



NC: 2026:KHC:45588-DB
WP No. 14680 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010328602026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN

WRIT PETITION NO. 14680 OF 2026 (LA-BDA)

BETWEEN:

M/S PRAMOD MODERN EDUCATION TRUST (REGD)
NO.33, CHALLAKERE, K.R. PURAM HOBLI,
BANASAWADI POST, BANGALORE 560 043.
REPTD. BY ITS
MANAGING TRUSTEE-CUM-SECRETARY-
V. VENKATARAMA REDDY.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K.C.SHANTA KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT M. S. BUILDINGS,
BENGALURU – 560 001.
REPTD. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
2. THE COMMISSIONER,
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD, KUMARAKRUPA WEST,
BENGALURU-560 020.
3. THE SPECIAL ADDITIONAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER,
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARAKRUPA WEST EXTENSION,
BENGALURU 560 020.

Digitally
signed by
MALAK N
Location:
High Court
of Karnataka



NC: 2026:KHC:45588-DB
WP No. 14680 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010328602026

4. JUSTICE K.N. KESHAVANARAYANA COMMITTEE
(CONSTITUTED BY THE HON'BLE
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA IN
W.P.NO.51929/2014)
KRISHI BHAVAN, 4TH FLOOR,
HUDSON CIRCLE, BENGALURU-560 002,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.S.H.RAGHAVENDRA, AGA FOR R1;
SRI.MURALI.N, ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3;
V.C.O DATED 05.05.2026 NOTICE TO R4 IS D/W)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO I) ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED REPORT OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT BEARING KNKC NO.213/2022 (CHALLAKERE) DATED 15/10/2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-K AND II) PASS AN ORDER DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS-1 TO 3 TO DELETE/WITHDRAW THE PETITIONERS LAND FROM ACQUISITION PROCEEDINGS SINCE THE SCHEDULE LAND BELONG TO THE PETITIONER AND IN VIEW OF HAVING ESTABLISHED EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION ON IT AND BY TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION OF THE JUDGEMENT / ORDER PASSED BY THE APEX COURT IN BANDU RAMASWAMY AND OTHERS VS BDA, REPORTED IN 2010(7)SCC PAGE-129 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 D K SINGH
AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN



CNR: KAHC010328602026

**NC: 2026:KHC:45588-DB
WP No. 14680 of 2026**

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN)

The instant Petition seeks to challenge the report of the 4th respondent bearing KNKC No.213/2022 (Challakere) dated 15.10.2025 arising out of W.P.No.21158/2014 whereby the representation of the petitioner came to be rejected. The petitioner further seeks to direct the respondent Nos.1 to 3 to delete/withdraw the petitioner's land from acquisition proceedings.

2. The case of the petitioner/Trust is that the land bearing Sy.No.127/2, measuring 17 guntas, though included in the acquisition proceedings for formation of Arkavathi Layout, was being used for an educational purpose, and therefore, deserved to be deleted from the acquisition. The Trust contended that the land had been purchased by Sri V. Venkatarama Reddy and that the Trust was running an educational institution, namely, 'Lovely Bishop School' and had invested substantial



CNR: KAHC010328602026

amounts towards construction of buildings and development of the institution. It was further contended that, having regard to the judgment of the Division Bench, the landowners were entitled to seek deletion of lands which fell within the parameters laid down therein, particularly where the land was being utilised for an educational institution. The Trust accordingly submitted that its representations seeking deletion of the land from acquisition ought to have been considered favourably.

3. The Trust also relied upon the educational permissions and documents produced before the Committee to contend that the land was being used for running the school and allied educational activities. It was urged that the surrounding lands had either been deleted from acquisition or had already been acquired and that the land in question could not conveniently be treated differently. The Trust further maintained that its claim was *bona fide* and that the fact that the land was represented by one of its Trustees, who was also the purchaser of the



CNR: KAHC010328602026

property, was sufficient to maintain the request for deletion. The Trust, therefore, sought reconsideration of the acquisition proceedings and deletion of the subject land, particularly in view of the long-standing representations made by it and the educational purpose for which, according to it, the land was intended to be used.

4. The Bangalore Development Authority ('BDA') opposed the request for deletion primarily on the ground that the petitioner/Trust had no *locus standi* to seek deletion of the land from the acquisition proceedings. According to the BDA, the revenue records and acquisition documents showed *Sri. Venkatarama Reddy* as the *khatedar/owner* of the land and not the Trust. The BDA pointed out that the land had been purchased by Sri.Venkatarama Reddy under a registered sale deed dated 07.11.2001, whereas the Trust had been registered only subsequently and there was no material demonstrating that the purchaser had dedicated or



CNR: KAHC010328602026

transferred the property in favour of the Trust. It was, therefore, contended that the Trust could not claim the benefit available to an owner of the notified land. The BDA also relied upon the fact that an award had already been passed on 06.10.2004 and physical possession had been taken on 08.11.2004.

5. The BDA further contended that, as on the date of the Preliminary Notification, the land was not being used for the educational institution as claimed by the Trust. According to the inspection and mahazar reports, the land was lying vacant and only a very small shed was noticed subsequently, which did not establish the existence of a functioning educational institution on the notified land. The BDA also relied upon the photographs and satellite imagery placed before the Committee, which indicated that the 'Lovely Bishop School' was situated at a different location and not on the subject land. It was thus argued that the land did not satisfy the parameters prescribed by the Division Bench for deletion from



CNR: KAHC010328602026

acquisition. The BDA consequently sought rejection of the Trust's request for deletion.

6. Upon consideration of the rival contentions and the material available on record, the Committee found that the petitioner/Trust had failed to establish that it was the owner or khatedar of the land in question. The Committee noticed that the revenue records continued to reflect the name of Sri V. Venkatarama Reddy and that the registered sale deed dated 07.11.2001 stood in his name. There was no satisfactory material to demonstrate that, after purchasing the land, Sri.V.Venkatarama Reddy had dedicated or transferred the property in favour of the Trust. The mere fact that he subsequently represented the Trust as its Managing Trustee was held insufficient to confer *locus standi* upon the Trust to seek deletion of the land from the acquisition proceedings.

7. Even otherwise, the Committee found that the second requirement for deletion was also not satisfied. The material on record, including the mahazar, inspection



CNR: KAHC010328602026

reports, photographs and satellite imagery, did not establish that the subject land was being used for running an educational institution as on the date of the Preliminary Notification. On the contrary, the evidence indicated that the land was substantially vacant and that the 'Lovely Bishop School' was functioning at another location. The Committee also found that the surrounding lands had largely been acquired and developed as part of the layout and that the subject land could be integrated with the adjoining development. Consequently, the Committee concluded that the land did not satisfy the parameters laid down by the Division Bench for deletion and recommended rejection of the representation of the petitioner/Trust.

8. Aggrieved by the said report of Hon'ble Mr.Justice K.N.Keshavanarayana Committee, the petitioner has preferred the present petition seeking to set aside the impugned Report.

9. The petitioner assails the impugned report dated 15.10.2025 primarily on the ground that the fourth



CNR: KAHC010328602026

respondent has erroneously held that the petitioner-Trust has no *locus standi* to seek deletion of the subject land from the acquisition proceedings. According to the petitioner, the land was purchased in the name of Sri V. Venkatarama Reddy, the Managing Trustee, for the purposes of the Trust and the mere fact that the sale deed stood in his individual name could not, by itself, disentitle the Trust from asserting its claim over the property. The petitioner further contends that it has been in possession and enjoyment of the land and has established and been running an educational institution thereon pursuant to the permissions granted by the competent educational authorities. The Committee, it is urged, failed to properly appreciate these circumstances and mechanically concluded that the petitioner had no locus to challenge the acquisition.

10. The petitioner/Trust further challenges the finding that no educational institution was functioning on the subject land as on the date of the Preliminary



CNR: KAHC010328602026

Notification. It is contended that the school was initially commenced in temporary structures and was thereafter developed by putting up permanent constructions and conducting higher classes and other educational activities. The petitioner also submits that the Committee erred in relying upon the mahazar, photographs and satellite images without properly identifying the subject property or considering the permissions and documents produced by the petitioner. It is further contended that the Committee failed to apply the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Bondu Ramaswamy and Others -vs- Bangalore Development Authority and Others*¹ regarding small pockets of land surrounded by acquired or deleted lands. According to the petitioner, when substantial portions of the surrounding lands had been deleted from acquisition and the subject property was being utilised for an educational institution, its continued acquisition was arbitrary and discriminatory. On these grounds, the

¹ (2010) 7 SCC 129.



CNR: KAHC010328602026

petitioner contends that the impugned report suffers from errors of fact and law and is liable to be quashed.

11. The point that arises for consideration in the present appeal is:

Whether the said report of Hon'ble Mr.Justice K.N.Keshavanarayana Committee, suffers from any illegality or infirmity warranting interference by this Court?

12. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned counsel appearing for the respondent and have carefully perused the records of the case. Having regard to the rival submissions and upon consideration of the material on record, we proceed to pass the following order:

On a careful consideration of the material placed on record, this Court is of the view that the report of the Committee dated 15.10.2025 is a reasoned and considered one and does not suffer from any error warranting interference in exercise of the writ jurisdiction.



CNR: KAHC010328602026

The Committee has considered the rival contentions, examined the original acquisition records, the revenue entries, the sale deed, the representations submitted by the petitioner and the material relating to the alleged use of the subject land for educational purposes. The Committee has, in particular, recorded a finding that the subject land stood in the name of Sri.V.Venkatarama Reddy and that there was no sufficient material to establish that the property had been dedicated or transferred in favour of the petitioner/Trust. The conclusion that the petitioner had failed to establish the requisite *locus standi* was therefore reached upon consideration of the relevant material and cannot be characterised as 'arbitrary' or 'perverse'.

13. The Committee has also considered the question, whether the subject land satisfied the parameters for deletion from the acquisition proceedings. The mahazar, inspection reports, photographs and satellite imagery were examined and the Committee found that the



CNR: KAHC010328602026

material did not establish that an educational institution was being run on the subject land as on the date of the Preliminary Notification. It further noticed that the school relied upon by the petitioner was situated at a different location and that the surrounding lands had substantially been acquired and developed as part of the layout. In the circumstances, the Committee concluded that the subject land did not satisfy the parameters for deletion and recommended rejection of the petitioner's representation. The findings are based on the material available on record and disclose due application of mind. In the absence of any perversity, jurisdictional error or violation of principles of natural justice, the well-reasoned report of the Committee does not call for interference by this Court.

14. In view of the foregoing discussion and the findings recorded hereinabove, we are of the considered opinion that the report submitted by the Committee is well reasoned and is based upon a proper appreciation of the material available on record. The Committee has



CNR: KAHC010328602026

considered all the relevant aspects of the matter and has assigned cogent reasons for arriving at its conclusions. We, therefore, find no ground to differ from or interfere with the findings recorded in the said report.

15. Accordingly, we do not find any justifiable reason to interfere with the well-reasoned report of the Committee. The findings recorded therein do not suffer from any perversity, illegality or other infirmity warranting interference by this Court. The challenge to the said report, therefore, cannot be sustained and is liable to be rejected.

The Writ Petition is dismissed.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(H.SHANTHI BHUSHAN)
JUDGE**

KNM
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 13