



CNR: KAHC010251872025

NC: 2026:KHC:42910
WP No. 12290 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G.S. KAMAL

WRIT PETITION NO. 12290 OF 2025 (ULC)

BETWEEN:

1. SHRI. BHARATH K.L.,
S/O LATE LOKANATH,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
GRAND SON OF LATE K.R.SIDDALINGAPPA,
NO.207, LINGAYAT STREET,
KENGARI,
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK,
BENGALURU - 560 060,
AADHAR NO. 5894 0455 9742
MOBILE NO. 988098774.
2. SMT. SHANTHAKUMARI,
W/O LATE SAMUDRAN S,
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
NO.207, LINGAYAT STREET,
KENGARI, BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK,
BENGALURU - 560 060.
AADHAR NO. 9028 4620 1212.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. MANJULA T R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,

Digitally signed
by
ANNAPURNA G
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



CNR: KAHC010251872025

NC: 2026:KHC:42910
WP No. 12290 of 2025

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. THE COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARA PARK,
BENGALURU - 560 020.
3. THE ADDITIONAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER,
BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARA PARK,
BENGALURU - 560 020.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.MANJUNATH RAYAPPA, AGA FOR R1;
SRI.AJAY KUMAR M., ADVOCATE FOR R2 AND R3)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER
NO.ULC(8) 64/85-86 DATED 25.08.1987 IN THE KARNATAKA
GAZETTE NOTIFICATION DATED 08.10.1987 OF ADDL. SPECIAL
DC, URBAN LAND CEILING, BENGALURU VIDE DOCUMENT - 8
AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.G.S. KAMAL



CNR: KAHC010251872025

ORAL ORDER

1. Petitioners claiming to be the descendants of one, K. R. Siddalingappa, who was purportedly the owner of land bearing No.91/1, measuring 02 acres 23 guntas, situated at Valagerehalli, Kengeri Hobli, are before this Court, seeking following reliefs:

"WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a writ in the nature certiorari or any other appropriate writ or direction;

(i) To quash the Order No.ULC (8) 64/85-86 dated 25th August 1987 in the Karnataka Gazette Notification dated October 8, 1987 of Additional Special Deputy Commissioner, Urban Land Ceiling, Bengaluru vide Annexure-J;

(ii) To direct the Respondent-2-Commissioner, Bengaluru Development Authority to give compensation to the Petitioner since the Bengaluru Development Authority has acquired the schedule property of Sy.No.91/1A 2 acres 23 guntas for formation of Jnana Bharathi Badavane vide Annexure-R dated Nil along with interest from the date of acquisition;

(iii) Grant such other relief as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the interest of justice and equity."

2. Admittedly, proceedings under the provisions of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulations) Act, 1976 ('ULCR



Act' for short), were initiated and the grandfather of the petitioners herein had submitted his statement on 30.08.1980 and he had also filed his statement of objections to the further proceedings conducted by the concerned Special Deputy Commissioner. It appears, the land which was taken over under the Provisions of the ULCR Act, was subsequently made over to the Bangalore Development Authority ('BDA' for short), which was earlier known as CITB for the purpose of formation of 'Jnana Bharati layout', as far back as in the year 1987. Now the petitioners, after expiry of more than four decades are before this Court seeking the relief as noted above.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the only grievance that the petitioners have is that they have not been paid compensation either by the respondent-State or by the BDA, for they having acquired/utilised their land. She further submits that if respondents are directed



CNR: KAHC010251872025

NC: 2026:KHC:42910
WP No. 12290 of 2025

to consider the request of petitioners for payment of compensation, the purpose of the petition will be served.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-BDA, on the other hand submits no liability can be fastened on the BDA for payment of compensation inasmuch as when the land was made over to BDA it was the land belonging to the respondent-State and therefore, the petitioners cannot have any claim against the BDA. He submits that, claim, if any, can only survive against the respondent-State which admittedly taken over the land under the Provisions of ULCR Act.

5. Learned Additional Government Advocate for respondent-State submits that the petitioners having approached this Court after the lapse of more than 40 years cannot seek to revive a stale claim. He draws attention of this Court to the communication dated 25.01.1995 issued by the Under Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, in response to the application filed



CNR: KAHC010251872025

by one K. R. Siddalingappa and submits that the request made by said K.R. Siddalingappa was declined inasmuch as the land had been taken over under the ULCR Act and was made over to the BDA. Therefore, he submits that these proceedings were well within the knowledge of said K.R. Siddalingappa, who according to the petitioners was their grandfather. The actions of K.R. Siddalingappa would bind the petitioners and therefore, they are not entitled for seeking any relief and seeks for dismissal of the writ petition.

6. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned Additional Government Advocate for respondent No.1, learned counsel for respondents No. 2 and 3 and perused the records.

7. Petitioners claim to be the grand children of K.R. Siddalingappa, who even according to the records maintained by the respondent-State appears to be the owner in possession of the subject land at relevant point in



CNR: KAHC010251872025

time. There is no dispute that the said land was the subject matter of the proceedings under the Provisions of Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976, and said K.R. Siddalingappa himself had submitted the declaration. There is also no dispute to the fact that the said land has been made over to BDA for the purpose of formation of 'Jnana Bharati layout' which is admittedly formed. The petitioners, therefore, cannot seek to undo what has transpired 40 years ago by filing the writ petition belatedly seeking the reliefs as noted above. Further, the land admittedly has not been acquired by the BDA on its own. Records also indicate that the said land has been handed over by the respondent-State to the BDA. Therefore, as rightly pointed out by the counsel for respondent- BDA, the claim of the petitioners for compensation can only be against the respondent-State, if any and subsisting.

8. In that view of the matter, a limited indulgence is shown in this matter providing opportunity and liberty to



CNR: KAHC010251872025

NC: 2026:KHC:42910
WP No. 12290 of 2025

the petitioners to approach the respondent -State by making a representation for payment of compensation within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

9. Upon making such a representation, respondent-State shall look into the records, genuineness or otherwise of the claim being made by the petitioners being the grandchildren of K.R.Siddalingappa.

10. If the compensation is not paid, the request for payment of compensation be considered strictly in accordance with law. If the compensation is already paid, necessary communication with that regard be made to the petitioners within an outer limit of six months thereafter.

11. With the above observations, writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(M.G.S. KAMAL)
JUDGE