



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

WRIT PETITION NO.38390 OF 2025 (LA-BDA)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. B.K.RENUKA
W/O CHANDRASHEKAR K.
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS
R/AT VILLA NO.10,
RENAISSANCE PROSPERO,
BYATARAYANAPURA,
BENGALURU - 560 092.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K.N. NITISH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING,
BANGALORE - 560 001.
2. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 020.
3. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BENGALURU - 560 020.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA FOR R1;
SRI. B.S. KARTHIKEYAN, ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO RESPONDENT NOS.2 AND 3 TO CONSIDER THE PETITIONERS REPRESENTATIONS DATED 07.12.2024, 07.04.2025, AND 14.05.2025 AT ANNEXURE - P, P1 AND P2 AND THEREBY DIRECT RESPONDENT NOS.2 AND 3 TO ALLOT 40 PERCENT OF DEVELOPED LAND DIRECTLY IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER AS PER THE GOVERNMENT ORDER DATED 18.03.2011 AT ANNEXURE- Q WITHIN A TIME FRAME.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties.

2. In this writ petition, the petitioner is seeking direction to the respondents to consider his representations produced at Annexure- P,P1 and P2.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that, she has succeeded in O.S. No. 23/2022 against the original owner of the land in question. Therefore, the



petitioner seeks compensation and such other benefits as provided under the provisions of the Bangalore Development Authority Act. Accordingly, Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are directed to consider the representations produced at Annexure-P series, in accordance with law, within an outer limit of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

4. It is also the grievance of the petitioner that the Government Order dated 18.03.2011 (Annexure-Q), issued by the respondent-Government facilitating allotment of 40% of the developed land to the petitioner, which has not been implemented.

5. In that view of the matter, till the representations are considered by Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, they are directed to retain the vacant sites as they exist as on today and not to create any



encumbrance or third-party interest over such vacant sites.

6. While considering the representations at Annexure-P series, it is incumbent upon Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to take into consideration the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **V. Chadrasekaran and another vs. Administrative Officer and others** reported in **(2012) 12 SCC 133**.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE