



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 17932 OF 2026 (BDA)

BETWEEN:

SMT. RAJANI K.P.
W/O RAJEEV KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
R/AT NO.25, SWARAM
MALLASANDRA, T.DASARAHALLI
BENGALURU - 560 057.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SRINIVAS V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BENGALURU - 560 020.

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY IT'S
SECRETARY TO FOREST ECOLOGY
AND ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S.BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI., ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SMT. POOJA M. KOORSE, HCGP FOR R2)

Digitally signed
by
HEMALATHA J
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE R1 AND R2 TO SORT OUT THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEM AND PERMIT THE PETITIONER TO ENJOY THE PROPERTY BY GETTING THE PLAN SANCTIONED 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 R. NATARAJ

ORAL ORDER

Petitioner has sought for a direction to respondent Nos.1 and 2 to sort out differences between them and permit her to enjoy the property allotted to her or to direct respondent No.1 to allot an alternate site of the same dimension in the same area.

2. Petitioner claims that she was allotted a site by respondent No.1, bearing No.1486/12, followed by the execution of a sale deed dated 15.04.2005. She claims that at the time of allotment of the site, the Department of



Forest had laid a compound on the southern side of the layout demarcating the forest boundary. She contends that during a recent inspection, she was shocked to see that the Forest Department had constructed a new compound extending beyond the earlier demarcated boundary and encroached upon several sites allotted by the BDA including her site bearing No.1486/12. She contends that she submitted a representation dated 13.04.2026 before respondent No.2 seeking redressal of her grievance and to restore the site by getting the encroachment removed or allot an alternate site in the same layout without additional charges. She contends that similarly placed allottees had approached this Court in W.P.No.35541/2024 and this Court had granted interim order to maintain *status quo*. She therefore prays that a direction be issued to the respondents to work out their differences or a direction to respondent No.1 to allot an alternate site in the same layout at no extra cost.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterated above contentions and submitted that the petitioner is entitled to peacefully possess the site lawfully allotted to her and if there are any differences between the respondents they have to work out their differences amicably. He contends that since the title of the petitioner is threatened, the respondent No.1 is liable to be directed to allot an alternate site in the same area.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 however contends that the representation of the petitioner would be considered and suitable orders would be passed in accordance with law.

5. In view of the above, this writ petition is ***disposed of*** directing respondent No.1 to consider the grievance of the petitioner as per her representation dated 13.04.2026 and pass appropriate orders. In case, if the petitioner is entitled for an alternate site, the respondent No.1 shall allot an alternate site in the same layout



preferably or in any other nearby layout, in accordance with law. It is also needless to mention that after allotment of an alternate site, the petitioner shall not be called upon to pay any extra cost including registration fee, stamp duty, etc. The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE

DL
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 22