



CNR: KAHC010831182025

NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.P.VIVEKANANDA

WRIT PETITION NO.39154 OF 2025 (GM-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

KANASU VENTURES
A PARTNERSHIP FIRM HAVING
ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT,
NO.357, 3RD CROSS, CAMBRIDGE LAYOUT,
ULSOOR, BANGALORE-560 008
REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY
MS. DIVYA VASU REDDY.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SHIVAPRASAD SHANTANAGOUDAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
AND INDUSTRIES, REP. BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560 001.
2. KARNATAKA UDYOG MITRA
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
3RD FLOOR, KHANIJA BHAVAN,
RACE COURSE ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.
3. KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL AREAS
DEVELOPMENT BOARD
REP. BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Digitally signed by
PAVITHRA B
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010831182025

NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025

AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER
NO.14/3, II FLOOR, R.P.BUILDING,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. NAYVA SHEKAR, AGA FOR R1 AND R2;
SRI. H.N.VASUDEVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NOS.1 TO 3 TO ISSUE LAND ALLOTMENT LETTER FOR PLOT BEARING NO.P3 MEASURING 4.64 ACRES IN HI-TECH DEFENCE AND AEROSPACE PARK, PHASE-1 AT BANDIKODIGEHALI TO THE PETITIONER.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.P.VIVEKANANDA

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner had earlier approached this Court in W.P.No.3741/2023 seeking direction to the respondents therein to place the application filed by it before the Land Audit Committee and thereafter before the State Level Single Window Clearance Committee.

2. The application filed by the petitioner was for allotment of industrial plot at Hi-Tech, Defence and Aerospace Park, Bangalore. During the pendency of the



CNR: KAHC010831182025

NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025

said writ petition, the petitioner had filed a memo seeking withdrawal of the writ petition reserving liberty to it to approach the respondents for allotment of land in terms of the application dated 04.03.2021. Considering the said request, the writ petition was disposed of as withdrawn in terms of the memo.

3. On the ground that the application submitted by the petitioner was not placed before the Land Audit Committee and thereafter before the State Level Single Window Clearance Committee, the petitioner had approached this Court once again in WP.No.19742/2023. The said writ petition along with other connected petitions were disposed of by order dated 18.04.2024 permitting the petitioner to submit a representation identifying suitable residential plot for the purpose of allotment and the respondents were required to place the same before the next ensuing meeting of the SLSWCC.



CNR: KAHC010831182025

**NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025**

4. Pursuant to the said order, the petitioner had approached respondent No.2 through the representation dated 05.07.2023. Thereafter, the petitioner had submitted several representations from the year 2023 to 2025, however, there was no response. Therefore, the petitioner has again approached this Court through W.P.No.33822/2025 making a grievance that pursuant to the order passed in W.P.No.19742/2023, though, the petitioner has identified the plot and informed respondents No.2 and 3, however, its request was not placed before the State Level Single Window Clearance Committee for necessary action.

5. The said writ petition was disposed of on 11.11.2025 directing respondent No.2 to place the application of the petitioner before the SLSWCC in the very next meeting without fail and with a further observation that if the application of the petitioner is not placed before the Committee for consideration, respondent No.2 would be facing the contempt proceedings. It was also observed



NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025

that until the said consideration, the respondents were restrained from allotting the plot which the petitioner had identified. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that despite the aforesaid direction, no steps have been taken by respondents No.2 and 3.

6. The present writ petition is filed for issue of writ of mandamus to the respondents for allotment of plot bearing No.P3 measuring 4.64 acres in Hi-Tech Defence and Aerospace Park, Phase-1, Bandikodigehalli.

7. While issuing notice of the present petition, this Court passed the following:

"ORAL ORDER"

Upon hearing Sri Shivaprasad Shantanagoudar, the learned counsel for the petitioner, the office objections stand overruled.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the outcome in the State Level High Clearance Committee meeting held on 05.12.2025 and even with the convening of the meeting. The petitioner's right to participate in the meeting stems from the provisions of the Karnataka Industries [Facilitation] Rules, 2003 and this Court's order dated 18.04.2024 in WP No.



CNR: KAHC010831182025

NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025

19742 of 2023 and order dated 11.11.2025 in W.P.No. 33822/2025. This Court in the order dated 11.11.2025 has directed the second respondent [the competent Authority under the Rules, 2003 to place the petitioner's request for allotment of land for residential project in its next meeting observing that if the petitioner's request is not placed before the next meeting, there shall be consequences including initiation of contempt proceedings.

Sri Shivaprasad Shantanagoudar submits that contrary to the Rules, 2003 the petitioner is issued with just a day's notice and that though the petitioner is orally informed that the proposal for allotment is rejected, no order is communicated on the petitioner's request to avail the appellate remedy. The learned counsel submits that the petitioner has sought for the allotment of plot No.3 measuring 4.64 acres in High Tech Defence and Aerospace Park, Bengaluru and that this Court in W.P.No. 33822 of 2025 has restrained the respondents from allotting the plot identified by the petitioner to others.

In consideration of these submissions and on perusal of records, to prevent multiplicity of proceedings, the interim order is granted directing M/s KIADB [the third respondent] not to allot the subject plot to any third person observing that even if there is any allotment between 05.12.2025 to this day, such allotment shall be subject to further orders of this Court.

Sri H.N.Vasudeva, the learned counsel for the third respondent, is called upon to accept notice for this respondent. Sri B. Ravindranath, the learned Additional Government Advocate, who has accept noticed for the first and the second respondents, shall secure instructions



CNR: KAHC010831182025

**NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025**

on [a] the details of the notices caused to the petitioner for the meeting held on 5.12.2025 [b] the resolution/decision on the petitioner's proposal and [c] the reason for the decision.

The office is directed to re-list this petition on 23.02.2026."

8. During the pendency of the present writ petition, after coming to know that the plot, which was earlier identified by the petitioner has already been allotted to third party, the petitioner has filed the application i.e., I.A.No.1/2026 seeking direction to respondent Nos.1 to 3 contending that it has identified another Plot No.R-2A measuring 4.108 acres in the very same industrial area, until such time, the writ petition is considered, the said plot shall not be allotted to any third parties. The documents produced by the petitioner along with the application i.e., I.A.No.1/2026, more particularly, the Confirmatory Letter of Allotment dated 14.01.2026 discloses that the plot, which the petitioner had earlier identified had been allotted to another entity through the letter of allotment dated 29.09.2025 itself. However, the



CNR: KAHC010831182025

NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025

fact of such allotment was not brought to the notice of this Court when W.P.No.33822/2025 was considered.

9. When this petition had come up before this Court on 24.08.2026, learned counsel for the respondents were called upon to inform this Court as to the action taken on the petitioner's application.

10. Today, learned counsel for respondent No.3 has filed the statement of objections contending that the project of the petitioner has not been approved by the SLSWCC, it is only after approval of the project, the petitioner could identify suitable plot and seek for allotment. It is only thereafter, as per the approved project the application of the petitioner would be placed before the Udyog Mitra. After such approval by the Udyog Mitra, the allotment process would be commenced by KIADB. Therefore, the petitioner, as a matter of right cannot seek for allotment of any plot, which has been identified by it.



CNR: KAHC010831182025

**NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025**

11. On looking at the history of the case, what is discernible is that the result of consideration of the application filed by the petitioner was never informed either to the petitioner or to this Court. In none of the earlier writ petitions the respondents have taken the contention that the project of the petitioner was not approved. Today, when the matter is taken up for consideration, learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that the petitioner does not intend to question the validity or otherwise of the allotment of the plots identified by it. However, he request this Court to permit the petitioner to approach respondent Nos.2 and 3 with a fresh proposal for approval of the project, so also for allotment of plot. If such an application is filed, the same shall be considered by the respondents at an early date taking note of the series of writ petitions filed by the petitioner, so also the orders passed therein.

12. The said submission appears to be reasonable and the same requires consideration.



CNR: KAHC010831182025

NC: 2026:KHC:46698
WP No. 39154 of 2025

13. In the light of the above, the writ petition is ***disposed of*** with liberty to the writ petitioner to approach respondent Nos.2 and 3 with a fresh proposal for approval of project and also for allotment of plot. If the petitioner approaches respondent Nos.2 and 3 with a fresh project the same shall be considered in accordance with law.

14. While considering the fresh proposal which may be submitted by the petitioner, the respondents shall take note of the fact that the petitioner had approached this Court on four occasions and orders have been passed directing consideration, despite the same, the request of the petitioner is not favoured.

15. With the above observation and directions, the writ petition is ***disposed of***.

Sd/-
(T.P.VIVEKANANDA)
JUDGE

PB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 13