



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 13TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

WRIT APPEAL NO. 1613 OF 2026 (LA-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

SMT. DHANALAKSHMI,
W/O R. PRAKASH REDDY,
AGE ABOUT 64 YEARS,
NO 24, 209, 4TH MAIN,
6TH 'A' CROSS,
ANDURANGA NAGAR,
J.P. NAGAR, 7TH PHASE,
BANGALORE - 560 076.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. VIKRAM A HUILGOL, SR. ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. B. RAMESH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
AND INDUSTRIES,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL
AREA DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
REP BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER,
NO 14/3, 2ND FLOOR, R.P. BUILDING,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 001.



3. THE SPECIAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICE - 1,
METRO RAILWAY PROJECT,
KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL AREA
DEVELOPMENT BOARD, (KIADB),
(METRO RAIL WAY PROJECT)
1ST FLOOR, R.P. BUILDING,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
4. THE BENGALURU METRO
RAIL CORPORATION LTD.,
COMPANY INCORPORATED
UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT 1956,
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT
B.M.T.C. COMPLEX, 3RD FLOOR,
KENGAL HANUMANTHAIAH ROAD,
SHANTHI NAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.
5. SRI. ATUL KUMAR,
S/O K.N. BAGARA,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
R/A NO 26/3,
SRINIVASA NIVASA,
2ND FLOOR, 4TH CROSS,
K.V. LAYOUT, JAYANAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 011.
6. SRI. B. PRASANNAIAH,
S/O BRAHMASURIAIAH,
MAJOR IN AGE,
R/A NO 07, 1ST MAIN,
KAS OFFICER COLONY,
J.P. NAGAR, 4TH STAGE,
BENGALURU - 560 078.
7. SRI. K V SRINIVAS REDDY,
S/O VENKATAPPA,
MAJOR IN AGE,



- R/A NO 398, 1ST FLOOR,
6TH BLOCK, 18TH MAIN,
KORAMANGALA,
BENGALURU - 560 095.
8. SRI. H.S. SURESH,
S/O LATE SHIVALINGAIAH,
MAJOR IN AGE,
R/A NO 25, 1ST MAIN,
RAJIV GANDHI NAGAR,
DOLLURU COLONY,
BENGALURU -560 096.
9. SMT. KOMALA,
W/O SATHISH REDDY P.S.R.,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
NO 385 AND 386,
18TH 'E' MAIN ROAD BLOCK,
KORAMANGALA 6TH BLOCK,
BENGALURU - 560 095.
10. SMT. BHARATHI,
W/O GANESH REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
R/A NO.291,
BEHIND GANESH TEMPLE,
JIGINI HOBLI,
HULIMANGALA,
BANGALORE - 560 105.
11. SMT. LAKSHMI,
W/O LOKESH REDDY,
D/O ROJAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
R/A NO 11, 3RD CROSS,
VINAYAKA GREEN LAYOUT,
KANNUR,
BANGALORE - 562 149.
12. SMT. KOKILA,
W/O NAGESH REDDY,
D/O ROJAMMA,



AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/A NO 03, NEAR ANJENAYA TEMPLE,
SUBRAMANI LAYOUT,
HULIMANGALA,
JIGINI HOBLI,
BANGALORE - 560 105.

13. SMT. K. HEMA,
W/O K SADASHIVA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R/A NO 59-60, AIKYA RESIDENCY
10TH CROSS, VINAYAKA LAYOUT,
HULIMANGALA,
BANGALORE - 560 056.

ALSO AT NO 644,
K.R. GARDEN,
8TH BLOCK,
11TH CROSS ROAD,
KORAMANGALA,
BENGALURU - 560 095.

14. SMT MANJULA.
D/O LATE NANJAPPA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS
R/A NO 03, MSR MEADOWS,
K NO 5/6, DEVARACHIKKANAHALLI,
BANNERGHATTA ROAD,
BANGALORE - 560 076.

15. SRI. R. MANJUNATHA REDDY,
S/O RAMA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
R/A 267, 7TH CROSS,
27TH MAIN, 1ST SECTOR,
HSR LAYOUT,
BENGALURU - 560 102.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. S.H. RAGHAVENDRA, AGA FOR R1,
SRI. UDAYA HOLLA SR. ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. A . CHANRACHUD, ADVOCATE FOR C/R5 AND R6)



THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, 1961, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 11.02.2026 PASSED IN WP NO.29527/2025 BY LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE BY ALLOWING THE WRIT PETITION AS PRAYED FOR AND ETC.,

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF)

The unsuccessful petitioners in W.P.No.29527/2025 are before us in this intra Court appeal, assailing the order dated 11.02.2026 passed by the Writ Court.

2. Under the impugned order, the Writ Court dismissed the petition as devoid of merits, declined to interfere with the order dated 12.09.2025 passed by the Special Land Acquisition Officer¹ - respondent No.3.

¹ "SLAO for short"



Further, declined to issue mandamus sought against respondent No.3 not to disburse the compensation.

3. Shorn of details, the facts germane to file the present appeal are as under:

3.1 The petitioners claim that they are the legal heirs of Nanjappa Reddy, who was the owner and cultivator of several properties including Survey Nos.18/6, 18/7, 18/8, 18/9 and 18/12 in Roopena Agrahara Village, Begur Hobli, Bengaluru South Taluk. These lands were originally notified for acquisition by the Bangalore Development Authority² for formation of a layout between Hosur Road and Sarjapur Road under Preliminary Notification dated 15.12.1984, followed by Final Notification dated 28.11.1986.

3.2 The State Government withdrew the acquisition and de-notified Sy.Nos.18/8 and 18/12 vide Notification dated 26.11.2002. There were certain Civil litigations

² "BDA for short"



between the family members of Nanjappa Reddy in respect of division of the properties left by him in O.S.No.1800/1982, O.S.No.136/2000, O.S.No.2825/2003, O.S.No.263/2003 and RFA.No.1975/2013.

3.3 There were certain disputes between the parties which led to filing of W.P.No.5358/2019, which came to be allowed directing the SLAO to consider the representations of the petitioners and hear all the concerned parties. Subsequently, the petitioners filed their objections staking the claim in respect of Sy.No.18/8 and 18/12. However, the SLAO passed an award on 26.11.2019, directing release of compensation to certain respondents. That was the subject matter in W.P.No.954/2021.

3.4 The petitioners received another notice dated 07.08.2025, requiring the petitioners to produce documents of title in compliance of the order passed



by this Court in W.P.No.24731/2024, wherein the Writ Court set aside the general Award and directed passing of a consent award subject to verification of title and restoration of general Award, if rival claim exist. The petitioners in response to the notice appeared and filed objections, stating that there are several issues regarding rival claims before the Court and requested to refer the matter to Civil Court for adjudication. It was further contention that despite the objection filed, the SLAO on 12.09.2025 exercising power under Section 29(2) of the Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Act, 1966³, directed for disbursement of compensation in favour of the respondent Nos.5 and 6. Assailing the said order the petitioners were before the Writ Court.

3.5 The petitioners contended before the Writ Court that the land acquired by the KIADB is part of 23 guntas of land in Sy.No.18/12, which was earlier notified by

³ "KIAD Act for short"



the Government vide Notification dated 26.11.2002. Since the land acquired is the land belonging to the family of the Nanjappa Reddy, that is, part of 23 guntas which was earlier de-notified to the petitioners, who have got right over the property. In that view of the matter since there were complex issues of title involved, the SLAO ought to have referred the matter to the Civil Court for adjudication instead of consolidating the rival claim by the respondent Nos.5 and 6 and passing order for disbursement. It was further contented that the order passed by the SLAO was in contravention of directions issued by this Court in W.P.No.24731/2024.

3.6 Per contra, respondent Nos.2 and 3 i.e., Karnataka Industrial Area Development Board⁴ as well as SLAO submitted before the Writ Court, that the SLAO is empowered to determine prima facie entitlements

⁴ "KIADB for short"



and decide whether a claim exists or not. It was further contended that every objections of competent existence raised must not automatically be referred to Civil Court under Section 30 of Land Acquisition Act, 1984⁵. The statutory scheme contemplated under the said provision could be exercised only when there are disputes involving complicated issues of title and not otherwise.

3.7 It was specifically contended that the land which was acquired by the KIADB for Metro Rail project was not part of 23 guntas of land which was de-notified way back in the year 2002. The land which was acquired is in the land which was acquired earlier by the BDA and subsequently, BDA allotted 2.398 guntas of land corresponding to 241.73 Square metres to Karnataka Income Tax Departmental House Building Co-operative Society, from whom the respondent Nos.5 and 6 have purchased the property and derived title

⁵ "LA Act for short"



through registered transactions. In that view of the matter, the SLAO has properly considered the claims made by the parties and on the basis of the documents passed orders, which does not call for any interference.

3.8 The learned Senior counsel appearing for respondent Nos.5 and 6 submitted in toe with the learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3, further added that placing reliance on Annexure-R3, to contend that out of Sy.No.18/12 measuring 1 acre 34 guntas, only 23 guntas were identified and remaining 1 acre 11 guntas continued with BDA. The BDA thereafter allotted 2.398 guntas corresponding to 241.73 square meters, out of 1 acre 11 guntas of land to Karnataka Income Tax Departmental House Building Co-operative Society from whom the respondent Nos.5 and 6 derived their title under registered documents. At no point of time, these petitioners raised any objections to the acquisition of land to an



extent of 1 acre 11 guntas of land and the land 2.398 guntas allotted to Society afore and thereafter in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6. So also they did not challenge the Final Notification of BDA. In that view of the matter, the order passed by the SLAO is in accordance with law and does not call for any interference.

3.9 The Writ Court after considering the rival submissions was of the opinion that the contentions raised by the petitioners cannot be countenanced, as they have failed to place any material document showing the extent of land that is 241.73 square meters was included within the boundaries of the de-notified 23 guntas of land, as claimed by them. The Writ Court has held that Section 28(2) of KIAD Act obligates the SLAO to consider objections raised by the persons interested in the land. Section 29 empowers the SLAO to determine the amount of compensation and who is entitled for the said compensation. Section 30



of the KIAD Act prescribes when the SLAO finds himself unable to decide the disputes regarding the apportionment of title due to complex disputes, he was under obligation to refer the matter to Civil Court for adjudication.

3.10 The SLAO while exercising power under Section 29, examined all the records placed before him, in order to ascertain whether the rival claim raised is genuine, supported and substantiated with the corresponding documents, thereafter passed order impugned.

3.11 The Writ Court at paragraph No.17 of its judgment has stated that, the objections raised by the petitioners are founded primarily on intra family disputes among the legal heirs of late Nanjappa Reddy. There was no challenge to the acquisition notification in vesting of land with BDA and BDA's allotment proceedings. The record produced, that is, the order of de-notification dated 26.11.2002



manifestly shows that, only 23 guntas in Sy.No.18/12 stood de-notified while remaining extent of 1 acre 11 guntas vested with the BDA and the BDA allotted 2.398 that is, 241.73 square meters allotted in favour of Karnataka Income Tax Departmental House Building Co-operative Society and subsequently the same conveyed in respect of respondent Nos.5 and 6.

3.12 The Writ Court has held that the petitioners have failed to place any cogent material demonstrating that the acquired extent of 241.73 square meters forms part of de-notified land. As their assertion remains unsupported by boundary descriptions, survey sketch, or revenue records. In that view of the matter, the SLAO relying on the acquisition notifications, registered documents and other documents placed on record, passed the order exercising power under Section 29 of KIAD Act. As such, the same does not require any interference and



dismissed the writ petition. It is this order passed by the Writ Court is called in question in this appeal.

4. Heard Sri.Vikram A.Huilgol, learned Senior counsel for Sri.B.Ramesh, learned counsel appellant and Sri.S.H.Raghavendra, learned Additional Government Advocate for respondent No.1 and Sri.Udaya Holla, learned Senior counsel assisted by Sri.A.Chandrachud, learned counsel for Caveator/ respondent Nos.5 and 6.

5. Sri.Vikram Huilgol, learned Senior counsel submits that the land which was acquired by the KIADB forms part of de-notified 23 guntas, in view of pendency of civil proceedings and the objections filed by the petitioners bringing to the notice of the SLAO, along with documents, the SLAO ought to have referred the matter under Section 30 of the KIAD Act to the Civil Court, for adjudication instead of dwelling upon the complex undisputed facts. The claim made before the SLAO clearly shows that the matter involves adjudication upon title. In that view of the



matter, the order passed by the SLAO and confirmed by the Writ Court does not stand to any reason and required to be quashed, by setting aside the order passed by the learned Single Judge and consequently allow the writ petition granting relief sought therein.

6. Per contra Sri.Udaya Holla, learned Senior counsel for respondent Nos.5 and 6 submits that, the power under Section 30 of KIAD Act, comes into picture only when there is complex issue of disputed facts arises between the parties. The suits filed by the petitioners are all between family *inter-se*. The respondent Nos.5 and 6 are totally strangers to the family. The records clearly speaks that out of Sy.No.18/12, only an extent of 23 guntas has been de-notified and remaining 1 acre 11 guntas out of 1 acre 34 guntas continued with BDA. The BDA thereafter allotted 2.398 guntas of land i.e. 241.73 square meters, in favour of Karnataka Income Tax Departmental House Building Co-operative Society. The respondent Nos.5 and 6 came to the ownership of such



property i.e., 2.398 Guntas (241.73 square meters) under the registered documents conveyed by the Society in favour of them. A conjoint reading of all these documents clearly show that the land involved, i.e., the land acquired by the KIADB is not the land forming part of 23 Guntas de-notified land in Sy.No.18/12.

7. The SLAO having found this fact after verifying the record, passed the order as there is no document in support produced to substantiate the claim that the property acquired is the part of 23 guntas de-notified land. The Writ Court having considered all these records came to a conclusion that the petitioners have failed to produce any material showing the extent of land acquired by the KIADB, to which the respondent Nos.5 and 6 subsequently became owners is included within the de-notified boundaries of 23 Guntas.

8. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the Writ Court, extensively considered entire material placed



on record and formed a clear opinion that the objection raised not supported by any documents to substantiate their claim, raised under the objections before the SLAO, and placing reliance on several judgments of Supreme Court as well as this Court, properly appreciated the records and passed the well reasoned order which does not require any interference at the hands of this Court and sought to dismiss the appeal.

9. Having considered the rival submissions, we have gone through the entire writ appeal papers. As stated supra, the Writ Court at paragraph Nos.13, 17 and 27 has clearly held that, the contentions raised by the petitioners fall short of documents to substantiate their claim. The observations of the Writ Court in paragraph Nos.13, 17 and 27 read as under:

- "13. On careful consideration of the rival submissions, this contention cannot be accepted, as the petitioners have failed to produce any material showing that extent of 241.73 square meters is included within the boundaries of de-notified 23 guntas.*
- 17. In the present case, the objections raised by the petitioners are founded primarily on intra family disputes among the legal heirs of late*



Nanjappa Reddy. The petitioners have not challenged the acquisition notification, the vesting of land or the BDA's allotment proceedings. The record unmistakably shows that only 23 guntas in Survey No.18/12 stood de-notified, while remaining extent continued to vest with the BDA from which 2.398 guntas (241.73 square meters) was subsequently allotted and conveyed through registered documents. The petitioners have failed to place any cogent material demonstrating that the acquired extent of 241.73 square meters forms part of the de-notified land. Their assertion remains unsupported by boundary descriptions, survey sketch, or revenue records. In contrast, the SLAO has relied upon the acquisition records. The surveyor's report, BDA's allotment, documents and registered conveyances, which collectively establish a clear prima facie chain of title in favour of respondents Nos.5 and 6.

27. *The petitioners' contention that rival claim must necessarily be referred to under Section 30, if accepted would render Section 29 otiose, and defeat the legislative intent of administrative scrutiny at the stage of acquisition. Accordingly, this Court finds that the SLAO has acted within the authority conferred under Sections 28 (2), 29 and 30 of the KIAD Act, read with Section 11 of the LA Act, 1894 and equivalent to under Section 23 of the Act, 2013. The objection raised by the petitioners does not disclose a genuine rival claim warranting reference to the Civil Court and accordingly, the point framed for consideration is answered and finding of entitlement recorded in the impugned order is based on material evidence and does not warrant any interference. Accordingly, this Court pass the following:*

ORDER

The writ petition is dismissed as devoid of merits."



10. We, having considered the order passed by the Writ Court, find no infirmities in the order passed after considering the entire material placed on record, in respect of the claim made by both the parties. In that view of the matter, appeal sans merit and accordingly, ***dismissed***.

11. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, no order as to costs.

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

**Sd/-
(T.M.NADAF)
JUDGE**

RR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 3
ct-vn