HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:60298
WP No. 24897 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010545662026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 24897 OF 2026 (LA-BDA)

BETWEEN:

SRI. K R PRABHU
S/O. SRI. REVANA SIDDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
R/AT NO.36, 9TH CROSS,
ULLALA MAIN ROAD,
BEHIND SAROJA MEMORIAL SCHOOL,
MUNESHWARA NAGARA,
BENGALURU - 560 056

...PETITIONER

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

AND:

Digitally signed by HEMALATHA J
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

THE COMMISSIONER
THE BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, KUMARA PARK WEST,
BENGALURU-560 020.
REP BY ITS COMMISSIONER

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI.B.S.SACHIN, ADVOCATE)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE PETITIONER DATED 26.06.2019, 07.07.2026 AND 04.08.2026 VIDE ANNEXURES - E, F AND G TO ALLOT AN ALTERNATIVE SITE IN LIEU OF PETITIONER

REVENUE SITE BEARING NO.314, IN THE CASE OF JUNJAMMA AND OTHERS V/S BDA AND OTHERS, REPORTED IN ILR 2005 KAR 608.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, 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 to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 26.06.2019, 07.07.2026 and 04.08.2026 and allot an alternate site in lieu of revenue Site No.314 formed in Sy.No.29/3 of Ramasandra, Kengeri Hobli, Bengaluru South Taluk.

2. (i) The petitioner claims to have purchased the site No.314 in Sy.No.29/3 of Ramasandra in terms of a sale deed dated 04.06.1997 and that he was in possession of the said site. He contends that the land in Sy.No.29/3 was notified for acquisition for formation of Sir.M.Vishweshwaraiah Layout, and the acquisition was upheld by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in a judgment reported in ***Junjamma and Others Vs. Bangalore Development Authority and Others - ILR 2005***

KAR 608. He contends that following the judgment passed by the Co-ordinate Bench, he submitted an application seeking allotment of an alternate site. His application was registered on 15.12.2002. However, the respondents have not taken any steps to consider the application, which compelled the petitioner to approach this Court in W.P.No.10465/2019. This Court disposed of the writ petition vide order dated 17.06.2019, directing the respondents therein to consider the application of the petitioner in accordance with the judgment rendered in ***Junjamma's*** case *referred supra* within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

(ii) Following this, the petitioner submitted another representation dated 26.06.2019, the receipt of which was acknowledged and the respondents assured that an alternate site would be allotted to him. However, no steps were taken which compelled the petitioner to submit yet another representation dated 07.07.2026. However, no action is initiated on the representations and therefore, the petitioner is before this Court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had purchased the revenue site much prior to the acquisition of the land bearing Sy.No.29/3 and therefore he is entitled for allotment of an alternate site as per the directions of this Court in ***Junjamma's*** case *referred supra*.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent submits that the request of the petitioner would be considered in accordance with law and appropriate orders would be passed.

5. It is unfortunate that the petitioner has to knock the doors of this Court more than once to consider his lawful representations dated 26.06.2019 and 07.07.2026. This Court had earlier directed the respondents in W.P.No.10465/2019 to consider the case of the petitioner in the light of the judgment passed by this Court in ***Junjamma's*** case. The continued silence on the part of the respondent shows the scant respect that the respondent has to the orders of the Court. Hence, this writ petition is ***allowed***. The respondent is directed to consider the representations of the petitioner within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. It is made clear that if the respondent does not consider the application in accordance with law, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to seek revival of this writ petition.

Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE

BKN
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 18