



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 13TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA

WRIT PETITION NO. 35008 OF 2025 (LA-BDA)

BETWEEN:

SRI. G. SIDDAGANGAIAH
SON OF LATE. GANGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 86 YEARS
R/A NO.820, GAYATHRI NILAYA,
JALAHALLI, HESSARAGATTHA,
BENGALURU 560 097.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ROHAN HOSMATH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
2. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST, T. CHOWDIAH ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 020
REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER

Digitally
signed by
YASHODA K L
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



3. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
DR. K SHIVARAM KARANTH LAYOUT
OFFICE OF BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST, T. CHOWDIAH ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 020

4. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
DR. K SHIVARAM KARANTH LAYOUT
OFFICE OF BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST, T. CHOWDIAH ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 020.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. M.RAJAKUMAR., AGA FOR R1
SRI. SHIVAPRASAD.M.SHANTANAGOUDAR., ADVOCATE
FOR R2 TO R4)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT,
ORDER OR DECLARATION IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI
QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT DT.04.07.2025
BEARING NO.BEM.AA.PRA/KA.AA/D.S.K.L/218/205-26, ISSUED
BY THE R2 INsofar AS THE SCHEDULE PROPERTY PRODUCED
AT ANNEXURE-H AND ETC.,

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA)

The petitioners are before this Court seeking the following prayers;

- (a) *Issue a writ, order or declaration in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned endorsement dated 04.07.2025 bearing No.Bem.Aa.Pra/Ka.Aa/D.S.K.L/218/2025-26, issued by the Respondent No.2 insofar as the schedule property produced at Annexure-H;*
- (b) *Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus to allot an equivalent extent of developed site on land-to-land basis and pay additional compensation for the building which was demolished;*
- (c) *Issue any other writ, order directions as may be necessary in the interest of justice and equity.*



2. Heard Sri Rohan Hosamath, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, Sri M.Rajkumar, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent – State and Sri Shivaprasad.M.Shanthanagoundar, learned counsel appearing for respondents –Bangalore Development Authority and have perused the material on record.

3. The learned counsel Sri Rohan Hosmath, appearing for the petitioner taking this Court to the documents appended to the petition would seek to demonstrate that issue in this petition stands covered by a particular order passed by this court in ***W.P.No.20971/2022 disposed of on 04.12.2024***. The learned counsel would further submit that the endorsement that was issued by the Bangalore Development Authority should stand quashed in the light of the issue answered in the aforesaid order.

4. The learned counsel Sri Shivaprasad. M. Shantanagoudar, representing the Bangalore Development



Authority would submit that the Bopaiah Committee now is empowered by this Court to go into the details of whether the constructions existed prior to the notification or have come up after the notification. In that light, the matter also could be referred back to the Bopaiah Committee for a factual assessment with regard to the existence of the structures/building prior to the notification or after the notification.

5. This Court, while entertaining the petition, has granted an interim order of *status quo* to be maintained by the parties till the proceedings would conclude in the light of the matter being remitted back to the hands of the Bopaiah Committee for consideration afresh to bear in mind the observations made in the course of the order, we deem it appropriate to dispose the subject petition with a direction to the Bopaiah Committee to enter upon the issue of whether the subject construction has come up prior to the notification or after the notification and pass necessary orders thereon. The committee shall decide the



issue as is indicated herein above with an outer limit of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order if not earlier, in accordance with law. Till such time, the *status quo* in the subject petition shall continue.

6. In the event, the committee would conclude that construction in the subject land has come up prior to the final notification, the Bangalore Development Authority shall grant benefit to the petitioners in accordance with law as is done in other cases.

7. In the light of the aforesaid observations, as a matter of form, the impugned endorsement stands quashed.

Sd/-
(R. DEVDAS)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(M. NAGAPRASANNA)
JUDGE

KLY
CT: JL