 (KLR-REG)**

**BETWEEN:**

B. CHANDRASHEKAR  
S/O. LATE BASAPPACHAR,  
AGED ABOUT 85 YEARS,  
R/O NAGADENAHALLI VILLAGE,  
KASABA (HOBLI),  
DODDABALLAPURA (TALUK),  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,  
PIN:561 203.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. N.B. NIJALINGAPPA, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

Digitally signed  
by JUANITA  
THEJESWINI  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA  
BY ITS SECRETARY,  
DEPT. OF REVENUE,  
M.S. BUILDING,  
BENGALURU – 560 001.
2. THE TAHASHILDAR,  
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK OFFICE,  
DODDABALLAPURA,  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT  
PIN:561 203.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,  
DODDABALLAPURA SUB DIVISION,  
DODDABALLAPURA,



BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT  
PIN:561 203.

4. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER NO.2  
KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL  
DEVELOPMENT BOARD,  
NO.14/3, 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR,  
MAHARSHI ARVIND BHAVAN,  
C.F.C. BUILDING,  
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,  
BENGALURU 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHAMANTH NAIK, HCGP FOR R1 TO R3;  
SRI. P.V.CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R4)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF  
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO A WRIT OF  
MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3 TO  
REGULARISE AND GRANT THE LAND MEASURING 1 ACRE 20  
GUNTAS OF NAGADENAHALLI VILLAGE IN SY.NO.105 (OLD  
SY.NO.17) AND TO ISSUE SAGUVALI CHIT AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

**ORAL ORDER**

Learned counsel for respondent No.4 - Sri  
P.V.Chandrasekhar submits that in the writ petition the  
petitioner contends that his grandfather late Sri  
Annappachar purchased 6 acres of land in Survey No.17 of



Nagadenahalli Village in a public auction held on 17.05.1937 and his name was entered in the revenue records in terms of MR No.15/1936-37. It is further contented that the petitioner himself purchased the adjacent land measuring 1 acre 20 guntas under registered sale dated 14.04.1967 and therefore the petitioner is the rightful owner of the two pieces of land. However, the prayer in the petition is to issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to regularise the grant made in favour of the petitioner's grandfather and the land purchased by the petitioner. Further, learned counsel for respondent No.4 points out to Annexure-N and submits that pursuant to the acquisition notification issued by the Government of Karnataka seeking to acquire the lands in Nagadenahalli along with the survey numbers that is stated in the petition, the Special Land Acquisition Officer has issued a notice at Annexure-N in terms of Sections 9 and 10 of the Land Acquisition Act. It is pointed out that the award enquiry



notice has been issued to the notified kathedars namely N.S.Nagaraju and N.S.Anjanappa and to the petitioner who is the objector. Therefore, learned counsel submits that there is inconsistency in the statements made in the writ petition, where on the one hand it is contented that the petitioner is the owner of the lands in question, but the prayer is to direct the respondent authorities to regularise the lands in favour of the petitioner. Be that as it may, learned counsel for respondent No.4 submits that if the grievance of the petitioner is that he is entitled to receive compensation in respect of the lands in question since he is the owner of the property, then in terms of the award enquiry notice the petitioner should have appeared before the Special Land Acquisition Officer and should have sought for reference or the petitioner himself could have filed a petition seeking a declaration that he is the owner of the property and is entitled to receive the compensation.



2. Having regard to the facts narrated herein above, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is inconsistency in the stand taken by the petitioner in the writ petition. There was no need for the petitioner to seek such a direction to the respondent authorities to regularise the lands in favour of the petitioner, in the light of the averments made in the petition that the lands belong to the petitioner.

3. Accordingly, the petition stands ***disposed of*** reserving liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent court to redress his grievance.

**Sd/-  
(R DEVDAS)  
JUDGE**

KLY  
CT: JL