



CNR: KAHC010794672025

NC: 2026:KHC:45180
WP No. 37629 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 20TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 37629 OF 2025 (BDA)

BETWEEN:

SMT. K. USHA
W/O. LATE BALAKRISHNAN,
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS,
R/AT. NO.64, ANANTHAPURAM,
MYSURU ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 002

...PETITIONER

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

AND:

1. THE BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE - 560 020
REPT.BY ITS COMMISSIONER.

2. THE DEPUTY SECRETARY-II
THE BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARAPARK WEST,
BANGALORE - 560 020

3. THE DEPUTY SECRETARY-IV
THE BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARAPARK WEST,
BANGALORE - 560 020

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. VASANTHA, ADVOCATE)

Digitally
signed by
HEMALATHA J
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PETITIONER DATED 27.11.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-S TO ALLOT AN ALTERNATIVE SITE IN LIEU OF SITE BEARING NO.179, MEASURING 6 X 9 METERS SITUATED AT BANASHANKARI 6TH STAGE IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, 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 respondents to consider her representation dated 27.11.2025 and allot an alternate site in lieu of Site No.179 at Banashankari VI Stage measuring 6 x 9 meters.

2. (i) Petitioner claims that she filed an application seeking allotment of a site under the Economically Weaker Section (EWS) category. The respondent No.1 allotted a site bearing No.179 at 2nd Block, VI Stage, Banashankari in terms of a letter of allotment dated 13.03.2002. The petitioner paid the entire sital value on 10.05.2002. She was thereafter called



upon to furnish documents to establish that she belongs to a economically weaker section, which too were furnished. Petitioner claims that respondent - BDA did not execute a conveyance in respect of the allotted site. However, the respondent No.3 issued a letter on 09.05.2011 to submit certain documents which too were furnished by the petitioner along with a representation on 06.01.2014. Since the respondent - BDA did not take any action to convey the sites, the petitioner submitted one more representation dated 18.08.2016, followed by another representation dated 22.05.2019.

(ii) Since no action was taken on the representations, the petitioner approached this Court in W.P.No.36669/2019 for a direction to the respondents to execute a sale deed. This Court allowed the writ petition in terms of an order dated 18.11.2019 and directed the respondent No.1 to consider the representations of the petitioner and take a decision. Thereafter, the respondent - BDA directed its revenue inspector to verify whether the site bearing No.179 was vacant. The revenue inspector verified the site and submitted a report



NC: 2026:KHC:45180
WP No. 37629 of 2025

CNR: KAHC010794672025

stating that the site is already allotted and sale deed was executed in favour of Mr. Muniraju and Mr. Honnappa. Petitioner claims that this is a fraudulent act on the part of the respondent - BDA as the allotment in her favour was not cancelled and the respondent - BDA had surreptitiously allotted it to Mr. Muniraju and Mr. Honnappa. The petitioner therefore made a representation on 11.06.2020 seeking allotment of an alternate site. The respondent No.3 issued an endorsement dated 11.06.2020 stating that an alternate site would be allotted and called upon the petitioner to furnish documents. The petitioner then submitted a representation dated 19.01.2021 requesting the respondents to allot an alternate site. The law officer of the respondent recommended that the petitioner is entitled for an alternate site. Despite such recommendation, the respondent - BDA did not take any action to allot an alternate site, which compelled the petitioner to file a representation to the respondent - BDA. The petitioner claims that no steps are taken by the respondents to consider the request of the petitioner to allot an alternate site. Petitioner



CNR: KAHC010794672025

therefore is before this Court seeking for a direction to the respondents to allot an alternate site.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterated the above submissions.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the name of the petitioner is short-listed for allotment of an alternate site and the same is pending consideration before the Committee constituted for allotment of alternate sites. He therefore, submits that if reasonable time is granted, the respondents shall take steps for allotment of an alternate site to the petitioner.

5. It is a matter of grave concern that the petitioner who is lawfully entitled for a site has been knocking at the doors of the respondents from the year 2002. It appears that the respondents have treated her despicably owing to her low economic and social status. The respondents have been heartless in not considering the claim of the petitioner, even after being directed by this Court in W.P.No.36669/2019. This



CNR: KAHC010794672025

NC: 2026:KHC:45180
WP No. 37629 of 2025

Court, therefore hopes and expects that the respondents would not compel the petitioner to again approach this Court.

6. In view of the submission of the learned counsel for respondents, the petition is ***allowed***. Respondent Nos.1 and 2 are directed to identify an alternate site preferably in the same layout and allot the same to the petitioner. This shall be done within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this Order.

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

PMR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 65