

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2024

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. P.S.DINESH KUMAR, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

WRIT APPEAL NO.1783 OF 2014 (LA-BDA)

C/W

WRIT APPEALS NO.1795 OF 2014, 1799 OF 2014,
 1802 OF 2014, 1803 OF 2014, 1806 OF 2014, 1966 OF 2014,
 1970 OF 2014, 1972 OF 2014, 1973 OF 2014, 1982 OF 2014,
 1986 OF 2014, 1988 OF 2014, 1989 OF 2014, 2000 OF 2014,
 2006 OF 2014, 2009 OF 2014, 2010 OF 2014, 2030 OF 2014,
 2032 OF 2014, 2033 OF 2014, 2034 OF 2014, 2035 OF 2014,
 2036 OF 2014, 2037 OF 2014, 2045 OF 2014, 2047 OF 2014,
 2048 OF 2014, 2052 OF 2014, 2063 OF 2014, 2064 OF 2014,
 2065 OF 2014, 2067 OF 2014, 2068 OF 2014, 2069 OF 2014,
 2239 OF 2014, 2243 OF 2014, 2244 OF 2014, 2246 OF 2014,
 2248 OF 2014, 2249 OF 2014, 2250 OF 2014, 2251 OF 2014,
 2255 OF 2014, 2256 OF 2014, 2259 OF 2014, 2261 OF 2014,
 2262 OF 2014, 2263 OF 2014, 2265 OF 2014, 2266 OF 2014,
 2267 OF 2014, 2268 OF 2014, 2269 OF 2014, 2446 OF 2014,
 2449 OF 2014, 2454 OF 2014, 2470 OF 2014, 2698 OF 2014,
 2717 OF 2014, 2718 OF 2014, 2719 OF 2014, 2725 OF 2014,
 2726 OF 2014, 2783 OF 2014, 2784 OF 2014, 2785 OF 2014,
 2787 OF 2014, 2808 OF 2014, 2810 OF 2014, 2811 OF 2014,
 2812 OF 2014, 2814 OF 2014, 2815 OF 2014, 2821 OF 2014,
 2825 OF 2014, 2827 OF 2014, 2828 OF 2014, 2829 OF 2014,
 2830 OF 2014, 2831 OF 2014, 2832 OF 2014, 2876 OF 2014,
 2877 OF 2014, 2879 OF 2014, 2880 OF 2014, 2881 OF 2014,
 2948 OF 2014, 2949 OF 2014, 2950 OF 2014, 2951 OF 2014,
 2953 OF 2014, 2954 OF 2014, 2955 OF 2014, 2956 OF 2014,
 2957 OF 2014, 2958 OF 2014, 3044 OF 2014, 3045 OF 2014,
 3046 OF 2014, 3047 OF 2014, 3049 OF 2014, 3050 OF 2014,
 3051 OF 2014, 3077 OF 2014, 3078 OF 2014, 3080 OF 2014,
 3082 OF 2014, 3083 OF 2014, 3084 OF 2014, 3085 OF 2014,
 3086 OF 2014, 3087 OF 2014, 3088 OF 2014, 3089 OF 2014,
 3091 OF 2014, 3159 OF 2014, 3160 OF 2014, 3162 OF 2014,
 3163 OF 2014, 876 OF 2015, 877 OF 2015, 879 OF 2015,
 880 OF 2015, 1010 OF 2015, 1164 OF 2015, 1166 OF 2015,
 1168 OF 2015, 1172 OF 2015, 1173 OF 2015, 1771 OF 2015,
 939 OF 2016, 1015 OF 2016, 1016 OF 2016, 1343 OF 2016,
 1344 OF 2016, 1644 OF 2016, 1818 OF 2016, 2104 OF 2016,
 2105 OF 2016, 417 OF 2017, 1798 OF 2014, 2245 OF 2014,
 2254 OF 2014, 2458 OF 2014, 2708 OF 2014, 2709 OF 2014,
 2781 OF 2014, 2782 OF 2014, 2786 OF 2014, 2817 OF 2014,
 2818 OF 2014, 2819 OF 2014, 3048 OF 2014, 3079 OF 2014,
 3081 OF 2014, 3090 OF 2014, 3125 OF 2014, 3165 OF 2014,
 3166 OF 2014, 1181 OF 2015, 1004 OF 2016, 1005 OF 2016,
 1020 OF 2016, 1339 OF 2016, 418 OF 2017 And 694 OF 2022 (LA-BDA)

IN W.A. NO.1783 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. R. SHANKARAN
S/O SRI. RANGASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.54, 7TH MAIN
NANDINI LAYOUT
SARASWATHIPURAM
BANGALORE-560 098.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)
R1-SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 32186/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1795 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. N. RAVISHANKAR
S/O LATE R.G. NANJUNDAPPA @
R.G. NANJUNDARADHYA
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
RESIDENT OF KOMMAGHATTA
SULIKERE POST
BANGALORE-560 050.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 31120/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO. 1799 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. S. RAMAIAH
S/O LATE SIDDARAMAIAH
SINCE DEAD BY LRs
- 1(A) SMT. MUNIYAMMA
W/O LATE SRI. S. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
- 1(B) SRI. THIMMEGOWDA R.
S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
- 1(C) SRI. GANGADHAR R.
S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
- 1(D) SRI. MANJUNATH R.
S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
- 1(E) SRI. HANUMARAJ R.
S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS

- 1(F) SRI. PRAKASH R.
S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
- 1(G) SRI. NAGARAJ R. NAGARABHAVI
S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
ALL ARE RESIDING AT
NO.15, ISSAAC ROAD
NAGARABHAVI
BANGALORE-560 072.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS
- (BY SHRI. B.S. GAUTHAM, ADVOCATE FOR R1(A TO G);
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 35628/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1802 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS
- (BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. ANURADHA
W/O DR. M.R. SREEVATHSA
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
RESIDING AT 'KRISHNA' 54 & 55
K.G. NAGAR MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE-560 019.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.S. ASHWIN KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 13000/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1803 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST

T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. K.B. YELLAPPA
S/O LATE DODDABYRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS
2. SRI. K.B. MUNIRAJU
S/O LATE DODDABYRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS

BOTH ARE R/AT FARM HOUSE
CONSTRUCTED IN SY. NO. 3/2
KENCHAPURA VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 0

3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. L.M. RAMAIAH GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL, IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 9842-44/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO. 1966 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. ACHAMMA AMMINI JOSEPH
W/O LATE MR. K.A. JOSEPH
AGED ABOUT 95 YEARS
NO.87, 7TH CROSS, 1ST MAIN
VERSOVA LAYOUT, KAGGADASAPURA ROAD
SIR. C.V. RAMAN NAGAR POST
BANGLORE-560 093.

REPRESENTED BY HER GPA HOLDER

MR. JOSEPH ALEXANDER
S/O LATE MR. K.A. JOSEPH
NO.87, 7TH CROSS, 1ST MAIN
VERSOVA LAYOUT
KAGGADASAPURA ROAD
SIR. C.V. RAMAN NAGAR POST
BANGALORE-560 093.
SINCE DEAD BY LRs

- 1(A) MR. JOSEPH ALEXANDER
S/O LATE MR. K.A. JOSEPH
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS
NO.87, 7TH CROSS, 1ST MAIN
VARSOVA LAYOUT
KAGGADASAPURA ROAD
SIR. C.V. RAMAN NAGAR POST
BANGALORE-560 093.
- 1(B) MR. JOSEPH K.S.
S/O LATE MR. K.A. JOSEPH
AGED ABOUT 72 YEARS
NO.14, TARAPORE AVENUE CHETPET
CHENNAI-600 031.
TAMIL NADU
- 1(C) MR. BINOY JOSEPH
S/O LATE K.A. JOSEPH
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS

R/AT NO.3/26, MCNICHOLS ROAD
2ND MAIN ROAD, CHEPET
CHENNAI-600 031.
TAMIL NADU

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE
FOR R1(A TO C);
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL, IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 12969-
972/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1970 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. PUTTAPPA
S/O LATE MAHIMANNA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS

RESIDING AT RAMASANDRA
KENGRI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 0.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 14913 &
14914/2013 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO. 1972 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. G. LAKSHMINARAYANA
S/O LATE G. GOVINDAPPA
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRs

1(A) SMT. SHASHIKALA
W/O LATE G. LAKSHMINARAYANA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS

1(B) SRI. KUSHAL KUMAR L.
S/O LATE G. LAKSHMINARAYANA
AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS

1(C) INDIRA L
D/O LATE G. LAKSHMINARAYANA
AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS

1(A) TO 1(C) ALL ARE RESIDING AT
NO.225, 6TH CROSS, RAJAGOPALANAGARA
MAIN ROAD, NEAR LAKSHMI DEVI FLOUR MILL
PEENYA II STAGE
BENGALURU-560 058.

2. VENKATALAKSHMAMMA
W/O LATE NANJUNDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS

3. MANGALA GOWRI
W/O N. SHANKAR
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS

4. DEVAKI
W/O CHANDRAIAH
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
NO.225, 6TH CROSS, RAJAGOPALANAGAR
MAIN ROAD, NEAR LAKSHMI DEVI
FLOUR MILL, PEENYA 2ND STAGE
BENGALURU-560 058.

5. RANGAPPA
S/O PRASURAMAPPA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
SINCE DED BY HIS LRS

5(1) HANUMAKKA
W/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS

5(2) K.R. RAMESH
S/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS

5(3) KRISHNA
S/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS

5(4) RANGANATH
S/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRS

5(4)(A) SMT. PUSHPA
W/O LATE RANGANATH
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS

5(4)(B) SRI. CHETAN
S/O LATE RANGANATH
AGED ABOUT 17 YEARS

5(4)(C) TEJASWINI
D/O LATE RANGANATH
AGED ABOUT 15 YEARS

5(4)(D) SMT. MAHALAKSHMI
D/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDENTS OF
NO. 121, 3RD FLOOR, 4TH MAIN
VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 049.

6. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. K. BHANUPRASAD, ADVOCATE FOR R1(A-C);
SHRI. B. SRINIVAS, ADVOCATE FOR R2, R3,
R4A TO R4D AND R5;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R6;

VIDE ORDER DATED 29/11/2021 NOTICE TO R5(1),
R5(4)(B), R5(4)(C) HELD SUFFICIENT)

THIS WRIT APPEAL, IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 29520/2012
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1973 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. K.S. MANJULA
D/O K.H. SRINIVASA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
RESIDING AT SY. NO. 31/2
HOSABYROHALLI
KOMMAGATTA PANCHAYATHI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS REVENUE SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. GANAPATHI BHAT VAJRALLI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 33131 & 35309/2011 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1982 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. M. NANJAPPA
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LR
N. SHIVASHANKAR
S/O LATE M. NANJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 702
MPM LAYOUT, 80 FEET ROAD
OPPOSITE TO AMBEDKAR INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY, MALLATHAHALLI
BANGALORE-560 056.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE AND

SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 11025/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1986 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. DABBAGULLAPPA
S/O LATE RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
RESIDING AT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. M.C. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 40644-
645/2011 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1988 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. H.R. CHARITABLE TRUST
A REGISTERED CHARITABLE
TRUST, HAVING ITS REGD.
OFFICE AT NO. 8, APPAJAPPA
AGRAHARA, CHAMARAJPET
BANGALORE-560 018.
REP. BY ITS MANAGING TRUSTEE
SRI. R. SRINIVAS
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. SHANMUKHAPPA, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 8901/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1989 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MARAPPA
S/O KADIRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRS

- 1(A). SMT. ARUVAMMA
W/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS

- 1(B). SRI. KADARIPATHI
S/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS

- 1(C). SRI. SHIVSHANKARA

S/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS

1(D). SMT. MUNILAKSHMI
D/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS

1(E). SRI. NAGARAJU
S/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS

1(F). SRI. LAKSHMANA
S/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS

1(G). SMT. NETHRAVATHI
D/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS

1(A) TO 1(G) ARE RESIDING AT
NO. 76/1, ISEC ROAD
NAGARABHAVI VILLAGE
BANGALORE-560 072.

1(H). SRI. SOMASHEKAR
S/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
RESIDING AT: HOSA BYROHALLI
NEAR VEERANJANEYA TEMPLE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.

1(I). SRI. ASHWATH
S/O LATE MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
RESIDING AT: NO. 169
GAYATHRI LAYOUT (RAMASANDRA DHAKALE)
5TH CROSS, SULIKERE POST
KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.

1(J). SMT. SARASWATHAMMA
W/O SRI. N. RAVI
D/O LATE MARAPPA

AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
RESIDING AT: NO. 208
2ND FLOOR, SHIVU WOODS APARTMENT
NAGARABHAVI VILLAGE
BANGALORE-560 072.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. J.M. RAJANNA SHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR R1(A-J);
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL, IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 12781/2011
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2000 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. N. UMASHANKAR
S/O NARASIMHAIAH

AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
RESIDENT OF NO. 108
THAGGIGUPPE VILLAGE
MAGADI TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT

2. SRI. MARIYAPPA
S/O LATE BETTAIAH
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA VILLAGE
BHEEMANAKUPPE
DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.
3. SRI. BETTAPPA
S/O LATE BETTAIAH
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS
RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA
VILLAGE, BHEEMANAKUPPE
DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.
4. SRI. JAVARAPPA
S/O LATE BETTAIAH
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA
VILLAGE, BHEEMANAKUPPE
DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.
5. SMT. JAYAMMA
W/O LATE HUCHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA
VILLAGE, BHEEMANAKUPPE
DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.
6. SRI. K. SHIVALINGAM
S/O SRI. KUPPASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT NO.1121, SAI BABA NILAYA
9TH CROSS, 2ND BLOCK
BSK 1ST STAGE
BANGALORE-560 050.

7. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. R. HEMANTHARAJ, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. D.L. JAGADEESH, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. PRAMOD, ADVOCATE FOR R2-R5;
R6 SERVED;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R7)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 6313-
6318/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A NO.2006 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. VENKATAMUNIYAPPA
S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 78 YEARS
2. SRI. VENKATA ARASAPPA

S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 76 YEARS

3. SRI. MARIYAPPA @ VENKATA ARASAPPA
S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS

R1 TO R3 ARE RESIDING AT
NO.14, SEEGEHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK-560 022.

4. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
GOVT. OF KARNATAKA
M.S. BUILDINGS
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R4)
R1 TO R3 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 46127-
129/2013 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2009 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. B.R. CHANDRASHEKARAIH
S/O LATE RUDRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
RESIDENT OF BANGALE VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. M.C. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 42536/2011
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2010 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. K.N. BASAVARADYA
S/O NANJUNARADHYA
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
RESIDENT OF NO. 1189/C
4TH MAIN, 14TH CROSS
M.C. LAYOUT, BANGALORE-560 040.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. M.C. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 44048/2011
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2030 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 020.
 - 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.
... APPELLANTS
- (BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SRI G LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT MUNIYAMMA
AGED ABOUT 79 YEARS,
D/O.LATE ARALAPPA,
SINCE DECEASED BY LR_s
 - 1(a) SRI MUDDANNA
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS
S/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA
 - 1(b) SRI MUNINARASAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS
 - 1(c) KAMBADANARASAPPA,
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LR
 - 1(c)(i) SRI SANTOSH KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS
S/O LATE KAMBADANARASAPPA
 - 1(d) SMT MUNILAKSHMAMMA
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
D/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA
 - 1(e) SRI NAGARAJ
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
S/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA
 - 1(f) SRI MUNIRAJU
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS
S/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA
- ALL ARE R/AT KKRISHNASAGAR VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE-560 060
- 2 . SMT. HANUMA NARASAMMA
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS,
W/O LATE GANGAPPA
 - 3 . SMT. HANUMAKKA

AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS,
D/O LATE NARASIAH,
SINCE DECEASED BY LRs

- 3(a) SRI HANUMANARASIAH
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASIAH
- 3(b) SRI THIMMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASIAH
- 3(c) SRI LAKSHMANA
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASIAH
- 3(d) SMT ANNAMMA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
D/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASIAH
- 3(e) SRI K N CHANNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASIAH

ALL ARE R/AT K KRISHNASAGAR VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE-560 060

- 4 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
MULTISTORIED BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI PRABHULING K NAVADGI, AG A/W
SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R4
SRI C M NAGABHUSHANA & P V CHANDRASHEKAR,
ADVOCATES FOR R1 TO R3

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 29668/2010 DATED
11/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2032 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. UMADEVI
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
2. SRI. G. SIDDALINGASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
3. SRI. K.G. GURUSANTHA
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDENTS OF
KANNALLI, KODIGEHALLI POST
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT-572 127.
4. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. L.M. RAMAIAH GOWDA, ADVOCATE
FOR R1 TO R3;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R4)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 40958/2012 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2033 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. PARAMASHIVAIAH
S/O LATE VEERANNA
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS
RESIDING AT SY. NO.154
KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE
Kengeri Hobli
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
MULTISTORIED BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. H.C. DUSHYANTH ARADHYA, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3134/2012 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO. 2034 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. MOHAN KUMAR
S/O CHIKKATHIMMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
R/AT BETTANAPALYA
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK.
2. SRI. T. NAGARAJU
S/O LATE THAYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/AT BETTANAPALYA VILLAGE
BHIMANAKUPPE DAKALE
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK.
3. SMT. JAYAMMA
W/O K.P. NARAYANA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT NO.75/1, 2ND CROSS

KANAKANA PALYA 2ND BLOCK
JAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 011.

4. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R4)
R1 AND R3 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 251-255/2013
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2035 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. S. RAMACHANDRA
S/O LATE SANJEEVAIAH
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS

R/AT OLD NO.322/15, NEW NO.20
6TH CROSS, G.P. RAJARATHNAM ROAD
HANUMANTHA NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 019.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. A.V. SRINIVAS, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 25616/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2036 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 020.
- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560020.
....APPELLANTS
- (BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SRI MUDDANNA
AGED 63 YEARS,
S/O LATE VEERAKEMPAIAH,

RESIDING AT BHIMANAKUPPE VILLAGE,
RAMOHALLI, KENGERI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK.

2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP.BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
MULTISTORIED BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560001.

3 . S. CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED 42 YEARS
S/O LATE SANJEEVAIAH
RESIDING AT NO.20, 4TH CROSS,
A.G.S. LAYOUT, BANGALORE-560061.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2;
SMT. K K THAYAMMA, ADVOCATE FOR R1
SRI. A V SRINIVAS, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 33267/2011 DATED
11/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2037 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

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

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2;
SHRI. K.MUNIYAPPA FOR
SHRI. LOHITASWA BANAKAR, ADVOCATES FOR R1)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.37886/2012
DATED 11/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2045 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. SRINIVAS @ SEENAPPA
S/O LATE VENKATARAMANAPPA
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRS
- 1(A) SMT. JAYAMMA
W/O LATE SRINIVASA @ SEENAPPA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
- 1(B) SRI. NAGESH S.
S/O LATE SRINIVASA @ SEENAPPA
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
- 1(C) SRI. VENKATESH S.

S/O LATE SRINIVASA @ SEENAPPA
AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS

R1(A-C) ARE RESIDING AT
NO.131, RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK
BENGALURU-560 060.

2. SRI. MOHAN
S/O LATE VENKATARAMANAPPA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
R/AT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.
3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. M.C. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE
FOR R1(A-C) AND R2;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 11306-
307/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2047 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. S.K.N. SWAMY
S/O SRI. S.V.K. SWAMY
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/AT NO. 298, 1ST FLOOR
15TH CROSS, 5TH PHASE
J.P. NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 078.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. B.N. TULSI KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 12225/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2048 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

IN W.A. NO.2052 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. T. BHAGYAMMA
W/O SRI. S. KRISHNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
OWNER OF SITE NO.30A, 3, 8
RESIDENT OF 94/3, 94/5
SEEGEHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE.
2. THE SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
STATE OF KARNATAKA
BANGALORE-560 001.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M. SHIVAPRAKASH, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)
R1 AND R3 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 28146/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2063 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMAR PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. M.H. MAMATHA
W/O LATE M.N. HARINATH
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 1433
PIPELINE, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. R. RANGASWAMY, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. C. CHANNEGOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 20398-
20414/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2064 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BANGALORE-560020.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI G LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . SRI B. M. KRISHNA MURTHY
S/O M. MUNIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,

2 . HEMALATHA
D/O SRI B. M. KRISHNA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS

3 . LAVANYA
D/O SRI B. M. KRISHNA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 21 YEARS

4 . MASTER KIRAN GOWDA
S/O SRI B. M. KRISHNA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS

ALL ARE R/AT BABASAHEBARA PALYA,
BASAVESHWARA NAGAR,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE.

5 . M/S N D PROPERTIES PVT. LTD.,

A PRIVATE LIMITED COMPANY
INCORPORATED
UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT 1 OF 1956
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT NO.398,
2ND FLOOR, 7TH CROSS,
MICO LAYOUT, BTM 2ND STAGE,
BANGALORE-560076
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR MR. M.K.K. DURRANI

6 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
AMBEDKAR VEEDI
BANGALORE-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI PRABHULING K NAVADGI, AG A/W
SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R6
SRI TOMY SEBASTIAN, ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R5)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.26373/2010
DATED 11/7/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2065 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. B.R. CHANDRASHEKARAIHAH
S/O LATE RUDRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS
RESIDING AT BANGALE VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGRI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. M.C. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 23247/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2068 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. KRISHNAPPA
S/O BYRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS
RESIDING AT KANNALLI
KODIGEHALLI POST
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT-560 058.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. L.M. RAMAIAH GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 43714/2012
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2069 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER

KUMARA PARK WEST
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE 560020

- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE 560020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI G LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT P N NIRANJANI
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
W/O H M S KUMAR
R/A KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE 560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI PRABHULING K NAVADGI, AG A/W
SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2
SRI K SHASHI KIRAN SHETTY, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI M SREENIVASA, ADVOCATE FOR R1)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.19807-
19808/2010 DATED 11/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2239 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. DHARMA NARAYANA
S/O SRI. VENKATARAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
AGRICULTURIST
RESIDING AT NO.1/4, 4TH MAIN
HVR LAYOUT, BANGALORE-560 057.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. H.T. VASANTH KUMAR, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. Y.D. SHIVASHANKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.32187/2010 AND
34096-098/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2243 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER

2. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. SHAMANTHAKAMANI
W/O A. SANJANNA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/AT YELLAE KODIGEHALLI
GOLLARAHATTI CROSS
MAGADI MAIN ROAD
VISHWANEEDAM POST
BANGALORE-560 091. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
R2 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.40115/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2244 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST, BANGALORE
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. NANJUNDA ARADHYA
S/O LATE NANJAPPA ARADHYA
SINCE DEAD BY LRs
- 2(A) SRI. K.N. BASAVARADYA
S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNNDARADYA
AGED ABOUT 72 YEARS
R/AT NO. 1189/C, 4TH MAIN
14TH CROSS, M.C. LAYOUT
VIJAYNAGAR, BANGALORE-560 040.
- 2(B) SMT. SHANTHAKUMARI
W/O LATE K.N. MURUGENDRARADYA
AGE UNKNOWN
- 2(C) SMT. LAVANYA
D/O LATE K.N. MURUGENDRARADYA
AGE UNKNOWN

BOTH ARE RESIDING AT
NO.56, 1ST MAIN, 4TH CROSS
HOSAHALLI, VIJAYNAGAR
BENGALURU-560 085.

2(D) SRI. N. MRUTYUNJAYA
S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNNDARADYA
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS
R/AT NO. 98, 4TH MAIN, 5TH 'A' CROSS
VIDYAGIRI LAYOUT
NAGARBHAVI CIRCLE
BENGALURU-560 072.

2(E) SMT. K.N. GIRIJAMBA
W/O T.G. PARAMASHIVA
D/O LATE K.N. NANJUNNDARADYA
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS
R/AT RAJABEEDHI, TAVAREKERE
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK
BENGALURU-562 130.

2(F) SRI. K.N. SHIVAPRAKASH
S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNNDARADYA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS
R/AT NO. 595, 12TH CROSS
CHANDRA LAYOUT
VTC BENGALURU P.O. NAGARBHAVI
BENGALURU-560 072.

2(G) SRI. K.N. CHIDANANDA
S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNNDARADYA
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT NO. 65, KOMAGATTA
SULIKERE, BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK
BENGALURU-560 060.

2(H) SRI. K.N. GIRISH
S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNNDARADYA
AGED 60 YEARS
R/AT NO.65, KOMAGATTA ROAD
KOMAGATTA, BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK
BENGALURU-560 060. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. H.N. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE
FOR R2(A) TO R2(H);
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 19118/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2246 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. LAKSHMAMMA
SINCE DEAD BY HER LRs
- 2(A) HANUMAIAH H.C.K
H/O. LATE LAKSHMAMMA
AGED ABOUT 72 YEARS
- 2(B) RAJESH H.C.K
S/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS

2(C) KOMALA KUMARI H.C.K
D/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS

2(D) PUSHPA KUMAR
D/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS

2(E) KUSUMA KUMARI
D/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
NO. 53/9, NEAR MARUTI SCHOOL
SKANDANAGAR, KODAGEHALLI OF
MAGADI ROAD
BANGALORE-560 112.

3. DR. AMBEDKAR SC/ST EDUCATIONAL
AND SOCIAL WELFARE TRUST (REGD)
NO. 53, KODAGEHALLI
BANGALORE-560 091.
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. N. MANOHAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2(A) TO R2(E))
R3 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 17461/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2248 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. P. GOPINATH
S/O SRI. S. PALANI
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
R/AT SEEGEHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHAPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
R2 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 45934/2011
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2249 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P.WEST, BANGALORE
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P.WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.

APPELLANTS NO.1 AND 2 ARE
BEING THE DIFFERENT
SECTION OF THE SAME AUTHORITY
BOTH ARE REPRESENTED BY ALAOAPPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S.BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. G. RAMAKRISHNAPPA
S/O JUNJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
R/AT HUNASEMARADAPALYA
KENERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 050.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. T. NARAYANA SWAMY AND
SHRI. H.M. GOPAL, ADVOCATES FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 1753/2013
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2250 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. V. KRISHNAMURTHY
S/O V. KRISHNAMURTHY
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
R/AT NO.53/5, SKANDANAGAR
KODIGEHALLI POST
BANGALORE-560 091.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. L. UMASHANKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 34191/2011
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A.NO.2251 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

K.P. WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY
VIDHANA VEEDI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. M. LAKSHMINARAYANA
S/O SRI. MUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
R/AT NO. 140, AVALAHALLI
MYSORE ROAD
BANGALORE.
3. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1 AND R3;
SHRI. GANAPATHI BHAT VAJRALLI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 22777/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2255 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

K.P. WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. G. GALAPPA
S/O LATE GALAPPA
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
RESIDENT OF NO. 53/5
SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST
BANGALORE-91.
3. SMT. ANJINAMMA
W/O LATE LAKKAPPA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
RESIDENT OF NO. 53/5
SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST
BANGALORE-91.
4. SRI. VENKATASWAMIAH
W/O LATE RAMADASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
RESIDENT OF NO. 53/3
SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST
BANGALORE-91.
5. SRI. VENKATACHALAI AH
S/O LATE VENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
RESIDENT OF NO. 53/2

SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST
BANGALORE-91. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. L. UMASHANKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R5)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 35445-
35448/2011 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2256 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
K.P.WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
K.P.WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S.BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. T.A.MUNISWAMY NAIDU
S/O LATE T.ANJANEYULU
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
NO.112, 7TH MAIN ROAD
5TH CROSS, SRINIVASANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 050. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHAN, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 32869/2013
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2259 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P.WEST, BANGALORE
2. THE ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P.WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPT.
VIKAS SOUDHA
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE
2. SMT. SOUBHAGYAMMA
W/O V.K. RAMEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS
R/AT NO. 38, MIG
80 FEET ROAD
KENGARI SATTELLITE TOWN
BANGALORE-560 060.

3. K.G. NANDINI ENTERPRISES
NANDAAGOKULA LAYOUT
REPRESENTED BY ITS
JOINT DEVELOPERS
NAGARAJU, SY NO.161
RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
NEAR SIR M.V. LAYOUT
KENGRI HOBLI
SULIKERE POST
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060 ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. G. NARAYANA RAO, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
VIDE ORDER DTD 22.08.2017 SERVICE OF
NOTICE TO R3 IS DISPENSED WITH)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.44554/2012
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2261 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
HOUSING & URBAN

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
M.S.BUILDING
DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR BEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.

2. SMT. GANGAMALLAMMA
W/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS
3. SRI. S.M. ARASE GOWDA
S/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
4. SRI. S.M. MUNIYAPPA
S/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
5. SMT. S.M. UMA DEVI
D/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
6. SRI. S.M. ANNAYANNA
S/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS

RESPONDENTS NO.2 TO 6 ARE
RESIDING AT NO.14
SEEGEHALLI VILLAGE
MAGADI ROAD
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
PIN-560 060

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. G.S. VENKATA SUBBARAO, ADVOCATE FOR
R2 TO R6)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.33657/2010 &
40928/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2262 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. DE PAUL SERVICE SOCIETY
HOSAPALYA, BYROHALLI ROAD
KUMBALAGODU POST
BANGALORE-560 074.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRESIDENT
FATHER FRANSIS
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. LOHITASWA BANAKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 33243-
33246/2011 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2263 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST, BANGALORE
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE
2. SRI. Y.N. CHENNAPPA
S/O LATE NAGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
R/AT 'SAMUDAYA RESIDENCY'
BLOCK-B, KODIGEHALLI
VISHWANEEDAM POST
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
MAGADI MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE-560 091.
3. SMT. RUKMINI BAI
W/O V. RAMA RAO
AGED ABOUT YEARS
R/AT SY. NO. 94/3
KODIGEHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. B.V. VIDYULATHA, ADVOCATE FOR R2
R3 – SERVED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 251-255/2013
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2265 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P.WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P.WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI MURUGESH V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560 001
- 2 . SRI.H.C.PRAKASH
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
S/O LATE CHIKKANNA
R/AT NO.730 C, 9TH CROSS,
5TH MAIN, M.C.LAYOUT,
VIJAYANAGAR,
BANGALORE-560040

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI PRABHULING K NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R1
SRI S V GIRIDHAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 7297/2010 DATED
11/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2266 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S.BUILDING, B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. C. SUNITHA REDDY
D/O SRI NARAYANA REDDY
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
RESIDENT OF NO. 59, 9TH CROSS
MUNISWAR NAGAR, ULLAL MAIN ROAD
JNANABHARATHI POST
BANGALORE-560 056.

AND:

1 . SRI P V JOHNY
AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS,
S/O VARGHESE MATHAI,

2 . SMT. SARAMMA JOHNY
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS,
W/O SRI P.V. JOHNY,

BOTH ARE R/AT NO.74/E,
17TH "A" CROSS, 4TH BLOCK,
BASAVESHWARA NAAR,
BANGALORE-560079.
REPRESENTED BY THEIR
GPA HOLDER
SRI SAJJAN JOHNY
S/O P.V. JOHNY
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,

3 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT, M.S. BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560001.

....RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI PRABULING K NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3
R1 & R2 SERVED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.32653-
32656/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2269 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020

2. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT NIRMALA
W/O SRI S. THIMMARAJU
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 143/96
BANASHANKARI
BANAGIRI NAGAR 3RD STAGE
BANGALORE-560 085.
2. SRI. B.C. CHIKKANNA
S/O LATE CHIKKANNA
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
RESIDING AT BYADARAHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALOE-560 091.
3. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
HOUSING & URBAN
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDI
BANGALORE-560 001.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. T. JEEVANTH, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. S.V. GIRIDHAR, ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. B.S. JEEVAN KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 11837 AND
11838/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2446 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. BASAVARAJU
S/O SRI REVANNA
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT 'BANGALE'
SULIKERE VILLAGE AND POST
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 15705/2013 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2449 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. MAREGOWDA
S/O SRI VENKATARAMANAPPA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/O KENCHANAPURA VILLAGE
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BANGALORE-560 074.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. L.M. RAMAIAH GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 36986/2011 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2454 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. N.K. SHIVAKUMAR
S/O SRI. S. KRISHNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS
R/O BHEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE
HUNISE MARADA DAKHALE
Kengeri Hobli
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 42138/2012 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2470 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
K.P. WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
K.P. WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. K.P. MANJUNATH
S/O LATE PUTTA NANJUNDAPPA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
2. SRI. K.P. VIRUPAKSHARADHYA
S/O LATE PUTTA NANJUNDAPPA
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS

RESPONDENTS NO.1 & 2 ARE
RESIDING IN HOUSE CONSTRUCTED
IN THE LAND BEARING BY NO.111/5
KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE
KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060
3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING

BANGALORE-560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3)
SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.11966-967/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2698 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. S. SUDHAKAR
S/O SRI K.L. SIDDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. F 101/17
MARAMMA TEMPLE STREET
3RD MAIN, 3RD CROSS, K.G.NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 019.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 173/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2717 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. MANJULA
W/O B.M. RENUKESHWARA
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.931/1097
1ST MAIN ROAD, 2ND PHASE
GIRINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 085.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. NARASIMHARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 176/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2718 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. S. SARVAMANGALA
W/O N. RANGARAJ URS
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.425
2ND CROSS, NAGAPPA STREET
P.G.HALLI
BANGALORE-560 003.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;

SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 177/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2719 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. H.C. SAROJAMMA
W/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA
SINCE DEAD BY LRs
- 1(A) P.S. SATHEESH BABU
S/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
NO.424, 9TH A CROSS
4TH MAIN ROAD
ANNAPURNESHWARI NAGAR
BENGALURU-560 091.
- 1(B) P.S. SHIVA KUMAR
S/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
NO.424, 9TH A CROSS

4TH MAIN ROAD
ANNAPURNESHWARI NAGAR
BENGALURU-560 091.

1(C) SMT. P.S. GEETHA
D/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
NO.24, SADHASHIVA TEMPLE ROAD
RAMASWAMY PALYA
BENGALURU-560 033.

1(D) SMT. P.S. KANAKA MANJULA
D/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
NO. 83, 1ST MAIN ROAD
MARAPPA LAYOUT
RAJARAJESHWARI NAGAR
BENGALURU-560 098.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. K.S. KALLESHPA, ADVOCATE
FOR R1(A) TO R1(D);
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 179/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2725 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. D.S. BALACHANDRA
S/O SRI. DALI SATHYANARAYANA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.4, 3RD MAIN
EKADANTA BADAVANE
K. KRISHNASAGARA VILLAGE
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 181/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2726 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. SHARANAPPA GURIKAR
S/O SRI. AYYAPPA GURIKAR
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. V 2/2
RING ROAD
VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE
MYSORE-570 017.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 182/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2783 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. LAKSHMIDEVI
W/O SRI. VIRATARAYA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.72
5TH CROSS, RAMAKRISHNA LAYOUT
MALAGALA MAIN ROAD
VISHWANEEDAM
BANGALORE-560 091.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3084/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2784 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. MANJULA H
W/O SRI DAYASHANKAR
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.29
43A LAST STOP
KATRIGUPPE MAIN ROAD
SANESHWARASWAMY TEMPLE
3RD STAGE, BSK
BANGALORE-560 085.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)
R1 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3085/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2785 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. A.N. SREEKANTA
S/O LATE A.C. NANJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
RESIDING AT
Z.A.R.C.V.C. FARM
MANDYA-571 405.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3086/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2787 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. MONTHINE PINTO
W/O SRI G. PINTO
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 20
7TH CROSS, BHAVANINAGAR
CHRIST SCHOOL ROAD
BANGALORE-560 029.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3089/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2808 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST

BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. SARASU VENUGOPALA
W/O G.R. VENUGOPALA
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT NO. 156, 3RD MAIN ROAD
KUVEMPU ROAD, GKVK LAYOUT-UAS
BANGALORE-560 064. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
R2 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3114/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2810 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. V.N. MURALIKRISHNA
S/O LATE V.S. NANJUNDA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
R/AT NO. 20, 1ST FLOOR
4TH MAIN ROAD, CHAMARAJPET
BANGALORE-18. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3133/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2811 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. MANJULA RAVINDRA PUROHIT
W/O RAVINDRA V. PUROHIT
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
R/AT NO. 279, 10TH CROSS
NEAR MYTHRI STORES, N.R. COLONY
BANGALORE-560 019. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3115/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2812 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. PREMA N. GOWDA
W/O C. NARAYANA GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT 694/17, 5TH MAIN, 11TH CROSS
M.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040.
3. SMT. SUNANDA
D/O A. CHANNE GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
R/AT 966, 10TH B MAIN ROAD
4TH E BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010.
4. SMT. SUMITHRA VISHANKANTA
W/O LATE VISHAKANTA
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
R/AT 694, 5TH MAIN, 11TH CROSS
M.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
R2 TO R4 SERVED.

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NOs.33599-
601/2014 & 34378/2014 DATED 28/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2815 OF 2014**BETWEEN:**

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

K.P. WEST, BANGALORE.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. CHIKKANNA
S/O MAHIMANNA
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/AT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-31.
3. MANJUNATHA
S/O LATE RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
R/AT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-31. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRHI. H.N. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R2
V/O DTD. 19.03.2018 SERVICE OF
NOTICE TO R3 IS HELD SUFFICIENT)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 57463-
464/2013 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2821 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER

2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.

2. SRI. HULLURIAIAH
S/O HANUMANTHAIHAH
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
R/AT NO.9, SY. NO. 46/1
KODIGEHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 091.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 12326/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2825 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. A.N. VISHWANATH
S/O SRI. A.G. NAGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
R/AT NO. 24, EKADANTA BADAVANE
K. KRISHNA SAGARA VILLAGE
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.
3. SMT. M. GANGA JAYAKUMAR
W/O SRI. M.M. JAYAKUMAR
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/AT NO.8, KAVERI NILAYA
CHINNAPPANAHALLI, MARATHHALLI
BANGALORE-560 037.

4. SMT. SHOBHAVATHI T.R.
W/O G.M. NARASIMHA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
R/AT NO.11, 1ST BLOCK
PWD QUARTERS, WILSON GARDEN
BANGALORE-560 027.
5. SMT. MONTHINE PINTO
W/O MR. G. PINTO
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
R/AT NO.20, 7TH CROSS
BHAVANINAGAR, CHRIST SCHOOL ROAD
BANGALORE-560 029.
6. SRI. G.M. RAMANATH
S/O SRI. G.R. MADAPPA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/AT NO.6/27, 14TH CROSS
6TH BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010.
7. SRI. S. BALAJI
S/O S. VENKATARAMANAPPA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
R/AT NO. 90, 3RD CROSS
MOUNT JOY LAYOUT
HANUMANTHNAGAR
BANGALORE-560 019.
8. SMT. B.R. SHASHIKALA
W/O SRI. NARYANA RAO
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
R/AT NO.2/5, SARASWATHIPURA
NANDINI LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 096.
9. SRI. SHIVA PRASAD GUPTA
S/O SRI. KANTHARAJA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/AT NO.104, 3RD 'A' CROSS
B.C.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040.
10. SMT. GAYATHRI

- W/O MANJUNATHA RAO
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/AT NO. V-60, 6TH CROSS
PIPELINE, MALLESWARAM
BANGALORE-560 003.
11. SMT. PUSHPA SHIVALINGAPPA
W/O DR. B.M. SHIVALINGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT NO. 159. T/2
"SAMPOORNA APARTMENTS"
8TH MAIN, BETWEEN 7TH AND 8TH CROSS
MALLESWARAM
BANGALORE-560 003.
12. SMT. SARASU VENUGOPAL
W/O G.R. VENUGOPAL
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT NO.5, BEHIND SRI. RAMA VIDYALAYA
NAVYANAGARA JAKKUR
BANGALORE-560 064.
13. SMT. PADMAVATHAMMA
W/O SRI. K. NARAYANA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
R/AT NO.26, 10TH CROSS
3RD FLOOR, CITY CHAIRS UPSYTAIRS
PIPELINE, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040.
14. SMT. MANJULA RAVINDRA PUROHIT
W/O RAVINDRA V. PUROHIT
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
R/AT NO. 279, 10TH CROSS
NEAR MYTHRI STORES, N.R.COLONY
BANGALORE-560 019.
15. SRI. B.L. NAGENDRA
S/O LATE B.T. LAKSHMINARAYANAPPA
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS
R/AT NO. U-57, SRI VEKATESH NILAYA
1ST CROSS, PADARAYANAPURA
BANGALORE-560 026.
16. SMT. NANCHARAMMA

W/O SRI. A. KRISHNAIAH
 AGED ABOUT YEARS
 R/AT NO. 19, 13TH 'C' CROSS
 KEMPEGOWDANAGAR, BYADARAHALLI
 MAGADI MAIN ROAD, VISHWANEEDAM
 BANGALORE-560 040.

17. SMT. LAKSHMIDEVI
 W/O K. SUBRAMANYA GUPTA
 AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
 R/AT NO.104, 3RD 'A' CROSS
 S.V.G. NAGAR, HUCHAPPA LAYOUT
 MOODALAPALYA
 BANGALORE-560 072.
18. SMT. S.R. DATTATREYA
 S/O RANGAPPA T.R.
 AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS
 R/AT NO.35, 3RD 'A' CROSS
 S.V.G NAGAR, HUCHAPPA LAYOUT
 MOODALAPALYA
 BANGALORE-560 072.
19. SMT. K.SHAMALA
 W/O P.NAGARAJ
 AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
 R/AT NO.608/1, 80 FEET ROAD
 7TH BLOCK, 2ND PHASE, BSK III STAGE
 BANGALORE-560 085.
20. SRI. KIRAN S. PAMADI
 S/O P.R. SAMPANGIRAMA SHETTY
 AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
 R/AT NO. 4/3, DIWAN S. MADHAV RAO ROAD
 BASAVANAGUDI
 BANGALORE-560 004.
21. SMT. B.J. LAKSHMI NARAYANA
 S/O LATE B.M. JAYARAMA SHETTY
 AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
 R/AT M.G. ROAD, KOLAR. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
 SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
 R2 NOTICE HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD 13/01/2020

R3 TO R21 NOTICE IS DISPENSED WITH V/O
DTD 12/01/2017

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 16364/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2827 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. K. VASANTH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. B.L. NAGENDRA
S/O LATE B.T. LAKSHMINARAYANAPPA
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. U-57
SRI. VENKATESH NILAYA
1ST CROSS, PADARAYANAPURA
BANGALORE-560 026.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;

SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3116/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2828 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. K. VASANTH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. K. SHAMALA
W/O P. NAGARAJ
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 608/1
80 FEET ROAD, 7TH BLOCK
2ND PHASE, BSK III STAGE
BANGALORE-560 085.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2
R1 - SERVED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3117/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2829 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE
SHRI. K. VASANTH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. S.R. DATTATREYA
S/O LATE RANGAPPA T.R.
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 35
3RD 'A' CROSS, SVG NAGAR
HUCHAPPA LAYOUT
MUDALAPALYA
BANGALORE-560 072.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3123/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2830 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. SARASWATHI D
W/O SRI. D. BALACHANDAR
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.28
BILIGIRI KUTEERA
BANK OF BARODA COLONY
7TH PHASE J.P. NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 078.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3129/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2831 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. K. VASANTH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. CHALISANI NARAYANA RAO
S/O SRI. VENKATESHARAIHAH
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. FLAT NO.304
'B' WING, QUEENS CORNER
APARTMENT, NO.3
QUEENS ROAD
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA

BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.N. PAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 20330/2014
DATED 01/08/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2832 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTN.
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTN.
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. CHIKKATHIMMAIAH
S/O LATE DODDA MOODALIAH
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS
2. SMT. NANJAMMA
W/O LATE KEMPAIAH
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
3. SMT. LAKSHMAMMA
W/O LATE VENKATESHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
4. SRI. CHIKKAKEMPAIAH

S/O LATE DODDA MOODALIAH
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS

RESPONDENTS 1 TO 4 ARE RESIDENTS OF
BETTANAPALYA, BHEEMANAKUPPE DHAKALE
KENGARI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-570 074.

5. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S.BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R5)
R2, R3 AND R4 ARE SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 31401-
402/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2876 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. LAKSHMAMMA
W/O HANUMANTHARAYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
R/AT GONGGADIPURA VILLAGE
KODIGEHALLI, YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 091.
3. SRI. RAMACHANDRA
S/O LATE DODDAHANUMANTHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
R/AT GONGGADIPURA VILLAGE
KODIGEHALLI, YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 091. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. L.M. RAMAIAH GOWDA, ADVOCATE
FOR R2 AND R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 41802/2013
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2879 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SENIOR LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.
3. SMT. MAMATHA
W/O RAMESH
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
NO. 448, 3RD CROSS
4TH MAIN, BHRUSMSPUTHRA NADI
SRINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 086.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. H.T. VASANTH KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 38953/2013
DATED 02/08/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2880 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001
2. SRI. C.N. RAJANNA
S/O NARASEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/A NO.10/5, ARUNA KIRANA NILAYA
4TH C MAIN, ANJANEYANAGARA
BANGALORE-560 085
(SINCE DEAD BY LRS)
 - 2(A). JAYANTHI
W/O LATE C.N. RAJANNA
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
 - 2(B). ARUN GOWDA C.R
S/O LATE C.N. RAJANNA
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
 - 2(C). KIRAN GOWDA C.R
S/O LATE C.N. RAJANNA
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
NO.20/4, 5TH 'C' MAIN
ARUNAKIRANA NILAYA
BSK III STAGE
BANGALORE-85
3. SMT. GOWRAMMA
W/O SRI. GUNDAPPA

- AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
R/AT NO.29, 2ND CROSS
T.R.SHAMANNA NAGAR
SRINAGR
BANGALORE-560 050
4. SMT. K.R. YASHODHA
W/O G. SRINIVAS
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/O NO.34, 7TH CROSS
12TH MAIN, RAGHAVENDRA BLOCK
SRINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 050
5. SMT. SHANTHA
W/O MAHESHWARAPPA S.H
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS
R/AT SAMASTHITHI GURU LAYOUT
BEHIND GOVERNMENT POLYTECHNIC
TUMKUR-572 103
6. SRI. A.S. RUDRAMURTHY
S/O SIDDARAMAIAH A.S
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/AT ANGHA OLD KEB ROAD
NEAR RAVIDRA COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS
TUMKUR-572 102
7. SMT. NAYANATARA N. PATIL
W/O VISHWARS HITTALAMANI
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
R/AT NO.M/15, 3RD MAIN
JAYAMAHAL EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 046
8. SRI. T.R. LOKESH
S/O D.S. RUDRAMUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
R/AT KAVERI, MAHALAKSHMINAGAR
TUMKUR-572 103
9. SRI. M.S. SREEDHAR
S/O M.R. SUBBARATHNAIAH
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
R/A NO.149, 8TH CROSS

1ST MAIN, KALYANA NAGAR
MUDALAPALYA
BANGALORE-560 072

10. SMT. RADHA
W/O RAMESH
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/AT NO.1, 5TH CROSS
KILLARI ROAD
BANGALORE-560 001
11. SMT. B. SUSHEELA
W/O S. UMESH
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/AT SRI GANESH HOTEL
YEDIYUR, YEDIYUR HOBLI
KUNIGAL TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT
12. SMT. INDIRA
W/O SURESH
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/A NO.525, 7TH CROSS
7TH MAIN, HANUMANTHANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 019
13. SRI. B.J. KUMAR
S/O JAVAREGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
R/A NO.1181, 4TH CROSS
11TH MAIN, RAGHAVENDRA BLOCK
SRINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 050
14. SMT. T.S.V. LAKSHMI
W/O K.R. UDAY KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/A RAILWAY STATION ROAD
GANDHINAGAR
TUMKUR-572 101
15. SRI. C. ANAND
S/O P. CHANNAGALARAVA
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
R/AT NO.25/1, BESIDE SRINIVAS

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. S.K.N. SWAMY
S/O SRI. S.V.K. SWAMY
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/AT NO.298, 1ST FLOOR
15TH CROSS, 5TH PHASE, J.P. NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 078.
3. SRI. JANARDHANA K.
S/O SRI. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA SETTY
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/AT NO.10, SAROVAR APARTMENT
SHRI RAJARAJESHWARI TEMPLE STREET
NEAR SOUTHEND CIRCLE
BANGALORE-560 004.
4. SRI. G. THIPPE SWAMY
S/O GANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS
R/AT NO. 2731, MANJUNATH NILAYA
2ND CROSS, GOKULA BADAVANE
MANDIR ROAD, KYATHASANDRA ROAD
TUMKUR-04.
5. SRI. M. SADHASHIVAIAH
S/O C. MALLAIAH
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS
R/AT NO. 100, 1ST FLOOR, 11TH MAIN ROAD
NEAR SRINAGAR BUS STAND
BANGALORE-50.
6. SRI. P.M. GURUPRASAD HEBBAR
S/O P.M.K. HEBBAR
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/AT NO. 100/42, 18TH CROSS
15TH MAIN, R.K. LAYOUT
PADMANABHA NAGAR

BANGALORE-61.

7. B. RAVI
S/O BALAKRISHNA
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
R/AT NO. 37, 22ND CROSS
ITMADU MAIN ROAD
BANASHANKARI 3RD STAGE
BANGALORE-85.
8. SMT. SHARADA
S/O J. SIDDALINGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
R/AT NO.34, 7TH CROSS
12TH MAIN, RAGAVENDRA BLOCK
SRINAGAR
BANGALORE-50.
9. SMT. K.S. GNANESHWARI
W/O B.J. KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
R/AT NO. 1181, 4TH CROSS
11TH MAIN ROAD, RAGAVENDRA BLOCK
SRINAGAR
BANGALORE-50.
10. SMT. KARIYAMMA
W/O B.T. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
R/AT NO.825, HRUSHABAVATHI NAGAR
2ND STAGE, KAMALANAGAR
BANGALORE-79.
11. SMT. B.N. NAGARATHNAMMA
W/O M.L. PARAMESHAIAH
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
R/AT NO. 3, BANDI NILAYA
3RD CROSS, HAVALAHALLI
MYSORE ROAD
BANGALORE-26.
12. SMT. B.N. RAJALAKSHMI
W/O B.K. NAGESH KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
R/AT NO.647, 80 FEET, 2ND PHASE

GIRINAGAR
BANGALORE-85.

13. SRI. K. CHANDRASHEKAR
S/O M.N. KRISHNNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
R/AT NO. 14/23, 5TH CROSS
16TH MAIN, 2ND STAGE, SRINIVASA NAGARA
MYSORE BANK COLONY
BANGALORE-50.
14. SMT. BINDUMATHI. P.
D/O PUTTALINGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
R/AT NO. 7, 19TH MAIN ROAD
MUNESHWARA BLOCK
MYSORE ROAD
BANGALORE-26.
15. KUM. GANANESHWARI. P.
D/O PUTTALINGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
R/AT NO. 7, 19TH MAIN ROAD
MUNESHWARA BLOCK
MYSORE ROAD
BANGALORE-26.
16. SRI. K.P. MAHALINGE GOWDA
S/O PUTTALAKEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS AND
SMT. SUDHA V
W/O K.P. MAHALINGE GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
R/AT K.K. HOSURU VILLAGE
BECHANAHALLI POST
HALEKOTE HOBLI
HOLENARASIPURA TALUK
HASSAN DISTRICT-573 211. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. B.N. TULSI KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2 AND R3;
SHRI. R. KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R16)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 726-740/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A NO.2948 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. K.M. NAGANANDINI
W/O M.J. PRAVEEN KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
R/AT NO.51, 3RD CROSS
5TH BLOCK, 2ND STAGE
NAGARBHAVI
BANGALORE-560 056.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3130/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2949 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.R.WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. KIRAN S. PAMADI
W/O P.R. SAMPANGIRAMA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
R/AT NO. 4/3, DIWAN S. MADHAV RAO ROAD
BASAVANAGUDI
BANGALORE-560 004.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. S. GANGADHAR AITHAL, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3124/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2950 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. M. HEMA PRASAD
S/O D.M. KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT NO. 39/89, 1ST E CROSS
REMCO LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE
BANGALORE-560 040. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
R2 - SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3119/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2951 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
3. SRI. M. AZAR BASHA
S/O SRI. M.M. IBRAHIM
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/AT NO.40, MACKAN ROAD
BHARATHINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
R2 – SERVED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3118/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2953 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. LAKSHMIDEVI
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
W/O K. SUBRAMANYA GUPTA
R/AT NO. 104, 3RD A CROSS
R.P.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3125/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2954 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. K.S. RAMAKRISHNA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
S/O LATE SHESHADRI GUPTA
R/AT NO. 343, 3RD CROSS
2ND MAIN, BEML LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 061.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3092/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2955 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. B.J. LAKSHMI NARAYAN
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
W/O LATE B.M. JAYARAMA SHETTY
R/AT M.G. ROAD
KOLAR-563 101.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
R2 SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3112/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2956 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHAMDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. SHIVA PRASAD GUPTA
S/O SRI M.N. KANTHARAJA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/AT NO. 104, 3RD 'A' CROSS
B.C.C LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3088/2014 DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2957 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. T.N. RAMESH
S/O LATE T.V. NARAYANA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
NO. 44/1, MKK ROAD
NAGAPPA BLOCK
BANGALORE-560 021.
3. SMT. M.N. SHOBHA
W/O LATE M.V. NARAYANA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
NO. 2394, 10TH MAIN

'E' BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010.

4. SMT. M. ANITHA
W/O M.G. MURALIDHARA
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
NO. 51, 8TH MAIN ROAD
SBM COLONY, BRINDAVA NAGAR
MATHIKERE
BANGALORE-560 054.
5. SMT. SUNITHA HARISH
W/O HARISH C.J.
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
NO. 660/9-1, 11TH CROSS
7TH BLOCK, JAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 082.
6. SRI. B.S. VANITHA
W/O P.S. DAKSHINAMURTHY
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
NO. 88, IV BLOCK, 3RD STAGE
IV MAIN, BASAVESHWARANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 078.
7. SRI. V. SRIDHARA
S/O LATE B.G. VASUDEVA
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
NO. 1012, 15TH CROSS, 1ST STAGE
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 078. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. T. MOHANDAS SHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R6;
SRI. A.M. RAMAMURTHY REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR R6
V/O DTD: 03/09/2018 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R7 IS
DEEMED TO BE COMPLETE)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 251-255/2013
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.2958 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. GAYATHRI
W/O A. PUTTASWAMY SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
R/AT EWS 768, 2ND STAGE
KUVEMPUNAGAR
BANGALORE-560 023. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. M.C. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3120/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3044 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. THIMMAPPA
S/O KENDHANNA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
R/AT BATTANAPALYA
BEEMANAKUPPE JODI GRAMA
RAMOHALLI POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH
TALUK-560 068.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. R.P. SOMASHEKHARAI AH, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 19193/2013
DATED 12/08/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3045 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
M.S.BUILDINGS
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
 2. SMT. R.R. RAJESHWARI
W/O LATE G.S. TARARAMASETTY
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
 3. SRI. G.T. NARAYAN
S/O G.S. TARKARAMASETTY
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
 4. SMT. G.T. KRISHNAMURTHY
S/O LATE G.S. TARAKARAMASETTY
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
- RESPONDENT NO. 2 TO 4
NO.16, R.K. STREET
SESHADRIPURAM
BANGALORE-560 020.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. G.S. VENKATA SUBBARAO, ADVOCATE
FOR R2 TO R4)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 46130-33/2013
DATED 04/08/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3046 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. M. HONNAMALLAIAH
S/O LATE B.M. MALLAIAH
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT NO.201/3, "BHRAMARA NILAYA"
4TH MAIN ROAD, 4TH CROSS
CHAMARAJAPET
BANGALORE-560 018.

3. SMT. B.M. CHANDRAKALA
D/O SRI N. MARIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/AT NO.2, "THRINETRA NILAYA"
1ST MAIN ROAD, 2ND STAGE
RPC LAYOUT, BANGALORE-560 040.

4. SRI. B. YATIRAJU
S/O A.T. BHASKARACHARY
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
R/AT COTTON PET
NEAR HEAD POST OFFICE
CHIKKANAYAKANAHALLI
TUMKUR-572 124.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. B.S. HADIMANI, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R4)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 9081-83/2013
DATED 30/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3047 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SMT. M. GANGA JAYAKUMAR
W/O SRI. M.M. JAYAKUMAR
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/AT NO.8, KAVERI NILAYA
CHINNAPPANAHALLI, MARATHHALLI
BANGALORE-560 037. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1)
R2 – SERVED

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3127/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3050 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
REVENUE DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. SRI. R.R. RAMESH BABU
S/O R.H. RADHAKRISHNA GUPTA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/AT VIJAYALAKSHMI ROAD
DAVANGERE. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3131/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3051 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. S.R. RUKMINI
W/O SRI. S. JAYARAM
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
R/AT NO. 202, 6TH MAIN
2ND 'B' CROSS, SRINIVASANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 091.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 189/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3080 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. C.B. PARVATHY
W/O SRI. P.B. CHINNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT NO.32, 2ND MAIN, 1ST CROSS
AREKERE MICO LAYOUT
2ND STAGE, BANNERGHATTA ROAD
BANGALORE-560 076.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 180/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3082 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. NIRANJAN S. PAMADI
S/O SRI. P.R. SAMPANGIRAMA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS
R/AT NO.4/3, D.S. MADHAVA RAO ROAD
BASAVANAGUDI
BANGALORE-560 004.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 183/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3086 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. SATHI CHITRA
W/O M. ANAND
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/AT NO.2, 1ST CROSS
ASHOKAPURAM
YESHWANTHPUR
BANGALORE-560 022

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)
SMT. MAMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.188/2014 DATED
25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3091 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER

2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. KANTHANNA
S/O THIMMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
R/AT C.P.W. QUARTERS
182, 13TH BLOCK
H.S.R. LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 102.
2. SRI. K. JAGADEESH
S/O KEMPARAJU
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/AT M-109, 5TH CROSS
7TH MAIN, LAKSHMINARAYANAPURA
BANGALORE-560 021.
3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. H.N. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R1 AND R2;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 770-771/2014
DATED 25/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3159 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
....APPELLANT
- (BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. DR. VAMANA ACHARYA
S/O NARASIMHA ACHARYA AAYI
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
OCC: INDUSTRIALIST
R/O BASAVESHWARANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 038.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
TO THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. VIKRAM PHADKE, ADVOCATE FOR
SMT. SONA VAKKUND, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 3107/2012
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3160 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

AND:

1. SRI. B. ESHWARA
S/O SRI BYRAPPA @ DODDABYRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/O SULIKERE, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH
BANGALORE-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHAN, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 46491/2011
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.3163 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI RANGASWAMIAH

S/O SRI NADUTHIRAIH
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS
RESIDING AT GIDADHAPALYA @
SOOLIKATTEPALYA VILLAGE
THAVAREKERE HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
PIN: 560 029.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. L.M. RAMAIAH GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 28892/2012
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.876 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. JAICHAND

S/O DEEPCHAND
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.6
1ST CROSS, VASANTH NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 052.

2. SMT. J. RAJKUMARI
W/O D. JAICHAND
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.6
1ST CROSS, VASANTH NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 052. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. S.V. GANESH, ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 19475/2010
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.877 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P WEST, BANGALORE
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
REPRESENTED BY ADDITIONAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER.
- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P WEST, BANGALORE 560 020
REPRESENTED BY ADDITIONAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER.
-APPELLANTS
- (BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI GOWTHAMDEV C ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR BEEDHI,
BANGALORE 560001

- 2 . SRI. SOMASHEKAR
S/O SRI HUCHAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE
- 3 . SRI H. RAVINDRA
S/O SRI HUCHAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE
- 4 . SRI H.S. DEEPAK
S/O SRI. SOMASHEKAR,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE
- 5 . SMT. LEELAMMA
W/O SRI. SOMASHEKAR,
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI PRABHULING K NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
SRI SHASHI KIRAN SHETTY K, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI M SREENIVAS, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R5)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 12927-35/2010
DATED 11/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.879 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER

2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S.BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001.

2. SRI. NAGAMANGALAIHAH
S/O LATE KENDANNA
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS
R/AT BETTANAPALYA
BHEEMANAKUPPE, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE AND
SHRI. K.S. UDAY, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 1379/2015 DATED 27/01/2015.

IN W.A. NO.880 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P.WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P.WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. GOWTHANDEV C. ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDING
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. K.K. EDUCATION TRUST (REGD)
NO.52/8, KODIGEHALLI
MAGADI MAIN ROAD
BANGALORE-560 091.
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT
SRI. V. KRISHNAMURTHY
S/O LATE VENKATAPPA
BANGALORE CITY. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. L. UMASHANKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 33858/2011 AND 34282/2011 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1010 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001.
2. K.M. BASAVARADHYA
S/O LATE MALLIKARJUNAIAH
@ MALLIKARJUNA ARADHYA
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRs
- 2(A) SMT.C.M.NAGARATHANA
W/O LATE K.M.BASAVARADHYA
AGED ABOUT 82 YEARS
- 2(B) K.B. RAJASHEKAR

S/O LATE K.M. BASAVARADHYA
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS

2(C) K.B. GIRISH
S/O LATE K.M. BASAVARADHYA
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS

2(D) K.B. GURUPRASAD
S/O LATE K.M. BASAVARADHYA
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS

2(E) K.B. GEETHA
D/O LATE K.M. BASAVARADHYA

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE
SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1;
SHRI. C.M. NAGABHUSHAN, ADVOCATE
FOR R2(A) TO R2(E))

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 9101-
9102/2010 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1164 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.

2. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K.P. WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR

IN W.A. NO.1166 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MR. M. SRINIVASA MURTHY
S/O SRI MUNIGANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
OCC: AGRICULTURIST
BHEEMANA KUPPE VILLAGE
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.
2. MRS. M. SWETHA
D/O SRI MUNIRAJU
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
OCC: AGRICULTURIST
BHEEMANA KUPPE VILLAGE
KENGARI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 060.
3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M.S. BUILDINGS
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. B.S. NAGARAJ, ADVOCATE FOR R1 & 2;

SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 38252-
253/2012 DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1168 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. B. VACHAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. JASHODA BAI
W/O SRI. KRISHNARAM CHOWDARY
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.118
SUKKUR CIRCLE
Kengeri TOWN
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
PIN-560 060
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
REVENUE SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001

W/O B.M. VENKATESH
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT NO. 554, 6TH MAIN ROAD
4TH BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. G. BALAKRISHNNA SHASTRY, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 43470/2012
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1173 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS
COMMISSIONER
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. HANUMANTHA RAO
S/O SRI. MANKOJI RAO
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
FARM HOUSE, RAMASANDRA

KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.

2. SRI. NANJUNDAPPA J.H.
S/O J.P. HALAPPA
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS
RESIDENT OF 1271, 4TH MAIN
7TH CROSS, CHANDRA LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 040.
3. SRI. DOBBAGULAPPA
S/O SRI RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
RESIDENT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
BANGALORE SOUTH
BANGALORE DISTRICT
PIN:560 060.
4. SRI. MANJUNATH
S/O SRI RANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
RESIDENT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE
KENGERI HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH ZONE
BANGALORE DISTRICT
PIN:560 060.
5. SMT. GOWRAMMA
W/O SRI VENKATESH
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.16
50 FEET ROAD
MUNESHWARA BLOCK
BANGALORE-560 026.
6. SRI VENKATESH
S/O SRI SHIVARAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.16
50 FEET ROAD
MUNESHWARA BLOCK
BANGALORE-560 026.
7. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. K.L. ASHOK, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. H.N. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R3 AND R4;
SHRI. LOHITASWA BANAKAR, ADVOCATE
FOR R5 AND R6
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R7)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 251-255/2013
DATED 11/07/2014.

IN W.A. NO.1771 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. VENKATARASAPPA
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRS
- 1(A) SMT. KAMALAMMA
W/O LATE VENKATARASAPPA. V.

AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
R/AT NO. 7, MANGANAHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BENGALURU-560 060.

1(B) SMT. JINNUBAI NAGARAJU
W/O M. NAGARAJU
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
R/AT NO. 1, MANGANAHALLI VILLAGE
BENGALURU-560 060.

1(C) SMT. NAGAMANI M.V.
W/O RAJANNA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/AT NO. 77, 4TH BLOCK
SIR M.V. LAYOUT
ULLALU BASTI, ULLALU UPANAGARA
BENGALURU-560 056.

1(D) SRI. MANJUNATHA M.V.
S/O LATE VENKATARASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
R/AT MANGANAHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.

1(E) SRI. KUMAR V.
S/O LATE VENKATARASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
R/AT NO.70, MANGANAHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 060.

2. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
MULTISTORIED BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. K. ANAND, ADVOCATE FOR R1(A) TO R1(E);
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 6705/2014
DATED 20/03/2015.

IN W.A. NO.939 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. THE BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER)
KUMARA PARK (WEST)
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
THE BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK (WEST)
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. N. SREENIVASA RAO
S/O LATE SRI. S. NARAYANA RAO
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
NO. 65/2, KAKATHEYANAGAR
AREHALLI, ITTAMADU
BANASHANKARI III STAGE
BENGALURU-560 061.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR ROAD
BANGALORE-560 001.
(REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY) ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. T.A. KARUMBIAH, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 51495/2014
DATED 19/02/2016.

IN W.A. NO.1015 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. M.H. MAMATHA
W/O LATE M.N. HARINATH
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
R/AT NO.531, 7TH CROSS ROAD
SADASHIVANAGARA
BANGALORE-560 080.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)
V/O DATED 13.06.2013 NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 25087/2015
DATED 18/03/2016.

IN W.A. NO.1016 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, [BELLARY ROAD]
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. PURUSHOTHAMA
S/O D. VENKATA RAM
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.6
C/O SHILPA PRINTERS
1ST MAIN, VINAYAKANAGARA
HALE GUDDADHALLI, MYSORE ROAD
BANGALORE-560 026.
2. SRI. S. VENKATESH
S/O LATE G.N. SRIKANTIAH
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.1555
17TH 'B' MAIN ROAD
5TH BLOCK, 1ST STAGE
HBR LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 043.
3. SRI. S.G. NAGARAJ
S/O LATE GANGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 446
8TH CROSS, 29TH MAIN

BTM EWS LAYOUT
BANGALORE-560 076.

4. DR. H. SANTHOSH S. SHETTY
W/O DR. A. SANTHOSH SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
RESIDING AT "KRISHNA"
MAHALAKSHMI NAGARA
NEAR VENKATESHWARA TEMPLE
TUMKUR-572 103.
5. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. N. SRIRAMA REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R4;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R5
R1 – SERVED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 12699-
12702/2016 DATED 14/03/2016.

IN W.A. NO.1343 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. SHANTHARAJU
S/O LATE SHIVANNA
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT KANNELLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH DISTRICT
BANGALORE-560 091.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. M. SHIVAPRAKASH, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 20168/2015
DATED 01/04/2016.

IN W.A. NO.1344 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. MARAPPA
S/O LATE CHIKKANNA
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
2. SMT. BYRAMMA
W/O MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
3. SRI. M. CHANDRASHEKAR
S/O MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS
4. SMT. MANGALAGOWRAMMA
D/O MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
5. SRI. M. HANUMANTHA RAJU
S/O MARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS
6. SRI. NARASIMHA MURTHY
S/O LATE CHIKKANNA
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
7. SMT. VARALAKSHMI
W/O NARASIMHA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
8. SRI. N. GANGARAJU
S/O NARASIMHA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS
9. SMT. N. ANNAPOORNA
D/O NARASIMHA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS
10. SMT. N. BHAGYALAKSHMI
D/O NARASIMHA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDENTS OF
GONGADIPURA VILLAGE

KODIGEHALLI DHAKALE
VISHWANEEDUM POST
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK

ALL THE ABOVE ARE
REPRESENTED BY THEIR GPA HOLDER
SRI. M.G. RAGHU SHANKAR
S/O N. KRISHNA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
R/AT NO. 288, 6TH CROSS
BEL EXTENSION, BHARATHNAGAR
BYADARAHALLI, VISHWANEEDUM POST
BANGALORE-560 091.

11. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. B.A. BELLIAPPA, ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R10;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R11)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 15508-
517/2015 DATED 01/04/2016.

IN W.A. NO.1644 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. CHANDRASHEKAR
S/O SRI. VENKATESHAPPA
MAJOR
RESIDING AT BETTANA PALYA
BEEMANAKUPPE DAKALE
KENGARI - 2 HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BANGALORE-560 060.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
MULTISTORIED BUILDING
BANGALORE-560 001. ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2
R1 - SERVED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 55794/2014
DATED 04/04/2016.

IN W.A. NO.1818 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
REP BY ITS COMMISSIONER
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BENGALURU-560 020
REP BY SLAO.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BENGALURU DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

KUMARA PARK (WEST)
BANGALORE-560 020.
REP BY SLAO.

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. AJAY KUMAR M, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . SRI K S CHANDRASEKARAIH
S/O LATE K.R.SHIVARUDRAIAH
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/O NO.80/34, 5TH CROSS
BAPUJI LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR
BENGALURU-560 040

1.1 . SMT. GEETHA CHANDRASHEKAR
W/O LATE K.S. CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS

1.2 . SPOORTHI K.C
D/O LATE K.S. CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS

1.3 . SWATHI K.C.
D/O LATE K.S. CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT NO.80/34, 5TH CROSS
BAPUJI LAYOUT,
NEAR CHANDRA LAYOUT
VIAJAYANAGAR
BENGALURU - 560040

2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT,
M.S.BUILDING,
DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR ROAD
BENGALURU-560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2;
SHRI. G R MOHAN, ADVOCATE FOR R1(A TO C))

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 20557/16 DATED 12/4/16 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2104 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BENGALURU-560 020
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. B.R. RAMYA
W/O SRI. V.B.R. RAJASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.3871
VISHWESHWARAIHAH ROAD
GIRINAGAR, BSK III STAGE
BENGALURU-560 050.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. H.M. MURALIDHAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 46816/2014 DATED 02/03/2016.

IN W.A. NO.2105 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. B.R. RAMYA
W/O SRI. B.R. RAJASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 3871
VISHWESHWARAIHAH ROAD
GIRINAGAR, BSK III STAGE
BENGALURU-560 050.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY ...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI.H.M. MURALIDHAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH
SHRI. JEEVAN J. NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 46817/2014 DATED 04/03/2016.

IN W.A. NO.417 OF 2017

BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020.
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020.

[APPELLANTS NO.1 & 2 ARE BELONGS
TO SAME AUTHORITY HENCE
APPELLANT NO.2 IS
REPRESENTING THE
APPELLANT NO.1]

....APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. B.M. CHIKKANNA
S/O LATE MUNIVENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
2. SRI. B.M. ANJINAPPA
S/O LATE MUNIVENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
3. SRI. B.M. SRINIVAS
S/O LATE MUNIVENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
4. SRI. B.M. GALI ANJINAPPA

BANGALORE-560 020.
REP. BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER,

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . SMT. NARASAMMA,
W/O SRI T.G. RANGASHAMMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
NO.716, 2ND D CROSS,
8TH MAIN ROAD,
3RD PHASE, 3RD STAGE,
BASAVESHWARANAGARA,
BANGALORE-560 079.

2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS,
BANGALORE-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R2
SRI SANKETH M YENAGI, ADVOCATE FOR R1)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 33899/2011 DATED
11/7/14 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2245 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION

OFFICER,
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI MURUGESH V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE.
- 2 . SRI KRISHNAMURTHY
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
S/O LATE VENKATAPPA,
RESIDENT OF NO.53/5,
SKANDANAGAR,
KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.
- 3 . SMT. THULASAMMA
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
S/O LATE VENKATAPPA,
RESIDENT OF NO.53/5,
SKANDANAGAR,
KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.
- 4 . SMT. SHIVAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
W/O LATE BETTASWAMY,
R/AT NO.3, 8TH CROSS,
KOTTIGEPALYA,
MAGADI MAIN ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 091.
- 5 . SMT. RATHNAMMA,

AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
W/O LATE CHIKKAHANUMANTHAIAH,
R/AT KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.

- 6 . SRI N KRISHNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
S/O LATE NARASIAH,
R/AT NO.35/5,
KENCHANAPURA ROAD,
RESIDENT OF KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
SRI M SHIVAPRAKASH, ADVOCATE FOR R2, R3, R5 & R6
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R4 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.34413-423/2011
DATED 11/7/14 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2254 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER,
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI MURUGESH V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE.
- 2 . SRI KRISHNAMURTHY
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
S/O LATE VENKATAPPA,
RESIDENT OF NO.53/5,
SKANDANAGAR,
KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.
- 3 . SMT. THULASAMMA
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
S/O LATE VENKATAPPA,
RESIDENT OF NO.53/5,
SKANDANAGAR,
KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.
- 4 . SMT. SHIVAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
W/O LATE BETTASWAMY,
R/AT NO.3, 8TH CROSS,
KOTTIGEPALYA,
MAGADI MAIN ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 091.
- 5 . SMT. RATHNAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
W/O LATE CHIKKAHANUMANTHAIAH,
R/AT KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.
- 6 . SRI N KRISHNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
S/O LATE NARASIAH,
R/AT NO.35/5,

KENCHANAPURA ROAD,
RESIDENT OF KODIGEHALLI POST,
BANGALORE-560 091.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
SRI M SHIVAPRAKASH, ADVOCATE FOR R2, R3, R5 & R6
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R4 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.34413-423/2011
DATED 11/7/14 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2458 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.
- 2 . THE LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, :ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT NAGARATHNA G
W/O SRI. B.V. NARASIMHAIAH
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
NO.8, 7TH MAIN, SHIVANAGAR,
RAJAJINAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 010.

- 2 . SRI. SYED ASHRAF
S/O SRI. SYED UMAR SAHEB
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
FLAT NO. 410, VIJAYA MANSIONS
VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 040.
BY HIS GPA HOLDER

- 3 . SRI. V. THIMMAIAH
S/O SRI DODDA VENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
MAGADI MAIN ROAD,
SUNKADAKATTE
YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE-560 010.

- 4 . SMT. DEEPA SALUNKI
W/O SRI R.S. SALUNKI
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
NO.8, D. RAJGOPAL ROAD,
AMARJYOTHI LAYOUT,
RMV II STAGE,
BANGALORE-560 094.
REP BY THEIR POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER
SRI. B.V. NARASIMHAIAH
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
NO.8, 7TH MAIN
SHIVANAGAR, RAJAJINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010.

- 5 . SMT. SUMATHI SADASHIVA
W/O SRI SADASHIVA SALUNKI
AGED ABOUT 82 YEARS,
NO.8, D. RAJGOPAL ROAD,
AMARJYOTHI LAYOUT,
RMV II STAGE, BANGALORE-560 094.
REP. BY THEIR POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER
SRI. B.V. NARASIMHAIAH
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
NO.8, 7TH MAIN
SHIVANAGAR, RAJAJINAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 010.

6 . STATE OF KARNATAKA
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
MULTISTORIED BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560 001.
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R6
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2, R4, R5 HELD SUFFICIENT
V/O DTD 17.7.2023, R1 & R3 SERVED AND
UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO. 14140-
14147/2010 DATED 11/07/2010 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2708 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE 560020
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE 560 020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SR.UMESH
S/O SRI CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS

RESIDING AT NO.93
2ND FLOOR, 3RD MAIN ROAD
3RD CROSS, VINAYAKA LAYOUT
3RD STAGE, VIJAYANAGAR
BANGALORE 560040

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE 560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.174/14 DATED
25/7/14 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2709 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560020
REP BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER

- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560020
REP BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SRI.P.S.KRISHNA MURTHY
S/O SRI P V SURYANARAYANA RAO,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.647,
8TH MAIN ROAD,
PRAKASHNAGAR,
BANGALORE-560021

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS SECRETARY,
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.175/2014 DATED
25/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2781 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL.LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER.

- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560020
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL. LAND

ACQUISITION OFFICER

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . SMT SHOBHAVATHI T R
W/O SRI.G.M.NARASIMHA MURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.11,
1ST BLOCK, PWD QUARTERS,
WILSON GARDEN,
BANGALORE-560027.

2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3082/14 DATED
25/7/14 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2782 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL.LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER.

2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560020
REPRESENTED BY TIS ADDL. LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT B R SHASHIKALA
W/O SRI.NARAYANA RAO,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.2/5,
SARASWATHIPURA,
NANDINI LAYOUT,
BANGALORE-560096.

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3083/2014
DATED 25/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2786 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 020.

REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL.
LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER.

- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY TIS ADDL.
LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SRI G M RAMANATH
S/O SRI G.R. MADAPPA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
R/AT NO. 6/27, 14TH CROSS
6TH BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
DEVELOPMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 3087/2014 DATED
25/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2817 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K P WEST, BANGALORE.
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER

2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K P WEST, BANGALORE-560020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI M V CHARATI, ADVOCATE FOR A1 & A2)

AND:

1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M S BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560001

2 . SMT. MUNIYAMMA
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
W/O MUNINAGAPPA,
R/AT 134, 8TH MAIN ROAD,
PIPELINE WEST, KASTURIBHA NAGAR,
MYSORE ROAD, BANGALORE-560026

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.58892/2013
DATED 28/7/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2818 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P.WEST, BANGALORE.
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER.
REPRESENTED BY SLAO.

- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
K.P.WEST, BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY SLAO.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI M V CHARATI, ADVOCATE FOR A1 & A2)

AND:

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
M.S.BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560 001.

- 2 . SMT.T.S.SHYLA
W/O L.LAKSHMI KANTHA,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
NO.29, (BBMP NO.16) 5TH CROSS,
4TH BLOCK KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.

- 3 . SMT.K.KAVITHA
W/O L HARI KRISHNA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
NO.41, HARINIMITHA, IST BLOCK,
JNANABHARATHI LAYOUT,
R.V.POST, BEHIND SHRIKE APARTMENTS
BANGALORE-560 059.

- 4 . SRI SHIVARATHNA KUMAR M.S.

W/O LATE SIDDARAJU,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
M.D.NO.60-61, NISCHALA NILAYA
1ST FLOOR 6TH MAIN,
GNANAJYOTHINAGAR, MALLATHAHALLI
BANGALORE-56.

- 5 . SMT.G.PADMA
W/O T.M.NAGARAJA,
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
NO.150, 6TH MAIN ROAD,
AVALAHALLI BDA EXTN.,
BSK III STAGE,
BANGALORE-560 085.
- 6 . SRI NAGARAJ
S/O LATE KENCHIAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
NO.316/1, NTB ROAD,
KAMATH BUILDING,
JANNA PURA BHADRAVATHI-577 301
SHIMOGA DISTRICT.
- 7 . SMT.K.UMAMAHESHWARI
W/O K.KUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
NO.1, NEW NO.3767,
DHEEMANDALA LAYOUT,
SRINIDHI LAYOUT 2ND PHASE,
M.S.PALYA ROAD,
VIDYARANYAPURA,
BANGALORE-560 097.
- 8 . SMT.G.S.SWARAJ LAKSHMI
W/O G.M.SRIRAM
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
NO.802, THEJAS NILAYA,
14TH MAIN ROAD, 13TH CROSS,
BANGALORE-72.
- 9 . SMT.S.BABITHA
D/O SATISH BABU,
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,

NO.205/P. 1ST CROSS,
SRIGURUNIVAS DEVASANDRA
K.R.PURAM, BANGALORE.

- 10 . MEGHANA S
D/O M.SURESH BABU,
AGED ABOUT 19 YEARS,
GURU NIVAS NO.206,
4TH CROSS, BASAVANAPURA MAIN ROAD,
K.R.PURAM, BANGALORE-560 036.
- 11 . SRI.D.N.NARASMIHAMURTHY,
S/O LATE D NARASIMHAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS,
NO.651, TCH COLLEGE ROAD,
1ST MAIN MARATHALLY,
BANGALORE-560 037.
- 12 . SMT.R.SUNITHA
W/O H.G.DEVARATHAN,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
NO.77, RAMANJANEYA LAYOUT,
NEAR "MURALI GAS", 3RD CROSS,
MARATHALLY, BANGALORE-560 037.
- 13 . SMT.JAYAMMA
W/O LATE RANGASWAMY,
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
C/O K R GANGAJANAKA,
NO.68, 80TH CROSS,
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT,
BSK 1ST STAGE,
BANGALORE-560 078.
- 14 . SMT.ANKAMMA
W/O LATE RAMAKRISHNA,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
NO.8, 2ND FLOOR, 2ND B MAIN,
JUGANAHALLI, NEAR MARAMMA TEMPLE,
RAJAJINAGAR,
BANGALORE-10.
- 15 . SRI KODANDARAM

S/O DASAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
NO.342, 3RD MAIN ROAD, 1ST CROSS,
VIJAYANANADA NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 096.

- 16 . P.M.KHALIDH
S/O P M IBRAHIM,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
NO.412, 14TH MAIN ROAD,
M.C.LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 040.
- 17 . SRI PURUSHOTHAM
S/O SUBRAMANI,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
NO.35, 4TH CROSS,
9TH MAIN ROAD,
AVALAHALLI NEW LAYOUT,
MYSORE ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 026.
- 18 . DR.JYOTHI PATIBANDLA
W/O DR KAMARSHI PRASAD,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
R/AT NO.86, BHEL COLONY,
NANDINI LAYOUT,
BANGALORE-560 096.
- 19 . SMT.ANKAMMA
W/O LATE RAMAKRISHNA,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
NO.8, 2ND FLOOR,
2ND B MAIN, JUGANAHALLI,
NEAR MARAMMA TEMPLE,
RAJAJINAGARA
BANGALORE-10.
- 20 . SRI.K.S.NARENDRA NATH
S/O LATE K.S.SUBHA RAO,
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS,
FLAT NO.207, BLOCK A SAKET PRANAM KAPRA,
HYDERABAD-500062.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
SRI K ANANDA, ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3
SRI MOHANDAS SHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR R4, R7, R11 TO
R13, R18 & R20, SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R14 & R19 HELD
SUFFICIENT V/O DTD 17.7.2023, R5, R6, R8, R9, R10, R15,
R16 AND R17 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.58873-
58891/2013 DATED 02/08/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. NO.2819 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER.
- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 020.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI M V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
M.S. BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560 001.
- 2 . SRI. GAGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
S/O SRI HUCHAGANGAIAH,
R/AT NO.3, SY.NO.46/1,
KODIGEHALI VILLAGE,

YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560091.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.12324/14 DATED
25/7/14 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.3048 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI M V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560 001.
- 2 . SMT. PUSHPA SHIVALINGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
W/O DR. B M SHIVALINGAPPA,

R/AT NO.159, T/2, "SAMPOORNA
APARTMENTS", 8TH MAIN, BETWEEN 7TH
AND 8TH CROSS,
MALLESHWARAM,
BANGALORE-560 003.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R1
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
15.9.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3134/2014
DATED 25/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.3079 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE 560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE 560 020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SRI. K.R. RAMACHANDRAIAH
S/O K.L. RAMAKRISHNAIAH SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 49, 3RD MAIN
EKADANTA BADAVANE
K. KRISHNA SAGARA,
KENGERRI HOBLI,

BANGALORE-560 060.

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE 560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3111/2014
DATED 25/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.3081 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION,
BANGALORE 560020
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE 560020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI M V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT. S.N. MANJULA
W/O SRI. C. PARAMESHWARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 836, 17TH "F" MAIN ROAD,
5TH BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR

BANGALORE-560 010.

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE 560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.185/2014 DATED
25/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.3090 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION,
BANGALORE 560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE 560 020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI M V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SRI G M NARASIMHA MURTHY
S/O G R MADAPPA SHETTY
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT NO.11,1ST BLOCK
P.W.D QUARTERS

WILSON GARDEN
BANGALORE 560 030

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
DEVELOPMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE 560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.178/2014 DATED
25/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.3125 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

- 1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE.
REP BY SALAO
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560020
REP BY SALAO

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI GOWTHAMDEV C ULLAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
M S BUILDINGS
BANGALORE 560 001

2 . SRI MAHESH NAGAPPA ATHANI
S/O NAGAPPA
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
R/AT NO.24, APMC YARD FLAT
NAVANAGAR, BAGALKOT 587 101

3 . SRI BYATAPPA
S/O CHANNINGE GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
NO.417, 3RD STAGE
12TH MAIN ROAD
MANJUNATHANAGAR
BANGALORE 560010

4 . SRI HONGALA ANILA BASAVARAJ
S/O LATE BASAVARAJ
NO.43/192, JEEVAN RELIANCE HOME
6TH CROSS, KIRLOSKAR COLONY
BASAVESHWARANAGARA
BANGALORE 560 079

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R1
SRI K SUMAN, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI SIDDHARTH SUMAN, ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R4 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
15.9.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.31607/2013
DATED 6/8/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.3165 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD

SANKEY ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER
NOW REP. BY SPECIAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER

... APPELLANT

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI MURUGESH V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT
M S BUILDINGS
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001

2 . SRI BYATAPPA
S/O CHANNINGE GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
NO. 417, 3RD STAGE
12TH MAIN ROAD,
MANJUNATHNAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R1
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.31609/2013
DATED 6/8/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.3166 OF 2014

BETWEEN:

1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY

SANKEY ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 009

... APPELLANT

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI MURUGESH V CHARATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE-560 001

2 . SRI HONGALA ANILA BASAVARAJ
S/O LATE BASAVARAJ
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
NO. 43/192, JEEVAN RELIANCE HOME
6TH CROSS, KIRLOSKAR COLONY
BASAVESHWARANAGARA
BANGALORE-560 079

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R1
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.31608/2013
DATED 6/8/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.1181 OF 2015

BETWEEN:

1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020

2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI B S SACHIN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SRI K H LAKSHMANA GOWDA
S/O SRI HUCHEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
R/AT NO. 67, MUNESWARA LAYOUT,
KODIGEHALLI
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE-560 091
- 2 . SRI N SRINIVAS
S/O P NARAYANA
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
R/AT NO. 17, POORNIMA NILAYA
5TH CROSS, DEFENCE COLONY
H G ROAD, BANGALORE-73
- 3 . SRI CHAKRAPANI
S/O LATE VENKATACHALAPATHY
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/AT NO. 304/B, 3RD MAIN
MANJUNATH NAGAR
BANGALORE-560 010
- 4 . SMT SHASHIKALA
D/O SRI VENKATEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS
R/AT NO. 42/3, 1ST CROSS
RAGHAVANAGAR
BANGALORE-560 026
- 5 . SRI NANJEGOWDA
S/O SRI GENDEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
R/AT BYLADAKERE VILLAGE
HEBBURU POST, THAGURU HOBLI
MADDUR TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571 428

- 6 . SRI OMESHAIH
S/O SRI CHIKKAKARI GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/AT NO. 137/B, BTS LAYOUT
ULLAL MAIN ROAD
BYADRAHALLY
BANGALORE-560 091
- 7 . SMT PREMA
W/O SRI A M MAHADEVIAH
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
R/AT NO. 787, NEAR GANESHA TEMPLE,
KAMAKSHIPALYA
BANGALORE-560 079
- 8 . SMT HEMA
W/O LATE C KRISHNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS
R/OF KALENAHALLY VILLAGE/POST
KOTHATHI HOBLI
MANDYA DISTRICT-571 434
- 9 . SRI. MAHADEVIAH
S/O LATE CHIKKAKARIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/OF GOWDAGERE VILLAGE /POST,
MALUR HOBLI,
CHANNAPATNA TLAUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT PIN: 562 108.
- 10 . SRI. ASWATHANARAYANA
S/O SRI VENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/AT NO. 10/1, 1ST MAIN
NEW GUDDADAHALLI,
MYSORE ROAD, BANGALORE-560 026.
- 11 . SMT TEJASWINI.R. GOWDA
W/O SRI. RUDREGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
R/AT NO.212 6TH MAIN
G.K.W. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR

BANGALORE-560 040.

- 12 . SRI. P.H. LAKSHMINARASIMHA
S/O P.S. HANUMANTHARAO
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 195, RMV 2ND STAGE,
NAGASHETTYHALLI
BANGALORE-560 094.
- 13 . SRI. K.K. SADHANANDA
S/O SRI LATE PALLANTE KARIGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
R/AT NO.133, 5TH MAIN, 7TH CROSS,
NAGARABHAVI, MARUTHI NAGAR
BANGALORE 560 072.
- 14 . SMT. SAVITHRI
W/O K.K. SADHANANDA
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
R/AT NO.133, 5TH MAIN,
7TH CROSS, NAGARABHAVI
MARUTHI NAGAR
BANGALORE 560 072.
- 15 . SMT. JAYAMMA
W/O SRI. GOVINDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
R/AT MAGADI MAIN ROAD,
VINAYAKANAGAR,
KAMAKSHIPALYA
BANGALORE-560 079
- 16 . SRI. C. MUNIRAJ
S/O SRI. CHIKKARANGAPPA
MAJOR, R/AT SITE NO.1
ASSESSMENT NO.107
KODIGEHALLI VILLAGE
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK -560 091
- 17 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA,

BANGALORE-560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R7
SRI M N MUNI REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R10, R12 TO
R14 & R16
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R11 TO R15 IS HELD SUFFICIENT
V/O DTD 17.7.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 22807-22102/2012
DATED 11/07/2014 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.1004 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE - 560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL. LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER.

- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE - 560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL. LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT M H MAMATHA
W/O LATE M N HARINATH,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,

R/AT NO. 531, 7TH CROSS ROAD,
SADASHIVANAGARA,
BANGALORE - 560 080.

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE - 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
15.9.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 25139/2015 DATED
17/03/2016 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.1005 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL. LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER
- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL SPECIAL LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020
REP BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT M H MAMATHA
W/O LATE M.N.HARINATH,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
R/AT NO.531, 7TH CROSS ROAD,
SADASHIVANAGARA,
BANGALORE-560 080

- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
15.9.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 25086/2015 DATED
16/03/2016 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.1020 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL. LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER

- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE-560 020
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL. LAND
ACQUISITION OFFICER

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SMT M H MAMATHA
W/O LATE M.N.HARINATH
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
R/AT NO.531, 7TH CROSS ROAD,
SADASHIVANAGARA
BANGALORE-560 080
- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA
BANGALORE-560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD
15.9.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 25138/2015 DATED
21/3/16 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.1339 OF 2016

BETWEEN:

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T. CHOWDAIAH, ROAD,
BANGALORE-560020.
REP. BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560020.

REP. BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
... APPELLANTS
(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . SRI B R REVANNA
S/O LATE RUDRAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 86 YEARS,
R/O SULIKERE BUNGALOW,
RAMASANDRA DHAKLE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.
SINCE DECEASED BY HIS LRs.

1(A) SMT GANGAMMA
W/O LATE B R REVANNA
AGED ABOUT 85 YEARS

1(B) SRI BASAVARAJ
S/O LATE B R REVANNA
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS

1(C) SRI SHIVAKUMAR
S/O LATE B R REVANNA
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
R/O SULIKERE BUNGALOW,
RAMASANDRA DHAKLE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

2 . SRI. SHIVAKUMAR
S/O B.R. REVANNA,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
R/O SULIKERE BUNGALOW,
RAMASANDRA DHAKLE, KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

- 3 . SRI. SHIVASHANKARAIHA
S/O LATE SIDDALINGASWAMY,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/O NO.95, SULIKERE,
BANGALORE-560060.
- 4 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560001.
- 5 . THE TAHSILDAR,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560002.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI M R RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI C M NAGABHUSHANA, ADVOCATE FOR R1(A TO C) & R2
SRI H N BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R3
SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R4 & R5)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 33899/2011 DATED
11/7/14 AND ETC.

IN W.A. No.418 OF 2017

BETWEEN

- 1 . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BANGALORE-560 020.
REPRESENTED BY ADDITIONAL
LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER.
- 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BANGALORE-560 020.

REPRESENTED BY ADDITIONAL
LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER.

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI SACHIN B S., ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1 . SMT. SHARADHA
W/O GANGA MALLESHAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
R/AT BETTANAPALYA,
BHEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560 072.
- 2 . SRI.KRISHNEGOWDA
S/O THAYAPPA @ LAKSHMINARASIMHAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
R/AT BETTANAPALYA,
BHEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE,
KENGARI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560 072.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI R HEMANTH RAJ, ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION 45965-966/2014
DATED 23/4/2016.

IN W.A. No.694 OF 2022

BETWEEN:

- 1 . THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE 560020
- 2 . THE ADDITIONAL SPECIAL

ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
KUMARA PARK WEST
BANGALORE 560020

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI G LAKSMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

- 1 . SRI NAGARAJU
S/O KENDANNA
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
R/AT BEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE
KENGARI -2,
HOBLI 560060
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
- 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT
MULTISTORIED BUIDLING
BANGALORE 560001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI VIKAS RAVIPURE, AGA FOR R2
SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O
DATED 15.9.2023)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
IMPUGNED ORDER OF THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE PASSED
IN WP No-55793/2014 DATED 28.03.2016 AND THERE BY
DISMISS THE WP IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND ETC.

THESE APPEALS HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED
FOR JUDGMENT ON 15.12.2023, COMING ON FOR
PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, **CHIEF JUSTICE**, DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:

JUDGMENT

The present appeals are filed by the Bangalore Development Authority¹ challenging the order dated 11.7.2014 passed in WP.No.32186/2010 and other connected matters, whereunder a learned Single Judge of this Court quashed the notifications issued for acquisition of the lands for formation of a residential layout known as "The Nadaprabhu Kempegowda Layout".

2. The relevant facts necessary for consideration of the present appeals are that the acquisition proceedings by the BDA for acquiring the lands under the provisions of the Bangalore Development Authority Act, 1976². Consequent to a resolution dated 3.9.2007 of the BDA, on 18.9.2007 it addressed a letter to the State Government with all the relevant particulars seeking its approval for the scheme. On 2.4.2008 the Government accorded approval and on 21.5.2008 a Preliminary Notification was issued under

¹ 'BDA' for short

² 'The Act' for short

Section 17 of the Act proposing to acquire an extent of 4814 acres and 15 guntas of land. Vide resolution bearing No.340/09 dated 12.1.2010, the BDA furnished the details as noticed in the said resolution and sought approval for issuance of notification under Section 18 of the Act in respect of 4043 acres and 27 guntas of land and vide letter dated 27.1.2010 the BDA sent to the Government its request enclosing a copy of the said resolution dated 12.1.2010. The Government of Karnataka in its proceedings dated 16.2.2010 accorded approval and sanctioned the scheme under Section 18(3) of the Act for acquisition of 4043 acres and 27 guntas of land. Accordingly, on 18.2.2010 a Final Notification was issued under Section 19 of the Act and 4043 acres and 27 guntas was declared as notified for formation of the layout.

3. The lands sought to be acquired are from 12 villages and the details of which are as follows:

Name of the District	Name of Taluk	Name of the Hobli	Name of the Village	Total extent Acre-Guntas
Bangalore	Bangalore North	Yeshwanthpur	1) Sheegehalli	99-38
			2) Kannelli	413-13
			3) Kodigehalli	453-25
			4) Manganhalli	37-24
Bangalore Urban	Bangalore South	Kengeri	5) Kommaghatti	721-34
			6) Bheemanakuppe	833-25
			7)Bheemanakuppe-Ramasagara	40-27
			8) Sulikere	318-14
			9)Kenchanapura	250-38
			10)Ramasandra	391-14
			11) Kommaghatti-Krishnasagara	154-12
			12)Challaghatta	328-03
GRAND TOTAL				4043-27

4. It is forthcoming from the order dated 2.4.2008 that the government after verifying the proposal of the BDA, while according approval to issue preliminary notification under Section 17 of the Act has ordered, *inter alia*, as follows:

- i) to reserve 45% of the area for civic amenities and to use remaining 55% of the land for residential sites by giving 40% of the developed sites at the ratio of 60:40 per acre to the land owners i.e., 9583 sq.ft., area or to pay compensation amount (land owners on request were eligible to receive compensation partly in money and partly in developed sites);
- ii) to reserve 20% of the sites and to allot sites of 6x9 metres to schedule caste, schedule tribe and backward classes category and to take steps to construct free houses to the economically weaker sections;
- iii) apart from reserving suitable civic amenity sites, to provide basic amenities to the layout by BBMP, BWSSB, BESCO and BMTC and other institutions;
- iv) to provide separate water pipe for the purified water by BWSSB and for drinking water while forming layout;

5. It is further forthcoming that in the Government Order dated 16.2.2010 under Section 18(3) of the Act, that the same is passed subject to the following conditions:

- i) That the entire expenses of the project shall be borne by the BDA out of its resources;
- ii) That any loan that will be availed by the BDA for the proposed project, the government will not give any guarantee and loan shall be cleared solely by the BDA;
- iii) The government will not be part of any affairs that may be entered by the authority;
- iv) In the event of change of land use, prior permission of the government was to be obtained;

6. Being aggrieved by the acquisition, various writ petitions were filed before this Court. A learned Single Judge of this Court heard all the writ petitions together and while considering the same has divided the writ petitioners broadly under various heads as is forthcoming from para 3 of the order, which is extracted herein below for ready reference:

" 3. The petitions are brought by persons, who may be broadly grouped under the following heads, namely:

(a) Agriculturists who claim that they are cultivating the land and residing therein and wholly dependant on the land for their livelihood.

(b) Persons engaged in rearing milch cattle and vending milk for their livelihood.

(c) Nurserymen, who have well developed nurseries and are also said to be cultivating the land for other purposes.

(d) House owners, who have built pucca houses well before the initiation of the acquisition proceedings.

(e) Persons who have established small scale industries including brick factories.

(f) Others claiming that the land in question is most inconveniently located for being integrated in the formation of the layout. This is also a common ground urged by several of the above petitioners as well."

7. After considering various contentions put forth by the writ petitioners as well as BDA, the learned Single Judge has framed 3 points for consideration as regards the legal issues that arose for consideration as is forthcoming from para 11 of the order which is extracted hereinbelow for ready reference:

"11. The legal issues that arise for consideration in the light of the contentions put forth and which have been hardly met by the BDA are :

a. Whether the procedure adopted by the BDA in initiating the acquisition proceedings is in accordance with law and within its jurisdiction.

b. Whether the repeal of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, has the effect of frustrating any proceedings with reference to Section 36 of the BDA Act.

c. Whether the acquisition proceedings can be said to have lapsed by virtue of the 2013 Act having come into force."

8. While considering point No.(a) the learned Single Judge after noticing the sequence of events resulting in passing of the award as well as the relevant statutory provisions, has recorded the following findings:

"It is seen that the BDA need not obtain any previous approval of the Government in drawing up any development scheme. (Whether the same is necessary by virtue of Section 3 (f) (vi) or (vii) of the LA Act, is however, not examined and the question is left open). There is no explanation forthcoming as to the need for having obtained such approval when the scheme of the Act contemplates that after the publication of the scheme and service of notice as provided in Section 17 of the BDA Act and after consideration of representations, if any, received, the authority shall submit the scheme, making such modifications as it may think fit, to the Government for sanction, furnishing such details as prescribed under Section 18 of the Act. It is not contemplated that the Government may consider and "approve" any Scheme even before the BDA has gathered particulars of the lands to be acquired pursuant to the notification under Section 17 of the Act. Therefore the "approval" said to have been conferred on a nascent development scheme of the BDA by the State Government dated 2.4.2008 is out of place and

premature. The presumption is that the State Government and the BDA were proceeding on the footing that the proposed acquisition of the several lands notified under Section 17 of the Act were available for acquisition, even without any of the stake holders having had their say on the viability of the said acquisition in respect of their lands.

It is also to be noticed that the notification under Section 17 of the Act is issued by the Commissioner, BDA, in exercise of power conferred thereunder. The BDA is not the acquiring authority, the State Government is. It is therefore impermissible for the BDA to authorize the Additional Land Acquisition Officer, BDA and his staff to exercise power conferred under Section 4 (2) of the LA Act. This is evident from the fact that the State Government exercises its power under clause (c) of Section 3 and Section 7 of the LA Act read with Section 36 of the BDA Act to appoint the Additional Land Acquisition Officer, BDA, to perform the duties and functions of the Deputy Commissioner (Land Acquisition) under the LA Act, only after according sanction to the Scheme and while issuing the notification under Section 19 of the BDA Act. Any acts performed by the Addl. LAO, BDA and his staff, prior to the issuance of the notification under Section 19 of the Act, is wholly without jurisdiction and illegal."

The BDA was clearly off bounds in even suggesting that compensation in kind, would be offered and even to specify the percentage of the acquired land that would be compensated by returning developed land of any particular extent. This initiative of the BDA is not contemplated under Section 16 of the BDA Act, which specifies the particulars to be provided for in a development scheme. The BDA would hardly be in a position to determine percentages of land use without completing the process of addressing representations pursuant to the notification under Section 17 and the sanction by the State

government in respect of the extent of land ultimately covered under the notification issued under Section 19 of the Act. It may also be said that even at that stage the quantum of compensation is hardly capable of being determined. It is the State Government which would, in the eye of law, acquire the land and determine the compensation to be paid. As is evident, large swathes of land have been given up from the acquisition proceedings and it is not clarified whether the percentages declared as above are any longer valid and tenable. It is also not that all the land holders are "farmers", nor is it to be taken that all the 4,000 acres, and more of the land, is of a uniform nature and of the same value. It is therefore shocking that the State Government had even approved such a "Scheme"

(emphasis supplied)

9. While considering point No.(b), the learned Single Judge has recorded a finding regarding frustration of the acquisition proceedings under the Act after coming into force of the Land Acquisition, 2013, and has held as follows:

"It may hence be concluded that the repeal of the LA Act and the coming into force of the 2013 Act would not frustrate further acquisition proceedings under the BDA Act. For even without an amendment to Section 36 of the BDA Act, the provisions of the 2013 Act, in so far as they are applicable, would operate to regulate the acquisition proceedings under the BDA Act – according to settled principles as enunciated in the authoritative decisions referred to above. The second point framed for consideration is accordingly answered."

(emphasis supplied)

10. As regards point No.(c) framed for consideration as to whether the acquisition proceedings were lapsed, the learned Single Judge while holding that the proceedings have not lapsed, has recorded the following findings:

"In considering the question whether the acquisition proceedings are deemed to have lapsed in terms of Section 24 of the 2013 Act, is concerned, it is to be observed that the further proceedings were stayed by this court by an interim order of stay of all further proceedings. The effect of that order would have to be kept in view. It is settled law that any restraint imposed by the courts on any ongoing acquisition proceedings would extend to all aspects of the process. If therefore the acquisition proceedings were kept in abeyance altogether by virtue of the interim order, the application of the provisions of the 2013 Act which have seamlessly replaced the provisions of the LA Act, in so far as they are applicable, to the BDA Act would also be kept in abeyance. It cannot therefore be said that by virtue of Section 24 of the 2013 Act, the proceedings stood lapsed."

(emphasis supplied)

11. Being aggrieved, the BDA has filed the present appeals.

12. Heard the submissions of learned Senior Counsel Sri Gurudas Kannur assisted by the panel

counsels for the BDA namely, Sri K.Krishna, Sri Murugesh V Charati, Sri G.Lakshmeesh Rao, Sri Gowthamdev C Ullal, Sri Sachin B.S. For the respondents, who are the writ petitioners, the submissions of learned Senior Counsels Sri Ashok Harnahalli, Sri M.R.Rajagopal, Sri D.L.Jagadish, Sri K.Suman, Sri K.Shashi Kiran Shetty, and learned counsels Sri C.M.Nagabhushana, Sri L.M.Ramaiah Gowda, Sri M.C.Basavaraju, Sri P.V.Chandrashekar, Sri B.S.Nagaraj, Sri G.R.Mohan as well as other learned counsels. Learned AGA represented the State Government.

13. It is the contention of the learned Senior Counsel for the BDA that the learned Single Judge has erred in quashing the notifications merely on the ground that approval of the State Government was at a nascent stage as also that it was impermissible for the BDA to authorize the Land Acquisition Officer to exercise power under Section 4(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894³.

³ Hereinafter referred to as the 'LA Act'

That the BDA having complied with the provisions of the Act, the acquisition of the BDA ought not to have been quashed.

14. Learned counsel for the writ petitioners who are the respondents in the present appeals contend that the order of the learned Single Judge quashing the acquisitions was just and proper. It is further submitted that although various grounds were urged before the learned Single Judge, the acquisition was quashed by merely considering the first point for consideration and even if this Court were to set aside the finding of the learned Single Judge on the said point, various other grounds which have been urged by the writ petitioners are required to be considered, for which the matter is required to be remanded to the learned Single Judge.

15. Responding to the contention of the writ petitioners regarding remand, it is the contention of the BDA that all the materials are available before this Court for consideration of the aspects regarding the acquisition made by the BDA and the validity of the

acquisition is required to be adjudicated in the present appeals itself without remanding the matter to the learned Single Judge.

16. Various statutory provisions and material on record which have been referred to by the learned counsel for the parties will be specifically referred to during the course of this order.

17. Having regard to the contentions put forth in the present appeals, the questions that arise for consideration are that:

i) Whether the finding recorded by the learned Single Judge in quashing the acquisition is just and proper?

ii) Whether the matter is required to be remanded to the learned Single Judge?

iii) Whether the acquisition made by the BDA is in compliance with the provisions of the Act?

iv) In what manner the contentions put forth in certain writ petitions pertaining to the facts of the said individual cases are required to be dealt with?

18. Before considering the contentions put forth by the learned counsel for the parties and the order of the learned Single Judge, it is relevant to notice the statutory scheme under the provisions of the Act.

19. Chapter III of the Act deals with Development Schemes. It is relevant to notice Sections 15 to 18 of the Act, which read as under:

"15. Power of Authority to undertake works and incur expenditure for development, etc.- (1) *The Authority may:*

(a) draw up detailed schemes (hereinafter referred to as "development scheme") for the development of the Bangalore Metropolitan Area; and

(b) with the previous approval of the Government, undertake from time to time any works for the development of the Bangalore Metropolitan Area and incur expenditure therefor and also for the framing and execution of development schemes.

(2) The Authority may also from time to time make and take up any new or additional development schemes:

(i) on its own initiative, if satisfied of the sufficiency of its resources, or

(ii) on the recommendation of the local authority if the local authority places at the disposal of the Authority the necessary funds for framing and carrying out any scheme; or

(iii) otherwise.

(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act or in any other law for the time being in force, the Government may, whenever it deems necessary require the Authority to take up any development scheme or work and execute it subject to such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Government.

16. Particulars to be provided for in a development scheme: *Every development scheme under section 15:*

(1) shall, within the limits of the area comprised in the scheme, provide for:

(a) the acquisition of any land which, in the opinion of the Authority, will be necessary for or affected by the execution of the scheme;

(b) laying and re-laying out all or any land including the construction and reconstruction of buildings and formation and alteration of streets;

(c) drainage, water supply and electricity;

(d) the reservation of not less than fifteen percent of the total area of the layout for public parks and playgrounds and an additional area of not less than ten percent of the total area of the layout for civic amenities.

(2) may, within the limits aforesaid, provide for:

(a) raising any land which the Authority may consider expedient to raise to facilitate better drainage;

(b) forming open spaces for the better ventilation of the area comprised in the scheme or any adjoining area;

(c) the sanitary arrangements required;

(3) may, within and without the limits aforesaid provide for the construction of houses.

17. Procedure on completion of scheme: *(1) When a development scheme has been prepared, the Authority shall draw up a notification stating the fact of a scheme having been made and the limits of the area comprised therein, and naming a place where particulars of the scheme, a map of the area comprised therein, a statement specifying the land which is proposed to be acquired and of the land in regard to which a betterment tax may be levied may be seen at all reasonable hours.*

(2) A copy of the said notification shall be sent to the Corporation which shall, within thirty days from the date of receipt thereof, forward to the Authority for transmission to the Government as hereinafter provided, any representation which the Corporation may think fit to make with regard to the scheme.

(3) The Authority shall also cause a copy of the said notification to be published in the official Gazette and affixed in some conspicuous part of its own office, the Deputy Commissioner's Office, the office of the Corporation and in such other places as the Authority may consider necessary.

(4) If no representation is received from the Corporation within the time specified in sub-section (2), the concurrence of the Corporation

to the scheme shall be deemed to have been given.

(5) During the thirty days next following the day on which such notification is published in the official Gazette the Authority shall serve a notice on every person whose name appears in the assessment list of the local authority or in the land revenue register as being primarily liable to pay the property tax or land revenue assessment on any building or land which is proposed to be acquired in executing the scheme or in regard to which the Authority proposes to recover betterment tax requiring such person to show cause within thirty days from the date of the receipt of the notice why such acquisition of the building or land and the recovery of betterment tax should not be made.

(6) The notice shall be signed by or by the order of the Commissioner and shall be served:

(a) by personal delivery or if such person is absent or cannot be found, on his agent, or if no agent can be found, then by leaving the same on the land or the building; or

(b) by leaving the same at the usual or last known place of abode or business of such person; or

(c) by registered post addressed to the usual or last known place of abode or business of such person.

18. Sanction of scheme: (1) After publication of the scheme and service of notices as provided in section 17 and after consideration of representations, if any, received in respect thereof, the Authority shall submit the scheme, making such modifications therein as it may think fit, to the Government for sanction, furnishing:

(a) a description with full particulars of the scheme including the reasons for any modifications inserted therein;

(b) complete plans and estimates of the cost of executing the scheme;

(c) a statement specifying the land proposed to be acquired;

(d) any representation received under sub-section (2) of section 17;

(e) a schedule showing the rateable value, as entered in the municipal assessment book on the date of the publication of a notification relating to the land under the section 17 or the land assessment of all land specified in the statement under clause(c); and

(f) such other particulars, if any, as may be prescribed.

(2) Where any development scheme provides for the construction of houses, the Authority shall also submit to the Government plans and estimates for the construction of the houses.

(3) After considering the proposal submitted to it the Government may, by order, give sanction to the scheme.

19.1 It is forthcoming that Section 15(1) of the Act entitles the Authority to draw up a scheme for development of the Bangalore Metropolitan Area and with the previous approval of the Government undertake works and incur expenses for such schemes.

Section 15(2) of the Act also enables the Authority to take up new or additional development schemes on its own initiative if it is satisfied of its resources as well as on the recommendation of a Local Authority if the funds are made available by the said Local Authority for framing and carrying out any scheme or otherwise. Section 15(3) of the Act enables the Government to require the authority to take up any development scheme subject to the conditions that it may specify.

19.2 Section 16 of the Act sets out the details and particulars that are required to be provided under the scheme for development under Section 15 of the Act.

19.3 Section 17 of the Act deals with issue of Preliminary Notification.

19.4 Section 18 of the Act deals with steps to be taken consequent to the issue of Preliminary Notification under Section 17 of the Act.

19.5 Section 19 of the Act deals with issuance of Final Notification.

19.6 Chapter IV of the Act deals with acquisition of land, wherein Section 35 of the Act enables the Authority, with the previous approval of the Government to purchase lands and Section 36 stipulates that the acquisition of land shall be regulated by the provisions, as far as they are applicable of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

19.7 Chapter V of the Act deals with Property and Finance.

20. The appellant – BDA has placed on record that pursuant to the acquisition proceedings initiated in respect of the layout in question, the award is passed for 2700 acres of land which has been utilized in the following manner:

"a) Possession of the 2694 acres 26 Guntas of land is handed over to Engineering Section for formation of layout.

b) 26,918 sites are formed to an extent of 2208 Acres 4 Guntas of land.

c) Roads Approximately formed:

9 Meter Road 106.47 Kms.

12 Meter Road 78. 51 Kms.

15 Meter Road 13.68 Kms.

18 Meter Road 13.54 Kms.

24 Meter Road 07.31 Kms.

30 Meter Road 04.00 Kms.

d) CA Sites formed:

104 CA Sites covering 149 Acres 35 Guntas

e) Park & Open Spaces:

125 parks covering 182 Acres 24 Guntas

f) Water supply & UGD:

*213.14 Kms., of Utility Duct, Power, Water
and treated water supply.*

7299 Holes are completed.

UGD Pipeline - 194.7 Kms.

Fresh Water Supply-191.02 Kms. Completed.

Recycled Water-157.18 Kms.

*g) Expenses already incurred by the
Engineering Section.*

For UGD: Rs. 1137.6 Crores.

Civil Work: Rs.768.27 Crores,

For PRR: Rs. 472.34 Crore.

*h) Compensation for the Acquisition of Land:
687.10 Crores."*

21. It is the case of the appellant – BDA that the extent of land under litigation is about 600 acres and that connectivity of roads, underground drainage, water

supply, electricity connection and other works are pending in view of the pendency of the above appeals as the connection is planned in such a way that it operates through the lands under litigation before this Court.

Re.question (i):

22. It is forthcoming from the aforementioned that the learned Single Judge has recorded a finding with regard to the issues (b) and (c) in favour of the BDA.

23. While considering question (a) it has held that the approval conferred at the nascent development of the scheme by the State Government vide order dated 2.4.2008 is '*out of place and premature*'. In the said context, it is relevant to note that in the case of ***Junjamma & Ors., v. BDA & Ors.***⁴ a learned Single Judge of this Court considering the scope of power under Section 15 of the Act has held as follows:

⁴ ILR 2005 KAR 608

"10. Previous approval of the Government under Section 15(2) is required for undertaking works for development of the Bangalore Metropolitan area. Similarly, such previous approval is required to incur expenditure therefor. Similarly, such a previous approval is required for preparing and execution of development schemes and not for drawing up a developmental scheme. Sub-section (2) of Section 15 makes it very clear that if the authority has sufficient resources or if a local authority places at the disposal of the authority the necessary funds for framing and carrying out any scheme they can take up new or additional development schemes. Therefore, it is clear only for the expenditure to be incurred either for undertaking, framing or execution of the developmental scheme previous approval of the Government is required. If the authority is able to take up these developmental scheme on its own and it does not depend upon the Government for raising the necessary resources, then there is no necessity to have the previous approval of the Government."

(emphasis supplied)

24. Having regard to Section 15 of the Act and the judgment in the case of ***Junjamma & Ors.***⁴ as noticed above, as well as the fact that in the Government Order dated 16.02.2010 a specific condition is imposed that the entire expenses of the project shall be borne by the BDA out of its resources, that the Government will not give any guarantee, that the loan shall be solely availed by the BDA and there will be no financial responsibility of the Government

with respect to the layout being developed by the BDA, approval need not have been taken by the BDA. Despite the same, merely because the BDA has taken the approval of the State Government, it cannot be said that the same is '*out of place and premature*'. Hence, the said finding recorded by the learned Single Judge is erroneous and liable to be interfered with.

25. With regard to the finding of the learned Single Judge while answering question No.(a) that it was impermissible for the BDA to authorize the Additional Land Acquisition Officer, BDA, to exercise the power conferred under Section 4(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, it is relevant to note that the Notification under Section 17(1) of the Act has been issued by the BDA after prior approval of the State Government. Further, in the case of ***The Commissioner BDA and Ors., v. State of Karnataka & Ors.***⁵ a Division Bench of this Court considering point No.4 in the said case as to the power of BDA to appoint a Land Acquisition Officer, has held as follows:

⁵ ILR 2006 KAR 318

"49. Point No. 4. Power of BDA to appoint LAO.--*Sri Gangi Reddy, learned Counsel appearing for some of the respondents contended that under Section 4(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, an officer specially authorized by Government only can perform the functions mentioned under Section 4(2) of the LA Act. The Commissioner of the BDA has no such power to authorize any officer to perform such functions. We do not find any substance in this contention. Firstly, Section 36 of the BDA Act makes the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act so far as they are applicable, to the acquisitions under the BDA Act. Section 52 of the BDA Act empowers the authority to authorize any person to enter into or upon any land or building with or without the assistants or workmen for the purpose of making any enquiry, inspection, measurement or survey or taking levels of such land or building; digging or boring into the sub-soil; setting out boundaries and intended lines of work; marking such levels, boundaries and lines by placing marks and cutting trenches and doing any other thing necessary for the efficient administration of the BDA Act.*

50. It is the Bangalore Development Authority which has issued the Section 17(1) notification under the BDA Act and has authorized the Additional Land Acquisition Officer, BDA, its staff and workmen to exercise the powers conferred under Section 4(2) of the LA Act which is almost identical with Section 52 of the BDA Act. The Commissioner of the BDA who is the Chief Executive and Administrative Officer of the Authority has authenticated the same by his signature. Instead of mentioning Section 52 of the BDA Act, Section 4(2) of the L.A. Act has been mentioned. It is settled law that mere mentioning of a wrong provision of law would make no difference. Power is vested in the authority and in exercise of the said power appointments are made. Therefore, there is no substance in the aforesaid contention. "

(emphasis supplied)

26. In the case of **Junjamma & Ors.,⁴** while considering the question as to whether appointment of the Land Acquisition Officer under the Act is one without jurisdiction, it has been held as follows:

17. Re.Point No. (4):- It was next contended that in exercise of the powers under Section 36 of the Bangalore Development Authority Act the Additional Land Acquisition Officer, Bangalore Development Authority, Bangalore, has been authorised to exercise the power conferred under Section 4(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. As the Additional Land Acquisition Officer is not an officer of the Government he cannot be appointed. Secondly, it was contended Section 36 comes into picture only after the land vests with the Government under Section 16 of the Land Acquisition Act and therefore even before such vesting the said Section is not attracted and, therefore, the appointment made is one without jurisdiction. Consequently, all the proceedings conducted by such officer is without the authority of law and liable to be quashed.

18. Sub-section (1) of Section 36 of the Act provides that the acquisition of the land under the Act otherwise than by agreement within or without the Bangalore Metropolitan Area shall be regulated by the provisions, so far as they applicable to the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. It only means in the Act when there is no provision prescribed for acquisition of land, the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act could be availed of for the acquisition proceedings. In other words if the Act provides for specifically to that extent the Land Acquisition Act stands excluded and in the absence of any provision, the provisions of Land Acquisition Act are applicable to the acquisition under the Act. In fact, Sub-section (2) of Section 36 categorically states that for the

purpose of Sub-section (2) of Section 15 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 the Authority under the Act shall be deemed to be the local authority concerned. When a notification is issued under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act under Section 4(2) any officer either generally or specially authorized by such Government in that behalf and his servants and workmen can take up the preliminary work as mentioned in the Sub-section (2) of Section 4. When the Commissioner under the Act issued the notification it is the Land Acquisition Officer of the Authority and his staff and Workmen who are authorized to exercise the power conferred under Section 4(2) of the Act the said power is exercised by the Commissioner under Section 4(2) of the Act because there is no corresponding provision in the Act. Merely because the Additional Land Acquisition Officer of the Bangalore Development Authority is not an Officer of the Government it cannot be said that he cannot be appointed under the provisions nor such an appointment would vitiate the acquisition proceedings. Under the Act though the preliminary notification is issued by the BDA the final notification is issued by the Government after sanction of the Scheme submitted by the BDA and it is the Government which publishes the declaration under Section 19(1) of the Act. It is in that context coupled with the fact that Section 50 of the Land Acquisition Act provides that the cost of acquisition should be borne by local authority after the acquisition is complete and on payment of the cost of acquisition and on issue of notification of Section 16 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 the land which has vested with the Government would be transferred to the Authority and it is thereafter that the land vests with the Authority. Therefore the contention that Section 36 comes into picture only after the land vests with the Government under Section 16 of the Act is contrary to the express provision contained under Section 36. In that view of the matter there is no substance

in the contention that because of the appointment of Additional Land Acquisition Officer attached to the BDA the acquisition proceedings are vitiated."

(emphasis supplied)

27. Having regard to the statutory provisions as noticed and as well as the judgment of this Court in the case of ***The Commissioner BDA and Ors.***⁵ and ***Junjamma & Ors***⁴ as noticed above, the finding recorded by the learned Single Judge on issue (a) with regard to the appointment of Land Acquisition Officers by the BDA for the acquisition proceedings is erroneous and liable to be interfered with.

28. With regard to the observation made by the learned Single Judge while discussing regarding point (a) as to the percentage of the land that was to be used for civic amenities as well as to be offered as compensation to the farmers in respect of which the learned Single Judge had opined that the BDA '*was clearly off bounds*' and further observed that '*it is therefore shocking that the State Government had even*

approved such a scheme', it is relevant to note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Bondu Ramaswamy & Ors., v. Bangalore Development Authority & Ors.**,⁶ while noticing various aspects regarding the kinds of acquisition and hardship that are caused to the landlosers observed as follows:

"48. "Public purposes" may be of different degrees of importance/priority/urgency. An acquisition for laying a road or a water supply canal may be of higher priority category when compared to acquisitions for formation of an urban residential layout. Planned urban development by forming residential layouts, is carried out not only by statutory Development Authorities, but also by private developers/colonisers. The reason why the legislature has created Development Authorities for executing development schemes, is because they can undertake large-scale developments providing better quality facilities with no profit motives. But in trying to achieve planned development and thereby benefit the urban middle class or urban poor by providing them housing plots, the interests of agriculturists/landowners who lose their livelihood on account of such acquisition, should not be ignored. Though the legislature intended that the landloser should get reasonable compensation at the time of dispossession or immediately thereafter, it seldom happens in practice."

(emphasis supplied)

⁶ (2010) 7 SCC 129

29. After observing the kinds of acquisitions, while setting out the different types of benefits that will make acquisitions landloser friendly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court⁶ further observed as follows:

"153. The solution is to make the landlosers also the beneficiaries of acquisition so that the landlosers do not feel alienated but welcome the acquisition. It is necessary to evolve tailor-made schemes to suit particular acquisitions, so that they will be smooth, speedy, litigation-free and beneficial to all concerned. Proper planning, adequate counselling, and timely mediation with different groups of landlosers, should be resorted to. Let us consider the different types of benefits that will make acquisitions landloser-friendly.

153.1

153.2

153.3 Where the acquisition is of the third kind, that is, for urban development (either by formation of housing colonies by Development Authorities or by making bulk allotment to colonisers, developers or housing societies), there is no scope for providing benefits like employment or a share in the equity. But the landlosers can be given a share in the development itself, by making available a reasonable portion of the developed land to the landloser so that he can either use it personally or dispose of a part and retain a part or put it to other beneficial use.

(emphasis supplied)

30. The BDA has placed on record that while issuing the notification under Section 17 of the Act for the formation of Dr.Shivarama Karanth Layout, a similar scheme for reserving a percentage of the land to be given to the land owners of their choice had been incorporated. While considering a challenge made to the acquisition of the BDA for the said layout, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Bangalore Development Authority v. State of Karnataka**⁷ has observed as follows:

"20. The scheme which was framed was so much benevolent scheme that 40% of the 55% of the land reserved for the residential purpose was to be given to the landowners at their choice and they were also given the choice to obtain the compensation, if they so desired, under the provisions of the LA Act. Thus, it was such a scheme that there was no scope for any exclusion of the land in the ultimate final notification."

(emphasis supplied)

31. Further, in the case of **Bangalore Development Authority v. State of Karnataka**⁸ it was further observed as follows:

⁷ (2018) 9 SCC 122

⁸ order dated 3.12.2020 passed in Misc. Application No.1614-1616/2019

"12. The State Government is directed to grant approval to the 60:40 scheme in respect of the layout in question, if necessary, within two weeks from today. The State Government is also directed to depute additionally six Land Acquisition Officers to the BDA within two weeks from today."

(emphasis supplied)

32. Hence, it is submitted by the BDA that keeping in mind the observation made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court⁶ in order to make the acquisitions more friendly to the land losers, a percentage of the acquired area was offered to be conveyed to the land losers while formulating the scheme for acquisition and the percentage stipulated in the present acquisition is not an isolated instance and that in the acquisition made in the formation of Dr.Shivarama Karanth Layout also a similar mode of payment of compensation has been adopted, which has been noted and upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court⁷.

33. Having regard to what is noticed above and the submission made on behalf of the BDA, the observations made by the learned Single Judge as

noticed at para 8 are also erroneous and liable to be set aside.

34. Having regard to the foregoing discussion, the finding of the learned Single Judge quashing the acquisition is clearly erroneous and liable to be interfered with. Hence, question No.(i) framed for consideration is answered in the ***affirmative***.

Re. Question No.(ii):

35. Learned Senior Counsel for the BDA in support of the contention that the matters are required to be adjudicated by this Court submits that all the materials that are necessary for adjudicating regarding the acquisition made by the BDA, already being the subject matter of the present appeals, the validity of the acquisition proceedings also is required to be adjudicated in these appeals.

36. Per contra, learned Counsel appearing for the writ petitioners submits that various contentions having been urged before the learned Single Judge and

the orders in the writ petitions having been made with regard to only a few limited questions as framed by the learned Single Judge, in order to consider the other contentions, the matters will require to be remanded to the learned Single Judge for adjudication even if the order of learned Single Judge is set aside. Both learned Counsels have relied on certain judgments which shall be considered in the course of adjudication of the present question.

37. Reliance is placed by the learned Senior Counsel for the BDA on a judgment of Full Bench of this Court in the case of ***Town House Building Co-Operative Society Ltd., Vs. Special Deputy Commissioner***⁹ wherein, the Full Bench was considering the question: '*Whether a Division Bench hearing the writ appeals against the order of Single Judge has power to remand the cases to the learned Single Judge or not?*'

⁹ AIR 1988 Kar 312

37.1. The Hon'ble Chief Justice heading the Bench, has held as follows:

"6. Before finding out an answer to the question, it may be observed at the outset that a learned single Judge of the High Court cannot be regarded as a Court subordinate to the High Court, that an appeal has been provided under a statute validly enacted by the Legislature, that the appellate jurisdiction conferred by S.4 of the Karnataka High Court Act, 1961, does not bring out any alteration in the constitution or organisation of the High Court, and that provision for an appeal merely regulates the exercise of that power by the High Court. As we find, S.4 of the Karnataka High Court Act does not define the scope of the appellate power. Again, there are no relevant rules in this respect. Normally, when a power of appeal is conferred, it implies conferment of all incidental and ancillary powers necessary to effectuate the grant of specific power. Further, such an express power, if not specifically hedged by any limitation, inheres within it, all qualities and attributes implied in the nature of such a power. "

" 14.

As a result of the aforesaid discussion, the answers to the questions referred to us may be stated as follows:—

(i) That there is an inherent power in the Division Bench hearing writ appeal against an order of a learned Single Judge, to remand the case to be decided afresh by a learned single Judge;

(ii) That a remand order may be passed in cases where a Writ Petition has been dismissed for non-prosecution or in limine or on the ground of delay or maintainability or on some question of

law without going into merits, etc. However, it is best in these matters to be neither dogmatic nor exhaustive, yet the aforesaid categories are the ones in which the Appellate Bench may exercise its power of remand; and

(iii) That where a Writ Petition has been disposed of on merits by an order made by a learned single Judge, a Division Bench on Appeal would have no jurisdiction to remand such a case to a learned single Judge for fresh decision on merits and the appeal has to be disposed of on merits by the Division Bench itself”.

(emphasis supplied)

37.2. In the concurring opinion, it was held as follows:

“27. On reconsideration of the matter in the light of the judgement of the Supreme Court in Umaji's Case (AIR 1986 SC 1272). I am of the view that if a Writ Petition has been dismissed for non-prosecution or in limine on grounds such as delay, maintainability etc., and not on merits by a learned single Judge and such an order is taken in appeal and the Division Bench sets aside such an order, the Writ Petition gets restored. As a consequence in view of Sec. 9 of the Act and the Rules, the Writ Petition has to be posted for preliminary hearing or final hearing, as the case may be before a learned single Judge. It is in this manner and to this extent, it appears to me it can be said that the Division Bench has the inherent or incidental power to bring about a remand of the Writ Petition by a learned single Judge.

28.
29.
30.

31. Section 4 referred to above provides for an appellate forum. In the absence of any restriction, it should be understood that the appellate power under the said provision has all the qualities of any other appellate power. The fact that it is an intra-Court appeal may be a relevant factor in considering the appropriateness of making a particular order in the course of exercising the said appellate power.

32. An appellate power necessarily includes a power to remand the cause to be decided by the original authority or Court. Such a power is inherent in the appellate power. Since the appellate power is conferred on a Bench of the same High Court here, while exercising the said appellate power necessarily the appellate Bench will have to be guided by principles of propriety while remitting a cause to the original side Bench. It is in this background I consider that the power to remit a cause to the original Bench by the Division Bench will have to be sparingly used when the situation absolutely warrants such a remand, as opined by my Lord the Chief Justice.

(emphasis supplied)

38. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Roma Sonkar Vs. Madhya Pradesh State Public Service Commission and others**¹⁰ has held as follows:

"We have very serious reservations whether the Division Bench in an intra-court appeal could have remitted a writ petition in the matter of moulding the relief. It is the exercise

¹⁰ (2018) 7 SCC 106

of jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The learned Single Judge as well as the Division Bench exercised the same jurisdiction. Only to avoid inconvenience to the litigants, another tier of screening by the Division Bench is provided in terms of the power of the High Court but that does not mean that the Single Judge is subordinate to the Division Bench. Being a writ proceeding, the Division Bench was called upon, in the intra court appeal, primarily and mostly to consider the correctness or otherwise of the view taken by the learned Single Judge. Hence, in our view, the Division Bench needs to consider the appeal(s) on merits by deciding on the correctness of the judgment of the learned Single Judge, instead of remitting the matter to the learned Single Judge.

(emphasis supplied)

39. Having regard to the settled position of law as held in the case of **Roma Sonkar**¹⁰ and in the case of **Town House Building Co-Operative Society Ltd.**,⁹ in the present case, the writ petitions having been adjudicated on its merits and the present appeals having been filed challenging the said decision, it is just and proper that the entirety of the matter on its merits be considered in these present appeals itself without remanding the matter to the learned Single Judge.

40. There is a factual aspect which is required to be placed on record at the present juncture. That the

acquisition proceedings commenced in the year 2008 with the issue of preliminary notification and a total extent of 4043 acres and 27 guntas have been notified for acquisition in the final notification. The subject matter of the present appeals is an extent of 600 acres. Further, the development of layout having been partially completed as morefully noticed at para No.20 hereinabove and the question as to the validity of the acquisition proceedings having been pending for adjudication for nearly 16 years and various allottees of sites for whom the layout is being formed as well as the landowners are waiting for many years for a culmination of the litigation, it is expedient that the merits of the matter be adjudicated in the present appeals itself. Hence, question No.(ii). framed for consideration is answered in the ***negative***.

Re. Question No.(iii):

41. Before considering as to whether the acquisition made by the BDA is in accordance with law, it is necessary to notice various judgments of this Court

as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court with regard to the legal position of the acquisitions made by the BDA.

41.1 The acquisition made by the BDA for formation of Arkavathi Layout was the subject matter of challenge before this Court wherein a learned Single Judge quashed the said acquisition. A Division Bench of this Court while considering the appeals filed by the BDA in ***The Commissioner BDA and Ors.***⁵ while considering the question as to whether the Land Acquisition Act prevails over the Act, has held as follows:

"41. Therefore, it is clear that the BDA Act is one which will squarely fall under and traceable to the powers of the State Legislature under Entry 5 of List II of VII Schedule in the Constitution of India. The BDA Act so far as acquisition of land for its developmental activities are concerned in substance and effect will constitute a special law providing for acquisition for the said purpose of the BDA and, therefore, it cannot be considered to be part of the LA Act. Thus a scheme formulated, sanctioned and set for its implementation under BDA Act, cannot be stultified or rendered ineffective and unenforceable by a provision in the Central Act, particularly of the nature of Section 4 or 5A which has no application to the actions taken under the BDA Act. Therefore, the finding recorded by the learned single Judge in this regard is liable to be set aside."

(emphasis supplied)

41.1.1 The Division Bench⁵ while considering the power of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to interfere with the acquisition proceedings which are in public interest, has held as follows:

"77. Therefore, public interest should not be permitted to be defeated on a mere technicality. Procedural defects which do not go to the root of the matter should not be permitted to defeat a just cause. There is sufficient power in the courts, to ensure that injustice is not done to any party who has a just cause. As far as possible a substantive right should not be allowed to be defeated on account of a procedural irregularity which is curable.

78. A memo filed by the BDA discloses that, in the total extent of 2,750 acres which is notified for acquisition in the final notification, challenge to the acquisition is only to the extent of about 748 acres. There is no challenge to the acquisition regarding rest of the land. About 538 acres of land belongs to the Government itself. In respect of 92 acres, no objections were filed. It is on record that to the extent of about 1228 acres awards have been passed; compensation paid, possession taken; layout is formed. 14,103 sites carved out. 2,29,000 applications received for allotment of sites. Under these circumstances to quash acquisition proceedings of this magnitude on the aforesaid grounds would be wholly unjustified and would be against public interest."

(emphasis supplied)

41.1.2 While considering the grievance of the writ petitioners that there was discrimination and arbitrariness on the part of the BDA in notifying the lands for acquisition, wherein the lands belonging to influential and powerful persons which are adjoining their lands and which are similarly situated are not notified for acquisition, the Division Bench⁵ has ordered as follows:

"102. Though the learned single Judge may be justified in holding that there is discrimination and arbitrariness in acquiring the land of the petitioners in W.P. No. 28087/2004, after referring to the pleadings in para 5 of the Writ Petition, which was not rebutted by the BDA or the Government in their statement of objections, he should have confined the relief only to those petitioners who have proved their case. On that ground he could not have quashed the entire acquisition relating to 2,750 acres. We are also satisfied that the plea of discrimination taken by some of the land owners is well founded. However, it is a disputed fact, which cannot be gone into in these appeals, without there being enough material on record. In fact the BDA and Government have not traversed those allegations of discrimination specifically. Under these circumstances and in the light of the aforesaid memo, we deem it proper to give an opportunity to all those land owners (excluding site owners) who have taken the plea of discrimination to file an appropriate application before the BDA for deletion of their lands from acquisition, and to substantiate their contention by producing such evidence which are available with them. On such application being filed and

after holding an enquiry, the BDA shall consider their requests. If they are able to establish that their lands are similarly situated as that of the other land owners, whose land was not at all notified for acquisition, or having been notified under Section 17(1) of the BDA Act, excluded from acquisition after upholding the objection, the said lands shall be excluded from acquisition. On receipt of such a report, the scheme already sanctioned by the Government shall stand amended accordingly, and the Government shall pass appropriate orders in this regard.

(emphasis supplied)

41.1.3 The Division Bench⁵ upheld the acquisition subject to certain conditions, the details of which shall be noticed subsequently.

41.2 The judgment of the Division Bench⁵ was the subject matter of challenge before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Bondu Ramaswamy**⁶ wherein, with regard to the non-compliance of Sections 15 to 19 of the Act and the specific contention that there was absence of specificity and discrepancy in extent, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

"104. Necessarily, a preparation of a development scheme would contemplate survey and ascertainment of suitable available land for acquisition and preparation of a scheme. Before the -scheme is finalised there will necessarily be modifications and changes. Even publication of a

notification under Sections 17(1) and (3) of the Act stating that the scheme has been made and specifying the lands which are proposed to be acquired is subject to a revision on consideration of representations/objections and deletions warranted. Therefore, the mere fact that there were some modifications from time to time between 2001 when the initial proposal was mooted till the issue of the notification under Sections 17(1) and (3) or that some lands were omitted/deleted in the declaration under Section 19(1) will not affect the validity of the scheme. In fact deletion of some items of land or reducing the extent proposed to be acquired in some items of land, when issuing final declaration is made is quite common and is indeed a result of the process prescribed under any Act providing for acquisitions. The changes and modifications are in fact contemplated in the process of making the scheme under Sections 15 to 19 of the BDA Act.

(emphasis supplied)

41.2.1 With regard to the contention regarding discrimination, malafides and arbitrariness, the Hon'ble Supreme Court ⁶, has observed as follows:

"136. Sporadic small unauthorised constructions in unauthorised colonies/layouts, are not to be deleted as the very purpose of acquisition for planned development is to avoid such unauthorised development. If hardship is the reason for such deletion, the appropriate course is to give preference to the land/plot owners in making allotments and help them to resettle and not to continue the illegal and haphazard pockets merely on the ground that some temporary structure or a dilapidated structure existed therein. A Development Authority should either provide orderly development or should stay away from development. It cannot act like unscrupulous

private developers/colonisers attempting development of small bits of land with only profit motive. When we refer to private developers/colonisers by way of comparison, our intention is not to deprecate all private developers/colonisers. We are aware that several private developers/colonisers provide large, well-planned authorised developments, some of which are even better than developments by Development Authorities. What is discouraged and deprecated is small unauthorised layouts without any basic amenities. Be that as it may.

(emphasis supplied)

41.2.2. Considering the principles regarding grant of relief in cases of discrimination, the Hon'ble Supreme Court⁶ , has held as follows:

"143. We are conscious of the fact that when a person subjected to blatant discrimination, approaches a court seeking equal treatment, he expects relief similar to what others have been granted. All that he is interested is getting relief for himself, as others. He is not interested in getting the relief illegally granted to others, quashed. Nor is he interested in knowing whether others were granted relief legally or about the distinction between positive equality and negative equality. In fact he will be reluctant to approach courts for quashing the relief granted to others on the ground that it is illegal, as he does not want to incur the wrath of those who have benefited from the wrong action. As a result, in most cases those who benefit by the illegal grants/actions by authorities, get away with the benefit, while others who are not fortunate to have "connections" or "money power" suffer. But these are not the grounds for courts to enforce negative equality and perpetuate the illegality.

158. Where arbitrary and unexplained deletions and exclusions from acquisition, of large extents of notified lands, render the acquisitions meaningless, or totally unworkable, the court will have no alternative but to quash the entire acquisition. But where many landlosers have accepted the acquisition and received the compensation, and where possession of considerable portions of acquired lands has already been taken, and development activities have been carried out by laying plots and even making provisional or actual allotments, those factors have to be taken note of, while granting relief. The Division Bench has made an effort to protect the interests of all parties, on the facts and circumstances, by issuing detailed directions. But implementation of these directions may lead to further litigations and complications.”

(emphasis supplied)

41.2.3 Having regard to the various scenarios contemplated while granting of reliefs when there was discrimination, the Hon'ble Supreme Court⁶ affirmed the directions of the Division Bench of this Court and has issued further directions.

41.3 The acquisition made by the BDA for formation of the Vishveshwaraiah layout was the subject matter of challenge before this Court. A learned Single Judge in the case of **Junjamma & Ors.**,⁴ while

considering as to whether the notifications are liable to be quashed on the ground of vagueness, non mentioning of public purpose and not giving clear description of the property, has held as follows:

"14. A comparison of the aforesaid two Sections discloses that in Section 17(1) of the Act there is no obligation cast upon the acquiring authority to mention the public purposes for which the land is needed. On the contrary what is to be mentioned in a notification under Section 17(1) is that a developmental scheme has been prepared and the said fact is to be stated in the notification and the limits of the area comprised therein and naming a place where particulars of the scheme, a map of the area comprised therein, a statement specifying the land which is proposed to be acquired and of the land in regard to which a betterment tax would be levied may be seen at all reasonable hours is all to be mentioned in the notification. When we look at Section 17(1) notification issued, it is mentioned that it appears to the Bangalore Development Authority that lands specified in the schedule hereto is likely to be needed for the purpose of formation of a layout called Sir M. Visweshwaraiah Layout and in that regard a developmental scheme has been proposed and that the particulars of the scheme, the maps of the area comprised therein and the statement specifying the lands which is proposed to be acquired may be seen in the office of the Additional land Acquisition Officer, Bangalore Development Authority, Bangalore, during the office hours on all working days. Thus the

notification issued under Section 17(1) of the Act complies with all the legal requirements mentioned in the aforesaid provision. It is not vague. In the judgment of the Supreme Court as aforesaid, in the preliminary notification in the column 'public purpose' it was shown the land is required for residential purpose and the only description given about the land to be acquired was that 2.29 hectares of land proposed to be acquired is situated in District Mandsaur, Village Mandsaur. Whereas, in the final notification issued under Section 6(1) the public purpose has been stated to be housing scheme of housing board, thus the public purpose mentioned in 4(1) notification was different from what was mentioned in 6(1) notification which was again different from what was mentioned in the letter of the Board to the Government. Similarly, the description of the property as required under law was not given. The Supreme Court therefore held those factors go to expose non application of mind by the authorities while issuing the impugned notification and it appears that they were not even sure of the public purpose for which the land was sought to be acquired. It is in that context it was held that the impugned notifications are vitiated on account of being vague and for non-compliance with the mandatory requirements of that law.

15. Whereas in the instant case, the notification issued is strictly in conformity with the requirements of law. The land sought to be acquired is clearly mentioned by giving the names of the kathedars/anubhavadars, the survey numbers, the nature of the land, the extent of land owned, extent of land proposed for acquisition and the boundaries of the land

which is proposed to be acquired, name of the Village where the land is situated and also the total land acquired under the scheme. Under these circumstances, I do not find any merit in the submission of the learned counsels for the petitioners that the notification is liable to be quashed on the ground of vagueness."

(emphasis supplied)

41.3.1. With regard to the contention that the lands used for nursery and garden cannot be used for residential purposes without there being appropriate permission by the planning authority, the learned Single Judge⁴ has held as follows:

"34. Similarly, there is no substance in the contention that having regard to the user of the land acquired, namely non-residential purpose; industrial purpose, commercial purpose, lands, used for nursery and garden cannot be used for residential purpose without there being appropriate permission obtained from the planning authority. In fact, in this regard the learned counsels for the petitioners relied on a judgment of this Court in the case of B.R. Baliga v. Town Municipal Council, Udupi, D.K. [1995 (4) Kar. L.J. 408.] where it has been held that when land which is acquired is an agricultural land acquired for the purpose of forming a residential layout the permission of the Planning Authority is required for the change of land use. Without such permission the land cannot be used for residential purposes. That again does not affect the power of the Authority or the Government to acquire the land. It is only

after acquisition of the land that the authority can seek permission for change of land use. The very fact that there is a provision for change of land use implies that the owner of the land is entitled to approach the planning-authorities for change of land use. But such a request is to be made by the owner of the land. The ownership of the land could be acquired by the Authority by the mode of acquisition. Therefore, not obtaining prior permission from the Planning Authority for change of land use does not in anyway vitiate the acquisition of land. In fact while according sanction under Section 18(3) of the Act, the Government has categorically stated that the sanction sought for is granted subject to the condition that the Authority shall obtain permission for change of land use. Therefore, not obtaining prior permission for change of land use would in no way vitiate the acquisition proceedings."

(emphasis supplied)

41.3.2 With regard to the acquisition made in the Green Belt, it was held as follows:

"36. If as a result of acute shortage of land within the city nearby agricultural land situated in the green belt is acquired by the Government it cannot be said that it is not a case of proper exercise of power under the Act by the Government. There is a large influx of people from all over the country to Bangalore. A comprehensive development plan has been prepared by the Planning Authority for the City of Bangalore earmarking residential area, commercial area, industrial area, etc., in the said plan. The said plan is not static. It is reviewed from time to time.

Similarly, the green belt area shown in the Comprehensive Development Plan cannot be static for all time to come. In any Comprehensive Development Plan sufficient area is to be earmarked as green belt area. If a portion of a green belt area is utilised for the formation of a layout consequently the authorities may earmark equivalent extent of land as green belt by extending the original green belt area. That is the reason why the boundary of the Bangalore Metropolitan area is extended from time to time by issuing notifications by the Government including more and more villages. The need is ever growing. It is for the planning authorities who are vested with the power to prepare a Comprehensive Development Plan, to take into consideration the needs of the public and other factors and earmark the green belt area. However all this would not in anyway affect the power of the Government under the Land Acquisition Act or the power of the Authority or the Government under the Act to acquire land which is situated within the green belt area for the formation of layout. Therefore, I do not find any substance in the said contention."

(emphasis supplied)

41.3.3. While considering the case of acquisition of nursery lands and as to whether any persons whose lands are similarly placed has not been acquired, it was held as follows:

"48. if petitioners who are similarly placed as that of the owners whose land is not acquired then, on that ground the entire

acquisition itself cannot be set aside. At best persons who are similarly placed are also entitled to the relief which is given to others. Therefore it is necessary to examine the entitlement of the petitioners before Court to the relief in the facts and circumstances of each case. Before any relief could be given to the petitioners in these case, an investigation has to be conducted to find out whether their case would fall within the parameters prescribed by the authorities on the basis of which relief is given to the persons who are similarly placed.

49. In the statement of objections filed before this Court the respondents deny the fact that the petitioners are similarly placed. Therefore, if this court has to grant any relief to the petitioners the court has to investigate into these disputed questions of fact and then only the petitioners would be entitled to the relief. For that purpose it has to be seen what is the nature of the plea of each petitioner, what was the position of the land on the date of preliminary notification, whether the entire land claimed by the petitioner would fall within the exempted category, if not what is the extent of land which could be excluded etc. It is also necessary to find out whether any of the petitioners have altered or improved the properties after obtaining the interim order from this Court. By mere looking into the photographs produced it is not possible to arrive at any conclusion. It requires an investigation, after affording reasonable opportunities to all the parties concerned to produce evidence and then to arrive at a conclusion. This Court cannot undertake this exercise in its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, I am of the view the appropriate

course would be as was done in Subesingh's case where Supreme Court directed the authority to consider the objections raised by the petitioners for exclusion of their properties from acquisition in the light of what is stated above and then pass appropriate orders on its merits. If said lands are similarly situated as that of the others certainly the authorities are bound to give the same benefit to those persons. If it is not similarly placed it is always open to the authorities to reject their objections and proceed further in the matter. This complaint could not have been made by the petitioners in the original objections filed by them for acquisition. Therefore, all that they have contended in their objection statement is that their land is not liable to be acquired for the reasons mentioned therein. The present objection has arisen after their objections are over ruled whereas the objections of persons who are similarly placed are accepted. Therefore, the authorities have to necessarily take in to consideration the material which was before them while upholding the objections of others and compare the same with the petitioners herein who have raised similar objections and then come to their own conclusion on merits and pass appropriate orders. It is in the nature of a subsequent event. Therefore, there is no necessity to quash the acquisition which is otherwise valid and legal and thus it would meet the ends of justice."

(emphasis supplied)

42. The acquisitions in the said case have been upheld subject to various directions which shall be discussed subsequently.

43. Having regard to the settled position of law and the factual matrix as noticed above, it is clear that consequent to the approval granted by the State Government on 02.04.2008 approving the scheme and permitting the BDA to issue Preliminary Notification under Section 17 of the Act, the Preliminary Notification was issued on 21.05.2008 under Section 17(1) and (3) of the Act whereunder, it was proposed as follows:

"Whereas it appears to the Bangalore Development Authority, that the lands specified in the schedule hereto likely to be needed for the purpose ie, for the formation of layout called "NADA PRABHU KEMPEGOWDA LAYOUT" including Link Roads. In this scheme as approved by the Government of Karnataka vide ನಅಇ 427 ಬೆಂಘೂಸ್ವಾ 2007, Bangalore, dated:2/4/2008, 45% of the Land covered under the scheme would be used for Civic Amenities, Play Grounds, Roads, etc., and the residential sites, would be formed by utilizing the remaining 55% of the Land. Out of this 55% developed residential area, 40% of 55% will be offered as compensation to the farmers as specified in the scheme and the remaining 60% of 55% will be the share of the BDA. The farmers are also given option to accept the developed eligible residential land or opt for Compensation / both."

44. Vide the said notification, an extent of 4814 acres 15 guntas of land was notified. Subsequently, vide notification dated 18.02.2010, a Final Notification was issued under Section 19 of the Act whereunder, it was stated as follows:

"Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-section (1) of Section 19 of the Bangalore Development Act, 1976 (Karnataka Act No.12 of 1976), the Government of Karnataka hereby declares that the lands specified in the Scheduled noted below be the same a little more or less are needed for public purpose viz for the formation of a layout called "NADAPRABHU KEMPEGOWDA LAYOUT" and in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause-(c) of the Section 3 and Section 7 of Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act- 1/1984) as amended and extended from time to time by the Land Acquisition (Karnataka and amendment) Act 1961 (Karnataka Act 17 of 1961) read with Section 36 of the Bangalore Development Authority Ac, 1976, the Additional Land Acquisition Officer, Bangalore Development Authority, Bangalore, is hereby appointed to perform the duties and functions of the Deputy Commissioner (Land Acquisition), under the Land Acquisition Act and directed to take order for Acquisition Lands."

45. The extent of lands notified in the said final notification is an extent of 4043 acres 27 guntas. Thereafter, it has been placed on record by the BDA

that award is passed for 2700 acres of land, out of which 2694 acres 26 guntas of land has been handed over to the engineering section for formation of layout and 26918 sites are formed in an extent of 2208 acres 4 guntas of land. The details of the land used for civic amenities and other utilities are noticed at para 20 hereinabove.

46. Having regard to the aforementioned, a relevant consideration is that, undisputedly, the lands have been acquired in public interest for the purpose of formation of a layout to satisfy housing needs of the general public in the city of Bengaluru. It is further notified that 20% of the sites are reserved for schedule caste, schedule tribes and backward classes category and steps are to be taken to construct free houses for economically weaker sections. The judgment in the case of ***The Commissioner, BDA***⁵, lays down the scope of interference of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution to interfere with the acquisitions which are made in the public interest. It is also relevant to note

that out of 4043 acres and 27 guntas notified for acquisition, the acquisitions have been challenged only insofar as an extent of 600 acres.

47. With regard to the contention of the writ petitioners that a large extent of land which was notified in the preliminary notification was left out in the final notification, it is relevant to note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Bondu Ramaswamy**⁶ has categorically held that deletion of some lands or reducing the extent proposed to be acquired when issuing a final notification is common and is a result of process prescribed under the Act. Hence, the said contention of the writ petitioners is liable to be rejected.

48. In the present case, it is clear that the Preliminary Notification and Final Notification have been issued after following the due process as stipulated under the Act. The contention of some of the writ petitioners that their lands have been notified for acquisition while similarly placed lands have been left out, has to be considered on the facts of each individual

case and the said contention is not a ground to quash the entire notification / acquisition.

49. It is also relevant to note that in the case of ***Junjamma & Ors.***⁴ the contention regarding vagueness of the notification and not giving clear description of the property has also been considered and that it has been categorically held that as long as survey number and extent of lands and the boundaries of lands are mentioned, as has been done in the present case, the question of quashing the acquisition under the said ground does not arise.

50. With regard to the contention that Nursery and Garden lands cannot be acquired and reliance is placed on various Government Orders in support of the same, it is relevant to note that said aspect has also been considered by this Court in the case of ***Junjamma & Ors.***⁴ wherein, it has been categorically held that it is only after the acquisition that the authority is required to seek adequate permission for change of land use and hence, on the said ground, the acquisition proceedings

cannot be quashed. Further, Government Orders will not in any manner restrict the exercise of a power vested under a statute.

51. In view of the foregoing discussion, the acquisition made by the BDA cannot be said to be contrary to the provisions of the Act. The acquisition made is just and proper. The preliminary notification dated 21.05.2008 and final notification dated 18.02.2010 having been validly issued are accordingly upheld. Hence, question No.(iii) framed for consideration is answered in the ***affirmative***.

Re. Question No.(iv):

52. After considering the submissions made by various learned Counsels wherein contentions were urged which were peculiar to the facts of the said individual cases, their grievances could be categorized as follows:

- i) grievances by owners of nursery/garden lands as well as lands where the owners were carrying out agricultural operations;
- ii) grievances by owners of lands who contend that similarly placed lands have been left out when the final notification was issued or in respect of which subsequently the lands have been denotified from acquisition under Section 48 of the Act;
- iii) grievances by owners of lands where educational institutions are situated;
- iv) grievances by owners of lands whose surrounding lands have been denotified;
- v) grievances of site owners who have purchased sites in layouts formed prior to the preliminary notification and where, in some cases residential houses have been constructed; and
- vi) grievances of owners who are running a brick or other industry.

53. Some of the writ petitioners have placed on record notifications issued under Section 48 of the LA

Act wherein, the lands have been deleted from acquisition, the details of which are as follows:

Sl. No.	Date	Sy. No.	Extent Acquired A – G	Extent With-drawn	Village	Name of the Kathedar
1	22.5.2010	8 (nursery land)	99.21	2.00	Sulikere	H.V.Subbakrishna
2	6.4.2010	3	3.28	3.28	Kodigehalli	Huchhappa, Parthasarathi
3	7.4.2010	101/2	3.05	3.05	Kenchanapura	Dr.P.Mallikarjuna swamy s/o R.Puttamadaiah
4	7.4.2010	22	2.00	2.00	Kencahanapura	R.Puttamadaiah s/o late Ramaiah
5	8.4.2010	15	4.00	4.00	Sulikere	Lankappa, Hanumanthaiah, Government, R.Naveen s/o Ramaswamy
6	27.5.2010	55/1	9.28	4.33	Kodigehalli	Doddahanumanthaiah Revanna, Chikkahanumanthaiah K.K.Krishnappa s/o Late H.K.Kalappa
7	6.9.2010	28	14.20	8.33	Challaghatta	M.Madanlala s/o Mongilala, D.Jaichand s/o Deepchand, Rajakumari w/o D.Jaichand, Rajakumari w/o D.Jaichand
8	7.4.2010	22	2.00	2.00	Kencahanapura	R.Puttamadaiah s/o late Ramaiah

54. It is further relevant to note that the writ petitioners have also referred to the orders passed in certain writ petitions wherein, the acquisitions have been dropped, the details of which are as follows:

54.1 Order dated 2.4.2014 WP No.9097-9100/2010 & 9103-9106/2010, which reads as follows:

"O R D E R

The learned Senior Advocate Shri Jayakumar S Patil, appearing for the Counsel for the respondent - Bangalore Development Authority (BDA), files a memo, which reads as follows:-

"MEMO

As per the affidavit of the Commissioner of Bangalore Development Authority dated 18.8.2011 and list accompanied the following petition schedule lands are Nursery lands.

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Sy.No.</i>	<i>Extent</i>	<i>Village</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>111</i>	<i>9 acres</i>	<i>Ramasandra</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>1 Acre 30 guntas</i>	<i>Ramasandra</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>27 guntas</i>	<i>Ramasandra</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>2 acres 21 guntas</i>	<i>Kommaghatta</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>03 guntas</i>	<i>Kommaghatta</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>77/1</i>	<i>1 acre 19 guntas</i>	<i>Kommaghatta</i>
<i>7</i>	<i>77/2B</i>	<i>3 acres 36 guntas</i>	<i>Kommaghatta</i>

The rest of the lands bearing Survey Nos.107, measuring 30 guntas, 108 measuring 2 acres, 111/6 measuring 5 acres and 111/12 measuring 4 acres all are situated at Ramasandra village are not Nursery lands and hence the Hon'ble Court may dispose of the petitions so far as nursery lands are concerned."

It is noticed that the BDA has not recommended deletion of all the items of petition schedule lands from the acquisition proceedings.

2. In view of the memo, it is now for the State Government to pass appropriate orders in the light of the recommendation made by the BDA, in so far as the items of lands mentioned in the memo. The State Government shall expedite consideration and shall pass orders on or before 30th June 2014, failing which, it shall be deemed that the lands are withdrawn from the acquisition proceedings.

The petitions stand disposed of in terms as above."

54.2 Order dated 30.4.2014 passed in WP Nos.43467-43468/2012, which reads as under:

"Shri C.R.Gopaldaswamy, learned Counsel takes notice for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

2. The learned Senior Advocate Shri Jayakumar S Patil, appearing for the Counsel for the respondent - Bangalore Development Authority (BDA), files status reports, in respect of the lands forming subject matter of the present writ petitions, which reads as follows:-

Status Report in W.P.No.43467/2012

"As per court documents given by the petitioner and perusal of the same. The above said lands there exists nursery in the name of "Janata Farm and Nursery". They have not submitted business transactions from PN Date to till date. The case of the petitioners along with the report of the Land Acquisition Section will be examined and accordingly proposal will be sent to the Government for appropriate action."

Status Report in W.P.No.43468/2012

"As per court documents given by the petitioner and perusal of the same. The above said lands there exists nursery in the name of "Rishi Farm and Nursery". They have not submitted business transactions from PN Date to till date. The case of the petitioners along with the report of the Land Acquisition Section will be examined and accordingly proposal will be sent to the Government for appropriate action."

In view of the Status Reports, it is now for the State Government to pass appropriate orders. The State Government shall expedite consideration and shall pass orders on or before 31st July 2014, failing which, it shall be deemed that the lands are withdrawn from the acquisition proceedings.

The petitions stand disposed of."

54.3 Order dated 23.4.2014 passed in WP

No.43469/2012, which reads as under:

"Shri C.R.Gopaldaswamy, learned Counsel takes notice for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

2. The learned Senior Advocate Shri Jayakumar S Patil, appearing for the Counsel for the respondent - Bangalore Development Authority (BDA), files a status report, in respect of the lands forming subject matter of the present writ petition, which reads as follows:-

"As per court direction petitioners have submitted the records, on the perusal of the same in the above said lands there exists nursery in the name of "Teju Farm and Nursery". They submitted registered ID Card. They have not submitted

business transactions from PN date to till date. The case of the petitioners along with the report of the Land Acquisition Section will be examined and accordingly proposal will be sent to the Government for appropriate action."

In view of the Status Report, it is now for the State Government to pass appropriate orders. The State Government shall expedite consideration and shall pass orders on or before 31st July 2014, failing which, it shall be deemed that the lands are withdrawn from the acquisition proceedings.

The petition stands disposed of."

55. It is also relevant to note that with regard to nursery lands, the State Government has passed Order bearing No.HUD 478 MNX 86, Bengaluru, dated 1.1.1987 wherein it was ordered as follows:

"Government have further examined the request and hereby order that the lands used for nurseries be exempt from Land Acquisition for its developmental schemes by the Bangalore Development Authority. If the owners of these nurseries discontinue to use those lands for nurseries, the lands will be acquired by the Bangalore Development Authority."

56. Having regard to the aforementioned, it is clear that the State Government has issued notifications under Section 48 of the LA Act denotifying certain lands

which were notified for acquisition. In addition, during the pendency of the writ petitions, pursuant to orders passed by the learned Single Judge, spot inspections have been carried out and mahazars have been drawn, consequent to which memos filed by the BDA and the acquisition has been withdrawn in respect of various lands. Amongst the said lands, various lands have been left out from acquisition on the ground that they are nursery lands or where layouts have been formed or where there are revenue sites as also due to various other reasons.

57. While considering the contentions of the writ petitioners that similarly placed lands have been denotified, it is relevant to notice some of the judgments that have been referred to, which are as under:

57.1 ***Hari Ram & Anr v. State of Haryana***¹¹, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:

"40. It is true that any action or order contrary to law does not confer any right upon any

¹¹ (2010) 3 SCC 621

person for similar treatment. It is equally true that a landowner whose land has been acquired for public purpose by following the prescribed procedure cannot claim as a matter of right for release of his/her land from acquisition but where the State Government exercises its power under Section 48 of the Act for withdrawal from acquisition in respect of a particular land, the landowners who are similarly situated have a right of similar treatment by the State Government. Equality of citizens' rights is one of the fundamental pillars on which the edifice of the rule of law rests. All actions of the State have to be fair and for legitimate reasons.

41. The Government has obligation of acting with substantial fairness and consistency in considering the representations of the landowners for withdrawal from acquisition whose lands have been acquired under the same acquisition proceedings. The State Government cannot pick and choose some landowners and release their land from acquisition and deny the same benefit to other landowners by creating artificial distinction. Passing different orders in exercise of its power under Section 48 of the Act in respect of persons similarly situated relating to the same acquisition proceedings and for the same public purpose is definitely violative of Article 14 of the Constitution and must be held to be discriminatory.

42.

43. It is unfair on the part of the State Government in not considering representations of the appellants by applying the same standards which were applied to other landowners while withdrawing from acquisition of their land under the same acquisition proceedings. If this Court does not correct the wrong action of the State Government, it may leave citizens with the belief that what counts for the citizens is right contacts with right persons in the State Government and that judicial proceedings are not efficacious. The

action of the State Government in treating the present appellants differently although they are situated similar to the landowners whose lands have been released can not be countenanced and has to be declared bad in law."

(emphasis supplied)

57.2 **BEML Employees House Building**

Co.op., Society Ltd., v. State of Karnataka¹²,

wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court was considering a case where the land owners have challenged the acquisition proceedings which was allowed by a learned Single Judge of the High Court which was also affirmed by the Division Bench. The Hon'ble Supreme Court considering a challenge to the same by the beneficiary of acquisition has upheld the judgment of the High Court and held that similarly placed lands have been left out from acquisition based on the recommendation of the land acquisition officer. That the land of the writ petitioners also having been recommended for dropping off the same from acquisition was entitled to the same relief.

¹² (2005) 9 SCC 248

57.3 **Mrs.Latha U.Kamath & ors. V. The Commissioner, Bangalore¹³**, wherein a Division Bench of this Court was considering a case wherein the writ petitioners were owners of nursery lands which were acquired by the BDA. It was the contention of the writ petitioners that the BDA and the Government having resolved not to acquire nursery lands, the acquisition was required to be quashed. The Division Bench of this Court placing reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Omprakash & Anr., v. State of U.P and ors.,¹⁴** refused to quash the acquisition proceedings. However, it ordered as follows:

"51. In these circumstances, we direct the appellants to make a representation to the State Government within three weeks from the date of receipt of this Order and the State Government shall consider the following matters:—

(i) Whether there were any nurseries on the acquired lands at the time of Section 17 notification;

(ii) Whether such nurseries were a legally permissible nurseries;

¹³ ILR 2003 KAR 1604

¹⁴ [1998 (6) SCC 1]

(iii) Whether such nurseries have continued to exist till the date of representation;

(iv) Whether such nurseries were covered by any government policy (Annexure-G) in force at the time of issuance of Section 17 notification and/or Section 19 notification of the B.D.A. Act 1976 for not acquiring lands having such nurseries;

(v) Whether such Government policy (Annexure-G) has continued to be in force till the date of representation.

52. The State Government which is a final authority shall determine these issues and pass orders in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible on the basis of the representation if possession has not been taken. Pending disposal of the representation, interim orders granted by this Court shall enure to the benefit of the appellants. If no representation is made within the stipulated time the interim orders granted by the earlier Division Benches of this Court shall stand vacated."

58. While considering the said contention, it is also relevant to note another contention that was canvassed by the writ petitioners that the Government having resolved not to acquire nursery lands and the BDA having acted upon the said decision by denotifying various nursery lands, the petitioners who are the owners of nursery lands also had a legitimate

expectation that their lands also would be denotified. Reliance is placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Jharkhand v. Brahmaputra Metallics Ltd.**,¹⁵ as also the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of West Bengal v. Gitashree Dutta (Dey)**¹⁶ .

58.1 It has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Jharkhand**¹⁶ that the Doctrine of substantive legitimate expectation is one of the ways in which the guarantee of non arbitrariness enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution of India finds concrete expression.

58.2 The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of West Bengal**¹⁷ has held as follows:

"14. There is a necessary inter-play between the plea of legitimate expectation and Article 14. For a decision to be non-arbitrary, the reasonable/legitimate expectations of the claimant have to be considered. However, to decide whether the expectation of the claimant is reasonable or legitimate in the context, is a question of fact in each case. Whenever the question arises, it is to be determined not

¹⁵ 2020 SCC OnLine SC 968

¹⁶ 2022 SCC OnLine SC 691

according to the claimant's perception but in larger public interest wherein other more important considerations may outweigh what would otherwise have been the legitimate expectation of the claimant."

(emphasis supplied)

59. A similar contention is also urged by the writ petitioners whose neighbouring lands have been left out of acquisition, while their lands have been notified.

60. Before passing orders with regard to the aforementioned, it is relevant to note that despite the avowed object with which layouts are formed by the BDA, it has been consistently noticed by this Court that in the manner of implementation of such schemes, the BDA as well as the State Government have repeatedly failed in ensuring that a proper and transparent process by which the grievances of the landlosers and the allottees of the sites are seamlessly addressed. In view of the same, this Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court have been constrained to resort to various measures to ensure that the process of acquisition is carried out in accordance with law by the BDA, so that the grievances

of the landlosers and allottees are adequately dealt with.

61. At this juncture, it is relevant to notice the rationale, methodology adopted and directions issued by this Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court while upholding the acquisitions made by the BDA:

61.1 A learned Single Judge of this Court in the case of **G.R.Jayamma & ors., v. BDA & Ors.**,¹⁷ while upholding the acquisition made by the BDA in respect of Anjanapura Layout has recorded the consensus that was agreed in the said case and held as follows:

"9. After the matter was heard further, a broad consensus was reached between petitioners and BDA. Having regard to the special facts and circumstances of these cases, petitioners and BDA submitted that these petitions may be disposed of recording the following terms agreed between them:-

(a) Petitioners hereby withdraw their objections to the acquisition and assure full support and co-operation to BDA in forming the layout.

(b) Petitioners shall register themselves as applicants for allotment under the Bangalore Development Authority [Allotment of sites] Rules, 1984 within a period of two months from today (extendable by another one month by

¹⁷ Order dated 20.7.2001 passed in WP No.20875/2001

BDA, if sufficient cause is shown). Petitioners will have to pay only the registration fee. They need not pay initial deposit as their sites have been acquired and they have agreed not to receive compensation in regard to the sites under this arrangement.

(c) The petitioners shall file applications for allotment of sites to BDA within three months from to day, in the prescribed form stating that they are applicants who were the petitioners in these writ petitions. Petitioners shall file their documents with BDA within a period of two months to enable BDA to verify the same.

(d) BDA will treat them as applicants entitled to priority in allotment and allot each of them a site measuring 30'x40' in Anjanapura Layout or in any other nearby layouts in Bangalore at the prevailing allotment prices subject to petitioners satisfying the twin requirements for allotment under the BDA (allotment of sites) Rules 1984; that they must be the residents of Bangalore (ten year domicile) and should not be owning any residential property in Bangalore (subject to exception as per Rule 10).

(e) If there are no rival claimants for compensation in regard to the plots claimed by petitioners, and if the ownership of the petitioners in regard to their respective sites which have been acquired is not disputed, BDA shall calculate the compensation payable to the petitioners and give credit to the same by adjusting the same towards the allotment price for the site to be allotted and call upon the petitioners to pay the balance. Petitioners shall be given six months time for making payment (to enable petitioners to know the amount of compensation which they will be entitled and to ascertain how much balance they should pay].

(f) If there are rival claimants in regard to the survey numbers or the sites or if any petitioner's title in regard to the sites are challenged, BDA

shall make a reference in regard to the compensation in regard to such site/land in question to the Civil Court under Section 30 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894; and the petitioners will have to sort out the matter before the reference Court. In that event, such petitioners will have pay the full allotment price within the time stipulated, without seeking adjustment of compensation for the acquired site.

(g) If any of the petitioners does not fulfil the requirements for allotment, under the allotment Rules, their cases may be considered for allotment of 20'x30' sites as per the Rules containing incentive scheme for voluntary surrender of lands. For the purpose of the said scheme, such petitioners will be deemed to have voluntarily surrendered the sites.

(h) The above scheme will be available to only those who are owners, as a consequence of execution of registered sale deeds in their favour prior to the date of preliminary notification/(and not to GPA/Agreement Holder)."

61.2 A Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***The Commissioner BDA and Ors.***⁵ while upholding the acquisition of the Arkavathi Layout has issued the following directions:

"(C) The acquisition of the lands for the formation of Arkavathi Layout is upheld subject to the following conditions:—

(a) *In so far as the site owners are concerned they are entitled to the following reliefs:—*

(i) These site owners/writ petitioners shall register themselves as applicants for allotment under the Bangalore Development Authority [Allotment of Sites] Rules, 1984 within a period of two months from today (extendable by another one month by BDA, if sufficient cause is shown). Petitioners will have to pay only the registration fee. They need not pay initial deposit as their sites have been acquired and they have agreed not to receive compensation in regard to the sites under this arrangement.

(ii) The petitioners shall file applications for allotment of sites to BDA within three months from today in the prescribed form stating that they are applicants who were the petitioners in these writ petitions. Petitioners shall file their documents with BDA within a period of two months to enable BDA to verify the same.

(iii) BDA will treat them as applicants entitled to priority in allotment and allot each of them a site measuring 30' × 40' in Arkavathi Layout or in any other nearby layouts in Bangalore at the prevailing allotment prices subject to petitioners satisfying the twin requirements for allotment under the BDA (Allotment of Sites) Rules, 1984, that they must be the residents of Bangalore (ten year domicile) and should not be owning any residential property in Bangalore.

(iv) If there are no rival claimants for compensation in regard to the plots

claimed by petitioners, and if the ownership of the petitioners in regard to their respective sites which have been acquired is not disputed, BDA shall calculate the compensation payable to the petitioners and give credit to the same by adjusting the same towards the allotment price for the site to be allotted and call upon the petitioners to pay the balance. Petitioners shall be given six months time for making payment. [To enable petitioners to know the amount of compensation which they will be entitled and to ascertain how much balance they should pay].

- (v) If there are rival claimants in regard to the survey numbers or the sites or if any petitioners title in regard to the sites are challenged, BDA shall make a reference in regard to the compensation in regard to such site/land in question, to the Civil Court under Section 30 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, and the petitioners will have to sort out the matter before the reference Court. In that event, such petitioners will have to pay the full allotment price within the time stipulated, without seeking adjustment of compensation for the acquired site.*
- (vi) If any of the petitioners does not fulfil the requirements for allotment, under the allotment Rules, their cases may be considered for allotment of 20' × 30' sites as per the Rules containing incentive scheme for voluntary surrender of lands. For the purpose of the said scheme, such petitioners will be deemed to have voluntarily surrendered the sites.*

(vii) The above scheme will be available to only those who are owners, as a consequence of execution of registered sale deeds in their favour prior to the date of preliminary notification (and not to GPA/Agreement Holders).

(D) In so far as the land owners excluding the site owners, are entitled to the following reliefs:—

(i) All the petitioners who are the land owners who are seeking dropping of the acquisition proceedings in so far as their respective lands are concerned, on the ground that: (a) their lands are situated within green belt area; (b) they are totally built up; (c) properties wherein there are buildings constructed by charitable, educational and/or religious institutions (d) nursery lands; (e) who have set-up factories (f) their lands are similar to the lands which are adjoining their lands but not notified for acquisition at all, are permitted to make appropriate application to the authorities seeking such exclusion and exemption and producing documents to substantiate their contentions within one month from the date of this order.

It is made clear that the BDA shall consider such request keeping in mind the status of the land as on the date of preliminary notification and to exclude any developments, improvements, constructions put up subsequent to the preliminary notification and then decide whether their cases are similar to that of the land owners whose lands, are notified for acquisition, notified and whose objections were upheld and no final notification is issued.

In the event the BDA comes to the conclusion that the lands of those persons are similarly placed, then to exclude those lands from acquisition.

- (ii) Petitioners who are interested in availing this benefit shall make appropriate application within 30 days from the date of this order and thereafter the BDA shall give notice to those persons, hear them and pass appropriate orders expeditiously.*
- (iii) Till the aforesaid exercise is undertaken by the BDA and the applications filed by the petitioners either for allotment of site or for denotifying or exemption sought for are considered their possession shall not be disturbed and the existing construction shall not be demolished. After consideration of the applications, in the light of the aforesaid directions, if the lands are not excluded then the BDA is at liberty to proceed with the acquisition. "*

61.3 The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Bondu Ramaswamy**⁶ while upholding the directions issued by the Division Bench of this Court⁵ has issued the following further directions:

"160. In view of the foregoing, we affirm the directions of the Division Bench subject to the following further directions and clarifications:

- (i) In regard to the acquisition of lands in Kempapura and Srirampura, BDA is directed to reconsider the objections to the acquisitions having regard to the fact that large areas were not initially notified*

for acquisition, and more than 50% of whatever that was proposed for acquisition was also subsequently deleted from acquisition. BDA has to consider whether in view of deletions to a large extent, whether development with respect to the balance of the acquired lands has become illogical and impractical, and if so, whether the balance area also should be deleted from acquisition. If BDA proposes to continue the acquisition, it shall file a report within four months before the High Court so that consequential orders could be passed.

(ii) In regard to villages of Venkateshapura, Nagavara, Hennur and Challakere where there are several very small pockets of acquired lands surrounded by lands which were not acquired or which were deleted from the proposed acquisition, BDA may consider whether such small pockets should also be deleted if they are not suitable for forming self-contained layouts. The acquisition thereof cannot be justified on the ground that these small islands of acquired land, could be used as a stand-alone park or playground in regard to a layout formed in a different unconnected lands in other villages. Similar isolated pockets in other villages should also be dealt with in a similar manner.

(iii) BDA shall give an option to each writ petitioner whose land has been acquired for Arkavathi Layout:

(a) to accept allotment of 15% (fifteen per cent) of the land acquired from him, by way of developed plots, in lieu of compensation (any fractions in excess of 15% may be charged prevailing rates of allotment);

OR

(b) in cases where the extent of land acquired exceeds half an acre, to claim in addition to compensation (without prejudice to seek reference if he is not satisfied with the quantum), allotment of a plot measuring 30' × 40' for every half acre of land acquired at the prevailing allotment price.

(iv) Any allotment made by BDA, either by forming layouts or by way of bulk allotments, will be subject to the above."

61.4 This Court in the case of **Junjamma & Ors.,⁴** upheld the acquisition of Vishveshwaraiah Layout subject to the following conditions:

"1. The challenge to the acquisition in all these Writ Petitions fails and is accordingly rejected. The acquisition is upheld subject the following conditions.

(a) The petitioners in W.P. Nos. who are all owners of sites in question which are acquired are entitled to the following:

(b) These petitioners shall register themselves as applicants for allotment under the Bangalore Development Authority [Allotment of sites] Rules, 1984, within a period of two months from today (extendable by another one month by BDA, if sufficient cause is shown). Petitioners will have to pay only the registration fee. They need not pay initial deposit as their sites have been acquired and they are not entitled to

receive compensation in regard to the sites under this arrangement.

(c) *The petitioners shall file applications for allotment of sites to BDA within three months from today, in the prescribed form stating that they are applicants who were the petitioners in these Writ Petitions. Petitioners shall file their documents with BDA along with the application to verify the same.*

(d) *BDA will treat them as applicants entitled to priority in allotment and allot each of them a site measuring 30' × 40' in Sir M. Visweswaraiiah Layout or in any other nearby layouts in Bangalore at the prevailing allotment prices subject to petitioners satisfying the twin requirements for allotment under the BDA (allotment of sites) Rules, 1984, that they must be the residents of Bangalore (ten years domicile) and should not be owning any residential property in Bangalore.*

(e) *If there are no rival claimants for compensation in regard to the plots claimed by petitioners, and if the ownership of the petitioners in regard to their respective sites-which have been acquired is not disputed, BDA shall calculate the compensation payable to the petitioners and give credit to the same by adjusting the same towards the allotment price for the site to be allotted and call upon the petitioners to pay the balance. Petitioners shall be given six months time for making payment [to enable petitioners to know the amount of compensation which they will be entitled and to ascertain how much balance they should pay].*

(f) *If there are rival claimants in regard to the survey numbers or the sites or if any petitioners title in regard to the sites are challenged, BDA shall make a reference in regard to the compensation in regard to such site/land in question, to the Civil Court under Section 30 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, and the*

petitioners will have to sort out the matter before the reference Court. In that event, such petitioners will have to pay the full allotment price within the time stipulated, without seeking adjustment of compensation for the acquired site.

(g) If any of the petitioners does not fulfil the requirements for allotment, under the allotment Rules, their cases may be considered for allotment of 20' × 30' sites as per the Rules containing incentive scheme for voluntary surrender of Land. For the purpose of the said scheme, such petitioners will be deemed to have voluntarily surrendered the sites.

(h) The above scheme will be available to only those who are owners, as a consequence of execution of registered sale deeds in their favour prior to the date of preliminary notification (and not to GPA/Agreement Holders).

(i) It is left to the discretion of the authorities also to consider the case of GPA Holders/Agreement Holders and persons who are claiming on the basis of affidavits the sites in question though they are not entitled to the same as a matter of right, only if they belong to weaker sections, poor and down-trodden.

(j) The Authorities shall also consider whether these petitioners have purchased the sites by way of investment or with the intention of having a roof over their head and based on the said consideration, to pass appropriate orders, in the light of the observations made in this order.

2(a). All the petitioners who are the land owners who are seeking dropping of the acquisition proceedings in so far as their respective lands are concerned, on the ground that: (a) their lands are situated within green belt area (b) they are totally built up; (c) converted for non -

agricultural use; (d) garden land and nursery lands; (e) who have built hospitals, educational institutions and factories; (f) who have not been served with the notice of acquisition and (g) who are in doubt about the inclusion of their land in the notification are permitted to make appropriate application to the authorities seeking such exclusion and exemption and producing documents to substantiate their contentions within three months from the date of this order.

(b) It is made clear that the authority shall consider such request keeping in mind the status of the land as on the date of preliminary notification and to exclude any developments, improvements, constructions put up subsequent to the preliminary notification and then decide whether their cases are similar to that of the land owners whose objections were upheld to the extent of 357 acres 25 guntas and in respect of those lands no final notification is issued.

(c) In the event the Authority come to the conclusion that those persons are similarly placed, then to denotify their lands and exclude them from acquisition.

(3) Petitioners who are interested in availing this benefit shall make appropriate application within 90 days from the date of this order and thereafter the authority shall give notice to those persons, hear them and pass appropriate orders expeditiously.

(4) Till the aforesaid exercise is undertaken by the Authority and the applications filed by the petitioners either for allotment of site or for denotifying or exemption sought for are considered their possession shall not be disturbed and the existing construction shall not be demolished. After consideration of the application in the light of the aforesaid directions, the Authorities are at liberty to proceed with the acquisition. "

62. Despite the detailed directions issued by a coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***The Commissioner BDA and Ors.***⁵ and a few additional directions by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Bondu Ramaswamy***⁶, the same was not followed, which has resulted in this Court in the case of ***Sri K.P.Anjanappa***¹¹ appointing a Committee of three members and issuing various directions.

63. At this juncture, the observations made by this Court while considering the acquisitions made by the BDA are required to be noticed:

63.1 A learned Single Judge of this Court in the case of ***Sri Gangaiah Naidu, by his L.Rs., v. The BDA, rep.by its Commissioner & Anr.***¹⁸ while considering a situation where the levy of betterment tax was issued in respect of the lands that were denotified has observed as follows:

"64. The three resolutions referred to supra by which the BDA has resolved to levy betterment

¹⁸ ILR 2010 KAR 1794

tax clearly exposes the callousness with which this power of acquisition is exercised by the Government and Authority to formulate a scheme of providing residential sites to needy citizens. The law is observed more in breach. It clearly demonstrates not only blissful ignorance of laws but also scant respect of the law. It clearly points out the shortcomings in the preparation of the scheme by the BDA in the first instance. It is obvious that before notifying the land for acquisition, proper attention is not given to find out the existing position. i.e., if, in the land which falls within the scheme, whether already buildings have come up and people are residing, and what are the developmental activities which has taken place. Though power to acquire is not disputed, the said power before it is exercised should be exercised with more care and caution. The law provides for levy of betterment charges in respect of those properties which fall within the scheme and which is going to be affected by the development of a layout by the BDA and provides for levy of betterment tax after hearing such land owners. The said procedure is rarely followed by the BDA. On the contrary even those developed land or buildings are included in the scheme and notified for acquisition. When objections are filed pointing out the said facts instead of giving relief to such deserving persons, in most of the cases they are denied the relief to which they are entitled to in law. On the contrary, the lands where there is no development at all are dropped from acquisition, obviously for extraneous consideration. Money, power, nearness to the seat of power and a host of other factors come into full play behind the scene for dropping the acquisition proceedings. In fact, a new breed of professionals, as a class, have come into existence who have specialized in the art of getting the lands denotified from acquisition proceedings. Politicians, bureaucrats, land mafia and other professionals are all partners in this lucrative enterprise. That is how in Bangalore, next to IT industry, this real estate

business is the most attractive and lucrative business resulting in people who are nothing in real life have become stinking rich and powerful overnight. Thanks to real estate business. The money from this business has spread its tentacles in all walks of life, thus polluting the health and culture of the society. After considering the objections, when the scheme is submitted by the BDA to the Government for approval, hardly there is any application of mind by the Government while according sanction to the scheme. It is almost automatic and mechanical. The affected persons have no say in the matter at that stage. Their elected representatives are no better. If really the recommendation made by the BDA is flawless, they have considered all genuine objections and their recommendation is based on merit and the Government do not find any justification to reconsider and interfere with the said recommendation, after according sanction to the scheme, the Government should see that the scheme is implemented in letter and spirit But, unfortunately in reality the conduct of the Government is otherwise. After the Government accords sanction to the scheme, a final Notification is issued making known the intention to acquire the land, as the Government has accorded sanction. Then a spate of requests are made to the Government for denotification of the land. Without any reason or rhyme, again for extraneous consideration, at the instance of the professionals who again become active behind the scene, indiscriminately land's are denotified. Obviously, again it is for a price which is not accounted anywhere.

(emphasis supplied)

63.2 This Court in the case of **Junjamma & Ors.**,⁴ has noticed as follows:

"56. The concern shown by this Court for the poor, needy, downtrodden and economically weaker sections of the society should not be construed as a license to allot sites to all the persons who have purchased sites in the approved and unapproved layouts and in revenue plots. Here it is emphasized that a distinction has to be made between persons who are struggling to have a roof over their head for shelter and persons who are speculators and who have purchased sites by way of investments. It could be easily made out from the sale deeds. If sites are purchased in the name of a family members minors and persons who are not residents of Bangalore and who are residing in other parts of the country, certainly there is no obligation cast upon the authority to allot sites in lieu of such sales. It would be a just exercise of discretion to award them compensation for the sites acquired. In this regard every care should be taken to scrutinize each sale deed by the officials concerned and keeping in mind the observations made by this Court in these Writ Petitions and terms of the order in respect of Anjanapura layout and see to it that the benefit conferred under this judgment is not misused, abused and misinterpreted. If persons who are entitled to allotment of sites are denied the sites and persons who are not entitled to sites are granted sites, and if any person were to approach this Court with the aforesaid complaint certainly this Court would view the matter very seriously and the concerned official who has been vested with the power to process claims could be held personally liable for all the consequences flowing therefrom. The experiences gained should lead the Authority to prompt action being taken in future to avoid repetition of similar situation so that there could be an orderly development of the beautiful city of Bangalore, and the land grabbers and speculators are kept at bay and innocent people are not lured into such helpless situations."

(emphasis supplied)

64. It is also relevant to note that while undertaking the process of acquisition of lands the Hon'ble Supreme Court⁶ has held that the process of leaving out certain lands or de-notifying certain lands are part of the process as contemplated under the Act when the acquisition is undertaken. However, it is also relevant to note that the obligation is on the State to act fairly while leaving out the lands from acquisition or issuing notifications for denotification of the lands. It is not open to the authorities of the State to pass different orders in respect of persons who are similarly placed.

65. While considering cases where similarly placed lands have been left out, it is relevant to note that at the time of filing objections to the preliminary notification, the land owners would have placed on record as to the nature of the land and as to why the said land ought not to be acquired. The said objections after being considered, the final notification has been passed. While it is the contention of the writ petitioners that their objections have not been properly considered,

and the BDA seeks to justify their action of notifying the lands for acquisition, it is relevant to note that, the petitioners have now placed on record various notifications wherein lands have been de-notified as also various instances wherein the BDA has given up lands from acquisition. Hence, the contention of the petitioners that they are similarly placed as persons whose lands have been de-notified / left out of acquisition, could not have been put forth or considered when the land owners filed their objection to the acquisition. Hence, the said aspect is required to be considered having regard to the said material on record, which exercise this Court cannot undertake under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. As has been done earlier by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court, the authorities are required to examine the objections of the land owners for exclusion of their properties from acquisition in light of the contention of the Petitioners that similarly placed lands have been de-notified / left out from acquisition. The authorities will necessarily have to take into consideration factors / material on the

basis of which the objections of some land owners were upheld and their lands were denotified / left out of acquisition, while considering the cases of the present writ petitioners. If the said lands are similarly placed, the authorities are bound to give the same benefit. If not, it is open to the authorities to reject their objections and proceed further in the matter.

66. With regard to site owners, this Court⁴ while considering the peculiar problems of persons of city of Bengaluru with regard to needs for housing and having regard to the said need emanating from the persons belonging to economically weak and backward communities as well as various other factors and considering the possible solution and also noticing what was done in the case of Anjanapura Layout, has held as follows:

52. Here I would like to suggest that in the given case if the Authority is satisfied that though some of the petitioners do not possess a registered sale deed or they have acquired title to the land after preliminary notifications or claiming right under power of attorney or any other mode other than by way of a registered sale deed if such persons belonged to weaker sections, economically backward, poor in their

discretion the same benefit may also be extended to them.

53. Similarly, if a layout has already been formed with approval of some authority or if a pucca layout is formed even without such approval if it is of the specifications prescribed under the BDA Act itself and if the said layouts could be harmonized or mingled with the layout to be formed by the BDA as far as possible every attempt should be made to synchronize the said layouts with the BDA layout and if it is possible to allot the very same sites to the petitioners and in particular to those who have already put up construction and living there. That would be the best way of solving this human and housing problem. However, if those sites or constructions come in the way of layout formation, it is open to the authorities to disturb the possession of the occupants of the said sites and buildings and allot a site in the layout to be formed by them. All these suggestions are made only with the fond hope of minimizing the hardship to those site owners, to reduce the cost of forming a layout and the heart burn is likely to cause. The same cannot be claimed as a matter of right by any of the petitioners."

(emphasis supplied)

67. Hence, while considering the objections of the site owners, the authorities are required to keep in mind the observations made in para 66 hereinabove.

68. The observations made by this Court in the case of **Gangaiah**¹⁸ and **Junjamma & Ors.**,⁴ as noticed in para 63 hereinabove are merely two

instances wherein, this Court has repeatedly, after noticing the manner in which the acquisition process is carried out has emphasized the yardstick that is required to be adopted while implementing the process of acquisition, keeping in mind the main purpose with which acquisition of lands are sought to be done i.e., to provide housing to the needy and deprived sections of society. Hence, the BDA and the State Government are required to take abundant care and caution in ensuring that the directions of this Court are implemented in letter and in spirit, in a manner to sub-serve the interest with which the acquisition is initiated in the first place and also while considering the lands to be acquired and the allotment of sites, the interest of the poor, needy, downtrodden and economically weaker sections of the society should be the paramount consideration.

69. In view of the aforementioned, the following:

ORDER

- i) The above appeals filed by the BDA are allowed;
- ii) The order dated 11.7.2014 passed by the learned Single Judge in WP No.32186/2010 and other connected writ petitions is set aside. The orders passed in writ petitions which are decided placing reliance on the order dated 11.7.2014 passed in WP No.32186/2010 and other connected writ petitions are also set aside;
- iii) The preliminary notification bearing No.BDA/ COMMR/DC(LA)/ALAO/158/2008-2009, Bangalore, dated 21.5.2008 and the final notification bearing No. UDD 51 MNX 2010, Bangalore, dated 18.2.2010 issued for acquisition of lands for the formation of the "Nadaprabhu Kempegowda Layout" are upheld subject to the following conditions:
- a) With regard to the land owners (excluding the site owners):

i) All the land owners/writ petitioners who are seeking for dropping of their lands from acquisition on the ground that their lands are (1) nursery lands; (2) situated within green belt; (3) totally built up; (4) that the buildings are constructed by religious/charitable educational institutions; (5) that similar adjoining lands have been either left out from acquisition or de-notified, are permitted to make an application to the BDA seeking for dropping of their lands from acquisition by producing all such material that they deem fit/necessary in support of their applications within 3 months from today;

(ii) The BDA shall consider each of the said application/s keeping in mind the status of the lands as on the date of the preliminary notification and without taking into consideration any developments / improvements / constructions made subsequent to the preliminary notification;

iii) The BDA shall complete the exercise of considering the applications of the writ petitioners and deciding on the same within an outer limit of six months from today;

iv) The BDA, upon consideration of the applications shall intimate the writ petitioners about its decision;

v) If the BDA is of the opinion that the acquisition will have to be proceeded with, the BDA is at liberty to proceed further in accordance with law;

b) Insofar as the site owners who have not made an application as contemplated in para (iii)(a) hereinabove:

i) They shall register themselves for allotment under the BDA (Allotment of Sites) Rules, 1984 within three months from today by paying the registration fee. However, payment of initial deposit by them is exempted. The necessary documents along with the said applications

are also to be filed to enable the BDA to verify the same;

ii) The BDA shall treat the applicants as being entitled for priority allotment and allot each of them a site measuring 30x40 feet in the Nadaprabhu Kempegowda Layout at the prevailing allotment prices subject to the applicants satisfying the dual requirements of allotment under the Rules that they must be the residents of Bengaluru (for 10 years) and should not be owning any residential property in Bengaluru;

iii) In case the applicants/writ petitioners do not fulfill the requirements for allotment under the Rules, 1984 they may be considered for allotment of 20x30 feet sites as per the Bangalore Development Authority (Incentive Scheme for Voluntary Surrender of Land) Rules, 1989;

c) Insofar as the owners of residential sites who form part of a layout and who have

sought for dropping their lands from acquisition in accordance with para (iii)(a) hereinabove, the BDA shall consider the same having regard to the observations made at para 66 hereinabove. If the BDA rejects their applications, the site owners who have first filed applications pursuant to para (iii)(a) hereinabove, shall be entitled to a further period of one month after the decision as contemplated therein is intimated to opt to and apply in the manner as contemplated in para (iii)(b) hereinabove.

iv) Till the aforesaid exercise directed to be undertaken by the BDA and the applications filed by the writ petitioners, either for allotment of sites or for dropping of the lands from acquisition are considered, their possession shall not be disturbed and the existing construction shall not be demolished.

v) In view of the allowing of the above appeals, pending interlocutory applications, if any, stand disposed of.

No costs.

**Sd/-
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
JUDGE**

ND/BS
CT-YSP, SL