HC-KAR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 39628 OF 2025 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

SMT. SUVARNA
W/O LATE R.BASAVARAJU
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
R/AT TIRUMALADEVARAHATTI
SATHENAHALLI POST, GUBBI
TUMKURU - 572 117.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI ALLAH BAKASH M, ADV.)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   HOME DEPARTMENT
   VIDHANA SOUDA - 560 001.

2. DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
   REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
   GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
   VIKASA SOUDA, BANGALORE - 560 001.

3. DIRECTOR GENERAL AND
   INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
   STATE OF KARNATAKA
   NRUPATHUNGA ROAD
   BANGALORE - 560 001.

4. THE COMMISSIONER
   DEVELOPMENT
   AUTHORITY OF TUMKURU
   TUMKURU - 573 201.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI ADITYA DIWAKAR, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INIDA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF

Digitally signed by NANDINI M S
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

MANDAMUS, ORDER OR DIRECTION TO COMPLY THE DIRECTIONS (NO.IV) PASSED BY THIS HON BLE COURT BY ITS FINAL ORDERIN DATED: 19.11.2010, W.P.NO.19957/2009, W.P.NO.16420/2010, W.P. NO.18063-18072/2010, W.P. NO.25363-369/2010, W.P. NO.18132-140/2010, W.P.NO.19515-19530/2010 VIZANNEXURE- A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

1. The present petition is instituted by the petitioner, who is the widow of Late R.Basavaraju, who was a member of the Karnataka State Reserve Police and was also a part of the 754 member Special Task Force, who were involved in the apprehending the notorious forest brigand Koose Munisamy Veerappan. The petitioner calls in the inaction of the respondents and further a direction in the nature of a mandamus directing the respondents to consider the representations and allot land to the petitioner in pursuance to directions issued by this Court and letter issued by respondent No.4.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State. The material placed on record has been carefully perused.

3. The short question that arises for consideration is as to whether there can be a direction to the respondents to allot land to the petitioner in pursuance of letter dated 07.05.2024, particularly in the light of the judgment rendered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in prior writ petitions, W.P.No.19957/2009 and others, wherein the very same directions were sought and the respondents were directed to allot land.

4. An ancillary, yet significant, issue that falls for consideration is as to whether the petitioner's late husband, who were serving in the Karnataka State Reserve Police and was also a part of the 754 member Special Task Force constituted exclusively for the purpose of tracking and neutralizing the said forest brigand, can be denied the benefit of the reward in terms of Government notification dated 08.07.2005.

5. This precise controversy is no longer *res integra*, inasmuch as a Coordinate Bench of this Court has already examined the issue in extenso and has proceeded to quash the very same endorsement impugned herein. In that view of the matter, it would be apposite to extract paragraph No.9 as well as the operative portion of the order passed in W.P.No.18063-18072/2010 c/w W.P.No.25363-369/2010 c/w W.P.No.18132-140/2010, which reads as under:

> *"9. This Court has taken into consideration all the aspects, in order to safeguard the interest of STF personnel as well as the Sate Government. The STF personnel should not feel that they are ignored by the State, though they virtually fought against Veerappan gang. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances and in the interest if equity, the following order is made:-*
>
> > *i) The prayer relating to quashing of Annexure-J, dated 17.5.2010, is rejected. The order at Annexure-J is held to be valid.*
> >
> > *ii) However, sites as per their eligibility shall be allotted to the petitioners, within two months, if available as of now.*

iii) If sites are not available as of now, respondents 1 and 2 are directed to comply with the order at Annexure-J, and the Corrigendum, dated 26.10.2010, issued by the State Government clarifying that the sital value (allotment price) of BDA is 2,100/- per sq.mtr, as early as possible, but not later than the outer limit of ***three months*** *from the date of this order. It is made clear that if the sital value (ailotment price) is not paid within three months, but is paid later, then, the State Government is directed to pay interest at the rate of 12% per annum, or the amount of sital value fixed by BDA, which would be existing as on the date of making payment, whichever is higher.*

iv) If sites are not allotted to any of the petitioners now, the petitioners and other similarly placed STF personnel are entitled to preferential allotment of sites in their respective Districts as and when the sites are formed and notified for allotment either by concerned Urban Development Authority/BDA or by the Housing Board.

v) In case if the sites are allotted to the petitioners and other similarly situated STF personnel as mentioned in order (iv) above, the sital value (allotment price) should be paid by the petitioners.

> *vi) In case if the petitioners do not accept the sital value pursuant to the impugned order at Annexure-J/Corrigendum (as arrived at in order-iii), the petitioners are liable to pay the difference of amount of sital value (allotment price), if any, on the date of such allotment. It is also made clear that in case if the sital value as fixed by the Allotting Authority is less than the amount to which the STF personnel are entitled to pursuant to the order at Annexure-J/Corrigendum (as arrived at in order-iii), the difference of amount should be paid to the petitioners by Government.*
>
> *Writ petitions are **disposed of** in the aforementioned terms."*

6. Having given anxious consideration to the findings recorded by the Coordinate Bench in the judgment extracted supra, this Court is of the considered view that the stand now canvassed by the State, seeking to deny the petitioners the benefit of reward, is wholly untenable and cannot be countenanced. The Coordinate Bench, upon an elaborate examination of the factual matrix, has categorically held that once the names of the personnel, including those from the Forest Department, are found in the list of eligible beneficiaries

prepared pursuant to the Government Order dated 08.07.2005, the State is estopped from denying such benefit on a specious plea that only a limited set of officers, who were present on the date when Koose Munisamy Veerappan was neutralized on 18.10.2004, would alone be entitled for the reward. The said contention of the State has been expressly rejected as being arbitrary, discriminatory, and contrary to the very object of the Government Order. This Court finds that the petitioner herein stand on identical footing as that of the petitioners in the earlier batch of writ petitions, and therefore, the denial of reward to the present petitioner would amount to perpetuation of an illegality which already stands corrected by judicial intervention.

7. This Court is also fortified in its view by the well-settled principle of law that when a Court has adjudicated upon an issue and granted relief in respect of a class of persons, the State and its instrumentalities, being model employers, are under a constitutional obligation to extend the benefit of such adjudication to all similarly situated persons, without driving each one of them to approach the Court individually. In this

regard, though rendered in a different factual context, the principles enunciated by the Division Bench in ***Nagappa vs. State of Karnataka***[1] are squarely applicable to the case on hand. The Division Bench has emphatically held that once a matter has attained finality and relief is granted, the authorities are duty-bound to uniformly apply the same to all eligible persons forming part of the same class. Applying the said principle to the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the respondents cannot discriminate between the petitioner herein and those who have already been extended the benefit pursuant to the earlier judgment.

8. In that view of the matter, this Court holds that the present petition is liable to succeed. The petitioner, whose name admittedly finds place in the list of eligible personnel, is entitled to be considered for grant of reward in terms of the Government Order dated 08.07.2005, and the respondents are bound to act in consonance with the directions already issued by this Court in the earlier round of litigation.

[1] W.A.No.1856 of 1986 Dated: 01.08.1986

9. For the foregoing reasons, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

(i) The writ petition is ***allowed***;

(ii) The respondents are hereby directed to consider the petitioner's representation and take action on the same in a time bound manner;

(iii) Respondent Nos.1 and 2 are directed to consider the case of the petitioner for allotment of land in accordance to the Government Order dated 08.07.2005, keeping in view the law laid down by this Court in W.P.No.18063-18072/2010 c/w W.P.No.25363-369/2010 c/w W.P.No.18132-140/2010;

(iv) Such consideration shall be undertaken expeditiously and in any event within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order;

(v) It is made clear that the respondents shall extend the benefit to the petitioner on parity with other similarly placed personnel, without driving them to further rounds of litigation.

Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE

DN
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 6