



CNR: KAHC010545642026

NC: 2026:KHC:43254
WP No. 24773 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 13TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 24773 OF 2026 (BDA)

BETWEEN:

SMT. V.M. GEETHA
W/O SRI. BASAVARAJ ETAGI
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
R/AT. NO.15, 'ASHIRVAD'
KOTHANURU MAIN ROAD,
5TH MAIN ROAD, ADITHYANAGARA,
ANJANAPURA, BENGALURU - 560 062

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SUPRITHA K.H., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
THE BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BENGALURU-560 020.
REP BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE DEPUTY SECRETARY - 3,
THE BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BENGALURU-560 020.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B.S. KARTHIKEYAN, ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE
IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT DATED 30.07.2026 VIDE NO.BDA/DS-

Digitally signed
by
HEMALATHA J
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



NC: 2026:KHC:43254
WP No. 24773 of 2026

3/B1-SK-441/2026-27 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 VIDE ANNEXURE- F 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 an endorsement bearing No.BDA/DS-3/B1-SK-441/2026-27 dated 30.07.2026 issued by respondent No.2. She has also sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondents to determine the sital value in respect of the site allotted to her as per the rates prevailing in the year 2004 when the application was filed by her seeking allotment of an alternate site. She has also sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondents to redo the calculation of the rate of allotment on the above basis.

2. (i) Petitioner contends that she had purchased a revenue site No.16 formed in Sy.No.28/2 of a Gidadakonenahalli, Yeshwanthapura Hobli, Bengaluru North Taluk, which was notified for acquisition for formation of 'Sir M. Vishweshwaraiah Layout'. She contends that following the



judgment of a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Junjamma and others vs. The Bangalore Development Authority and others [ILR 2005 KAR 608]***, an application was filed by her on 30.01.2004 seeking allotment of an alternate site in lieu of the revenue site bearing No.16. The petitioner had got herself registered with respondent No.2 for allotment of the site. After such registration, the Land Acquisition Officer passed an order on 30.12.2010 to allot a site measuring 30' x 40' in lieu of the revenue site bearing No.16. However, no action was taken to allot the site, which compelled the petitioner to file representation requesting the respondents to allot an alternate site. Petitioner claims that the respondents did not take any action which perforced her to file W.P.No.20978/2023 which was disposed off by this Court directing the respondents to allot an alternate site as per the judgment of this Court in ***Junjamma's case***, referred supra. Petitioner thereafter initiated contempt proceedings against the respondents for not taking action to allot an alternate site. During the pendency of the contempt proceedings, the respondents allotted a site bearing No.B1-SK-441 measuring 9 x 12 meters formed in



Sy.No.64/4 of Kodigehalli, situate at 'Nadaprabhu Kempegowda Layout'. An endorsement was thereafter issued on 30.07.2026 demanding a sum of Rs.41,24,500/- as the sital value.

(ii) The petitioner contends that the respondents are entitled to demand the value as on the date of filing an application seeking allotment of an alternate site. However, the respondents have demanded the price prevalent in the year 2026. She contends that this issue is no longer *res integra* in view of the order passed by this Court in identical cases in W.P.Nos.34067/2016, 34068/2016 and 53727/2016. The respondents had challenged the said order/s in W.A.No.470/2020, which was also dismissed. A Special Leave Petition was also filed in SLP (C) No.3898/2021, which was also dismissed. The petitioner therefore, contends that the respondents are entitled to demand the allotment price as it stood as on the date of filing the application not as on the date when the allotment was made.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner reiterated the above contentions and contended that the issue is fully covered by the judgments of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in



CNR: KAHC010545642026

various writ petitions and therefore, the petitioner also be granted the said benefit.

4. The learned counsel for the respondents does not dispute that the petitioner had registered herself for allotment of an alternate site in the year 2004. He also does not dispute that in identical circumstances, this Court in various writ petitions has held that the respondents are entitled to demand and collect the allotment price as it stood as on the date of the application and not as on the date of the allotment.

5. In view of the above submissions, this petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the following order is passed.

ORDER

- (i) The writ petition is ***allowed***.
- (ii) The impugned endorsement bearing No.BDA/DS-3/B1-SK-441/2026-27 dated 30.07.2026 issued by respondent No.2 is quashed.



**NC: 2026:KHC:43254
WP No. 24773 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010545642026

(iii) Respondent No.2 is directed to determine the sital value of Site No.B1-SK-441 at 'Nadaprabhu Kempegowda Layout' as it stood in the year 2004 and raise a fresh demand within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order. The petitioner shall pay the said demand within a period of two months thereafter.

(iv) After payment, the respondent No.2 shall ensure that the aforesaid site is conveyed to the petitioner in the manner as provided in law.

6. Sri. B.S. Karthikeyan, learned counsel for the respondents is permitted to file memo of appearance within a period of ten days.

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

PMR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 23