HC-KAR
NC: 2026:KHC:61629
WP No. 33715 of 2026
CNR: KAHC010734742026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 33715 OF 2026 (LA-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI.K.N.GIRISH @ N GIRISH BABU
   S/O LATE NARAYANAPPA
   AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS

2. SRI K N GANGADHAR
   S/O LATE NARAYANAPPA
   AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS

3. SMT JANAKAMMA
   D/O LATE K N RAMADASAPPA @ RAMADAS
   AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS

4. SRI R NARAYANA
   S/O LATE K N RAMADASAPPA @ RAMADAS
   AGED ABOUT 4O YEARS

5. R RAVI
   S/O K N RAMADAS @ RAMADAS
   AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS

   ALL ARE RESIDING AT:
   NO.265, 2ND CROSS
   OLD POLICE STATION ROAD
   BEHIND KANYAKAPARAMESHWARI TEMPLE
   K R PURAM, BANGALORE EAST TALUK
   BANGALORE 560036

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SHARAN N.MAJAGE, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by HEMALATHA J
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY ITS SECRETARY
   DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES
   VIDHANA SOUDHA
   BANGALORE-560001

2. KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL
   AREAS DEVELOPMENT BOARD
   REP. BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND
   EXECUTIVE MEMBER
   KHANIJA BHAVANA
   RACE COURSE ROAD
   BENGALURU-560001

3. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
   KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL AREAS
   DEVELOPMENT BOARD
   NO 14/1, 1ST FLOOR,
   ARAVINDA BHAVAN
   NRUPATUNGA ROAD
   BANGALORE-560001

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.B.J.ESHWARAPPA, AGA FOR R1;
SRI.H.L.PRADEEP KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2 AND R3)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE WRIT OF CERTIORARI QUASHING THE GENERAL AWARD BEARING NO.KIADB:LAQ: :2017-18 DATED:24.06.2017 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 IN RESPECT OF LAND IN SY.NO.104 AND 134 MEASURING 4 ACRES EACH SITUATED AT MASTHENAHALLI VILLAGE, KAIVARA HOBLI, CHINTAMANI TALUK, CHIKKABALLAPURA DISTRICT, IN SO FAR AS

THE PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED, WHICH IS PRODUCED AS ANNEXURE-F AND ECT.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

ORAL ORDER

The petitioners have sought for a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the general award bearing No.KIADB:LAQ: : 2017-18 dated 24.06.2017 passed by the respondent No.3 in respect of the land in Sy.Nos.104 and 134, measuring to an extent of 4 acres each, situate at Masthenahalli, Kaivara Hobli, Chintamani Taluk, Chikkaballapura District. They have also sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondent No.3 to consider the case of the petitioners under Section 29(2) of the Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Act, 1966 (henceforth referred to as 'the KIAD Act') and to direct the respondent No.3 to withdraw the general award amount deposited in the Reference Court.

2. (i) The petitioners claim that they are the absolute owners of the land in Sy.Nos.104 and 134, measuring to an

extent of 4 acres each, situate at Masthenahalli, Kaivara Hobli, Chintamani Taluk, Chikkaballapura District, which was proposed for acquisition for formation of industrial layout vide preliminary notification dated 03.02.2010 under Section 28(1) of the KIAD Act, followed by a final notification dated 26.05.2012. The petitioners contend that the possession of the aforesaid lands was taken over by the respondents. However, even after the acquisition proceedings were completed and possession was taken, the respondents failed to determine and pay the compensation.

(ii) Thereafter, respondent No.3 passed a general award dated 24.06.2017 determining compensation at a meagre sum and it was ordered to be deposited before the Civil Court. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioners have sought quashing of the general award dated 24.06.2017 and has further prayed for a direction to respondent No.3 to determine compensation payable in respect of the acquired land in terms of Section 29(2) of the KIAD Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners reiterated the above contentions and submits that in similar set of facts and

circumstances, this Court in W.P.No.27738/2026 passed an order dated 02.09.2026 granting relief for a consent award and therefore prays that this petition may also be disposed off on similar lines.

4. The learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 does not dispute the fact that the petitioners did not challenge the acquisition notifications issued by the respondent No.1. He also does not dispute the fact that a general award was passed determining the compensation payable in respect of the acquired land. He further does not dispute the fact that the issue raised in this petition is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in W.P.No.27738/2026

5. In view of the above, this writ petition is ***allowed***. The impugned general award dated 24.06.2017 passed by the respondent No.3, in so far as the petitioners' land is concerned is quashed. The respondent Nos.2 and 3 is directed to consider the case of the petitioners and pass a consent award as provided under Section 29(2) of the KIAD Act, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Amount, if any, deposited by respondent No.3 before the

competent Civil Court pursuant to the general award dated 24.06.2017, is permitted to be withdrawn.

6. It is made clear, in the event if there is no consensus or there is any dispute regarding the entitlement and apportionment of the award or there is any unresolved objections, the general award dated 24.06.2017 would stand revived and respondent No.3 shall redeposit the compensation, if it is refunded and the petitioners would be entitled to seek enhancement of the compensation in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE

BKN
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 33