



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 20879 OF 2026 (LA-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. ASHOK CHAND
S/O JEEVARAJ
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
2. SMT. MANJULA BAI,
W/O ASHOK CHAND,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
3. RAJESH KUMAR
S/O JEEVARAJ
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
4. SMT. CHANDAN BALA,
W/O RAJESH KUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
NO.15, DODDAKATAPPA ROAD,
1ST CROSS, HALASURU ROAD,
BANGALORE NORTH,
BANGALORE-560008.

Digitally signed
by
HEMALATHA J
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. RAGHAVENDRA GOWDA K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE & INDUSTRIES
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.



2. THE KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL
AREA DEVELOPMENT BOARD
EAST WING, KHANIZA BHAVAN,
BANGALORE - 560001
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER
3. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
(KRIDE), HEAD OFFICE,
KIADB NO.14/1, ARAVINDA BHAVAN,
1ST FLOOR, NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. POOJA M KOORSE, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE GENERAL
AWARD DATED 20/03/2026 BEARING NO.KIADB / KRIDE /
BHUSWA / C4 / R / 25 / 800-900 / HORAMAVU / 04 / 2025-26
DATED 20.03.2026 PERTAINING TO PETITIONERS LAND
MEASURING TO AN EXTENT OF 191.50 SQ.MTS., IN
SY.NO.99/1, OF HORAMAVU VILLAGE, K.R.PURAM HOBLI,
BANGALORE EAST TALUK VIDE ANNEXURE-A IN SO FAR AS
PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED PASSED BY THE THIRD
RESPONDENT.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ



ORAL ORDER

The petitioners have challenged the general award bearing No.KIADB / KRIDE / BHUSWA / C4 / R / 25 /800-900/Horamavu/04/2025-26 dated 20.03.2026 passed by respondent No.3. They have also sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct respondents to consider their case by passing a consent award under Section 29(2) of the Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Act, 1966 (henceforth referred to as 'KIAD Act' for short).

2. The petitioners claim that they are the owners of the land bearing Sy.No.99/1 totally measuring 35 guntas situate at Horamavu Village, K.R. Puram Hobli, Bengaluru East Taluk, out of which 191.50 square meters was proposed for acquisition for formation of industrial layout vide preliminary notification dated 17.01.2025 under Section 28(1) of the KIAD Act, followed by a final notification dated 29.03.2025. The petitioners contend that they executed a lease agreement in favour of Essay Petroleum India Private Limited for a period of 12 years for formation of petrol bunk station in Sy.No.99/1 of Horamavu village dated 10.08.2015, where lessee failed to form a petrol pump, since the lease agreement is in force, the respondents'



authorities issued notification in the name of Essay Petrol Bunk Area. They further contend that the respondent - KIADB without considering the revenue records straight away passed the general award dated 20.03.2026 and deposited the compensation amount before the competent Court. Petitioners claim that respondent Nos.2 and 3 have neither issued any notice regarding taking possession nor called upon them to enter into a consent agreement as provided under Section 29(2) of the KIAD Act but the respondent No. 3 has passed the impugned general award. The petitioners therefore claim that the general award passed by respondent No.3 is not within their knowledge and not beneficial to them and hence, prays that the same be quashed and a direction be issued to pass an award by consent as provided under Section 29(2) of the KIAD Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the respondent No.3 ought to have issued notice as mandated under Sections 9 and 10 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. However, without issuing notice and without giving an opportunity of being heard as provided under Section 29(2) of the KIAD Act, respondent No.3 passed the general award and



therefore, the petitioners being the lawful owners of the acquired land, are entitled to give their consent under Section 29(2) of KIAD Act before passing the general award. He further submits that in similar facts and circumstances in W.P.No.15886/2025 filed by the landloser, a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 01.07.2025, was pleased to direct respondent No.3 (SLAO) to consider the claim of the petitioners therein under Section 29(2) of the KIAD Act. He submits that the petitioners herein must be considered on par.

4. The learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 and 3 does not dispute the above order passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court and submits that if a representation is filed, the claim of the petitioners would be considered as per Section 29(2) of the KIAD Act and in accordance with law.

5. In view of the above submission, following order is passed:-

ORDER

- (i) The writ petition is ***allowed.***



- (ii) The impugned general award bearing No.KIADB/
KRIDE / BHUSWA / C4 / R / 25 / 800-900 /
Horamavu / 04 / 2025-26 dated 20.03.2026
passed by respondent No.3 in respect of
Sy.No.99/1, measuring 191.50 square meters
situate at Horamavu Village, K.R.Puram Hobli,
Hobli, Bengaluru East Taluk, Bengaluru District is
hereby quashed.
- (iii) The petitioners are granted liberty to submit a
representation to respondent - KIADB,
expressing consent for an award within a period
of thirty days from the date of receipt of a
certified copy of this order. Upon receipt of such
representation, the respondent-KIADB shall
consider the same in accordance with law and
pass appropriate orders.
- (iv) The said consideration by the KIADB shall be
within eight weeks from the date of submission
of the representation by the petitioners.



- (v) The respondent-KIADB is at liberty to withdraw the amount, if any, deposited before the Civil Court pursuant to the general award bearing KIADB/ KRIDE / BHUSWA / C4 / R / 25 / 800-900 / Horamavu / 04 / 2025-26 dated 20.03.2026 passed by respondent No.3.
- (vi) In the event, if there are any unresolved objections, respondent Nos.2 and 3 shall take appropriate action but in accordance with law and after notifying the petitioners.

6. Learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent No.1 and Sri. P.V.Chandrashekar, learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 are permitted to file memo of appearance and Vakalath respectively within ten days.

7. In view of disposal of main petition, pending interlocutory applications, if any, do not survive for consideration and same stand rejected.

Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE

HJ
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 18