



CNR: KAHC010625832026

NC: 2026:KHC:54048
WP No. 28397 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 28397 OF 2026 (LA-BDA)

BETWEEN:

SMT.SHARADAMMA
W/O. SRI. PUTTACHANNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
RESIDING AT KENCHANAPURA,
SULIKERE POST, KENGARI HOBLI,
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK,
BENGLAURU-560060

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M.S. CHANDRASHEKAR BABU, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARAPARK WEST,
BENGALURU-560020
2. THE SPL. LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,
BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARAPARK WEST,
BENGALURU-560020
3. SRI. S.UMASHANKAR,
S/O. LATE BANASHETTAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.43, JM CROSS,
M.S.LANE, BENGALURU-560002
4. SMT. REKHA
W/O. S.UMASHANKAR,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,

Digitally
signed by
HEMALATHA J
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



NC: 2026:KHC:54048
WP No. 28397 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010625832026

5. SMT. KANCHANA,
D/O. S.UMASHANKAR
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,

ALL ARE RESIDING AT NO.43,
JM CROSS, M.S.LANE,
BENGALURU-560002

...RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NO.1 AND 2 TO GIVE ALTERNATIVE SITE TO THE PETITIONER HEREIN IN LIEU OF THE LAND ACQUIRED WHICH BELONGS TO PETITIONER SY.NO.34/2, MEASURING 20 GUNTAS OF LAND IN KANNAHALLI GRAMA, YESWANTHPUR HOBALI, BENGALURU NORTH 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 mandamus to direct the respondent Nos.1 and 2 to provide an alternate site to her in lieu of the land in Sy.No.32/3 of Kannahalli Village, Yeshwanthapur Hobli, Bengaluru-North Taluk that was acquired. She has also sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondent Nos.1 and 2 not



to provide any alternate site or to disburse the award amount if not already disbursed to the respondent Nos.3, 4 and 5.

2. The petitioner contends that she is the owner of Sy.No.32/3 measuring 20 guntas out of 2 acres 37 guntas of land situate at Kannahalli Village, Yeshwanthapur Hobli, Bengaluru-North Taluk. She contends that respondent Nos.3, 4 and 5 had conveyed the aforesaid extent of land in her favour in terms of a sale deed dated 11.04.2007. The entire extent of land in Sy.No.32/3 was acquired by the State Government for the benefit of Bangalore Development Authority (henceforth referred to as 'BDA') for formation of Nadaprabhu Kempegowda Layout. The compensation was determined and since the petitioner as well as the respondent Nos.3 and 4 filed objections claiming compensation, the same was referred to the Reference Court which registered LAC No.82/2012. During the pendency of the proceedings before the Reference Court, the petitioner, respondent Nos.3 and 4 filed a joint memo requesting the Reference Court to dispose of LAC No.82/2012. In terms of the joint memo, respondent Nos.3, 4 and 5 undertook to pay a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- to the petitioner.



NC: 2026:KHC:54048
WP No. 28397 of 2026

The petitioner contends that the respondent Nos.3 and 4 have now violated the terms and conditions of the memorandum of understanding which was reported before the Reference Court and they have approached the Bangalore Development Authority for alternate sites instead of monetary compensation. The petitioner therefore contends that this is in breach of the joint memo filed before the Reference Court and the petitioner is not paid a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- till date. The petitioner is therefore before this Court seeking the aforementioned reliefs.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent Nos.3, 4 and 5 who were authorised to withdraw the compensation deposited and to pay Rs.40,00,000/- have now made a resiled by approaching the BDA seeking allotment of incentive sites. He submits that the petitioner may not receive Rs.40,00,000/- if sites are granted. Hence, he prays that the writ petition may be allowed.

4. A perusal of the joint memo filed in LAC No.82/2012 would show that the respondent No.3 had undertaken to pay a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- to the petitioner after withdrawing the compensation deposited. If the petitioner



**NC: 2026:KHC:54048
WP No. 28397 of 2026**

has not paid the said sum of Rs.40,00,000/-, it is for the petitioner to enforce the award by initiating necessary execution proceedings. This does not enable the petitioner to seek for a direction to the respondent Nos.1 and 2 to allot an incentive site instead of a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- or to stop the respondent Nso.3, 4 and 5 from approaching the respondent Nos.1 and 2 seeking for allotment of incentive site. The claim if any of the petitioner is only to the extent of Rs.40,00,000/- and therefore, the petitioner has to work out her remedy by executing the award passed by the Reference Court and not approach this Court seeking for directions particularly the ones mentioned above.

5. In that view of the matter, this petition is ***dismissed***. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to execute the award passed by the Reference Court in the manner known to law.

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