



CNR: KAHC010470402026

NC: 2026:KHC:48778
WP No. 21240 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 21240 OF 2026 (LA-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

SMT. KOMALA,
W/O T. NARASIMARAJU,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
RESIDING AT THIPPENAHALLI,
YASHWANTHAPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU-560073.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. P. RUDRAPPA, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. MARUTHI G.B., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU DISTRICT.
KEMPEGOWDA ROAD,
KANDAYA BHAVAN,
BENGALURU-560009.
3. THE TAHSILDAR,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK.
4. THE KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL AREAS
DEVELOPMENT BOARD (KIADB)
REP BY:- THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
KALIDASA MARG, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
GANDHI NAGAR, BENGALURU-560009.

...RESPONDENTS

Digitally
signed by
HEMALATHA J
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010470402026

NC: 2026:KHC:48778
WP No. 21240 of 2026

(BY SMT. POOJA M. KOORSE, HIGH COURT GOVERNMENT PLEADER
FOR RESPONDENT NOS.1 TO 3;

SRI. DILDAR SHIRALLI, ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT NO.4)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED
ORDER BEARING NO.KIADB/LAQ/BNG.NA/1270/2025-26 DATED
02.12.2025, PASSED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT ON ANNEXURE-E
INSOFAR AS IT WITHHOLDS THE COMPENSATION AMOUNT OF
RS.98,00,000/- PAYABLE TO THE PETITIONER IN RESPECT OF THE
ACQUIRED LAND BEARING SY.NO.8/4 MEASURING 3 ACRES 09
GUNTAS SITUATED AT SONNENAHALLI VILLAGE, YESHWANTHAPURA
HOBOLI, BENGALURU NORTH TALUK, AS BEING ARBITRARY, ILLEGAL,
UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND WITHOUT AUTHORITY OF LAW AND ETC.

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 petitioner has sought for a writ in the nature of
certiorari to quash the impugned order bearing
No.ಕೆಐಎಡಿಬಿ/ಎಲ್ ಎಕ್ಯೂ/ಬೆಂ.ಗ್ರಾ.ನಂ/1270/2025-26 dated 02.12.2025 in so
far as it relates to withholding compensation of Rs.98,00,000/-
payable to the petitioner in respect of acquisition of land
bearing Sy.No.8/4 of Sonnenahalli Village, Yeshwanathpura
Hobli, Bengaluru North Taluk, measuring 3 acres 9 guntas. She



has also sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondent No.4 to forthwith release the withheld compensation amount of Rs.98,00,000/- and to pay interest thereon.

2. (i) The petitioner contends that her husband had purchased land bearing Sy.No.8/4 of Sonnenahalli Village, Yeshwanathpura Hobli, Bengaluru North Taluk, in terms of a sale deed dated 12.09.2005. He later bequeathed it in her favour in terms of a gift deed dated 05.08.2011. She contends that her name is entered in the revenue records and that she was in possession and enjoyment of the same. The aforesaid land was acquired for public purposes under the provisions of the Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Act, 1966 (henceforth referred to as 'the Act, 1966'), which culminated in an award determining the compensation payable. The petitioner claims that she is the owner of the property and therefore, she is the person interested to receive the compensation. The petitioner produced the relevant documents before the respondent No.4 claiming the compensation.



(ii) The petitioner contends that the respondent No.4 held proceedings and on 02.12.2025 released a sum of Rs.3,53,50,000/- out of the total compensation of Rs.4,51,50,000/-. She contends that the respondent No.4 withheld a sum of Rs.98,00,000/- on the ground that O.S.No.435/2014 and O.S.No.406/2023 were pending consideration before the Civil Court, which were suits for partition filed in respect of the land in question. The petitioner contends that there is no interim order granted in the aforesaid suits restraining the respondent No.4 from releasing the compensation and hence, the impugned order in so far as it relates to withholding a sum of Rs.98,00,000/- is liable to be interfered with.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterated the above submissions and submitted that the petitioner is the full and absolute owner of the land in question and therefore, the respondent No.4 could not have withheld a sum of Rs.98,00,000/- on the basis of suits filed in O.S.No.435/2014 and O.S.No.406/2023. He therefore prays that the direction be issued to the respondent No.4 to release the compensation.



4. (i) Per contra, the learned concept of respondent No.4 submitted that O.S.No.435/2014 is filed by Sri.Ramaiah and Sri.Gopalakrishnaiah and O.S.No.406/2023 is filed by Sri.Gopalakrishnaiah and Sri.Govindaraju claiming partition of their 1/9th share in the land bearing Sy.No.8/4 of Sonnenahalli. He therefore contends that the respondent No.4 after coming to know of the suits filed has withheld compensation which is proportionate to the share claimed by the aforesaid persons in the suits mentioned above.

(ii) He therefore contends that there is no error committed by the respondent No.4 in retaining a sum of Rs.98,00,000/- which is equivalent to the 1/9th share of the aforesaid persons in the land bearing Sy.No.8/4 of Sonnenahalli. He contends that the compensation in respect of the remaining extent is already released to the petitioner. Thus, he contends that the impugned order is just and proper and does not warrant any interference.

5. Learned High Court Government Pleader also reiterated the above submissions and contended that once there is an objection from any person against releasing the



compensation, the respondent No.4 has no other option than to retain the compensation or deposit it before the Civil Court.

6. I have considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 to 3 as well as the Learned counsel for the respondent No.4.

7. A perusal of the impugned order would show that the respondent No.4 has taken note of suits filed in O.S.No.435/2014 and O.S.No.406/2023. He noticed that in O.S.No.435/2014, the plaintiffs had sought for 1/9th share in land bearing Sy.No.8/4. The said suit is not yet disposed off but is pending consideration. Therefore, the respondent No.4 was justified in withholding compensation to the extent of 1/9th share of the plaintiffs in O.S.No.435/2014. There is no error in the respondent No.4 doing so, warranting interference in this writ petition. This apart, the plaintiffs in O.S.No.435/2014 are not arrayed as parties in this writ petition. Hence, on all accounts, this writ petition fails and is accordingly ***dismissed***.



**NC: 2026:KHC:48778
WP No. 21240 of 2026**

8. Learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 to 3 and Sri.Dildar Shiralli, learned counsel for respondent No.4 are permitted to file memo of appearance within ten days.

**Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE**

BKN
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 22