SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com

Bangalore Development Authority Vs. Mr M Srinivasa Murthy

Bangalore Development Authority Vs. Mr M Srinivasa Murthy

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1235141

Court : Karnataka

Decided On : Feb-22-2024

Judge : Chief Justice and C.M. Poonacha

Appeal No. : WA 1166/2015

Appellant : Bangalore Development Authority

Respondent : Mr M Srinivasa Murthy

Judgement :

R1IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU DATED THIS THE22D DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2024 PRESENT THE HONBLE MR. P.S.DINESH KUMAR, CHIEF JUSTICE AND THE HONBLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA WRIT APPEAL NO.1783 OF2014(LA-BDA) C/W WRIT APPEALS NO.1795 OF2014 1799 OF2014 1802 OF2014 1803 OF2014 1806 OF2014 1966 OF2014 1970 OF2014 1972 OF2014 1973 OF2014 1982 OF2014 1986 OF2014 1988 OF2014 1989 OF2014 2000 OF2014 2006 OF2014 2009 OF2014 2010 OF2014 2030 OF2014 2032 OF2014 2033 OF2014 2034 OF2014 2035 OF2014 2036 OF2014 2037 OF2014 2045 OF2014 2047 OF2014 2048 OF2014 2052 OF2014 2063 OF2014 2064 OF2014 2065 OF2014 2067 OF2014 2068 OF2014 2069 OF2014 2239 OF2014 2243 OF2014 2244 OF2014 2246 OF2014 2248 OF2014 2249 OF2014 2250 OF2014 2251 OF2014 2255 OF2014 2256 OF2014 2259 OF2014 2261 OF2014 2262 OF2014 2263 OF2014 2265 OF2014 2266 OF2014 2267 OF2014 2268 OF2014 2269 OF2014 2446 OF2014 2449 OF2014 2454

OF2014 2470 OF2014 2698 OF2014 2717 OF2014 2718 OF2014 2719 OF2014 2725 OF2014 2726 OF2014 2783 OF2014 2784 OF2014 2785 OF2014 2787 OF2014 2808 OF2014 2810 OF2014 2811 OF2014 2812 OF2014 2814 OF2014 2815 OF2014 2821 OF2014 2825 OF2014 2827 OF2014 2828 OF2014 2829 OF2014 2830 OF2014 2831 OF2014 2832 OF2014 2876 OF2014 2877 OF2014 2879 OF2014 2880 OF2014 2881 OF2014 2948 OF2014 2949 OF2014 2950 OF2014 2951 OF2014 2953 OF2014 2954 OF2014 2955 OF2014 2956 OF2014 2957 OF2014 2958 OF2014 3044 OF2014 3045 OF2014 3046 OF2014 3047 OF2014 3049 OF2014 3050 OF2014 3051 OF2014 3077 OF2014 3078 OF2014 3080 OF2014 3082 OF2014 3083 OF2014 3084 OF2014 3085 OF2014 3086 OF2014 3087 OF2014 3088 OF2014 3089 OF2014 3091 OF20143159 OF2014 3160 OF2014 3162 OF2014 3163 OF2014 876 OF2015 877 OF2015 879 OF2015 880 OF2015 1010 OF2015 1164 OF2015 1166 OF2015 1168 OF2015 1172 OF2015 1173 OF2015 1771 OF2015 939 OF2016 1015 OF2016 1016 OF2016 1343 OF2016 1344 OF2016 1644 OF2016 1818 OF2016 2104 OF2016 2105 OF2016 417 OF2017 1798 OF2014 2245 OF2014 2254 OF2014 2458 OF2014 2708 OF2014 2709 OF2014 2781 OF2014 2782 OF2014 2786 OF2014 2817 OF2014 2818 OF2014 2819 OF2014 3048 OF2014 3079 OF2014 3081 OF2014 3090 OF2014 3125 OF2014 3165 OF2014 3166 OF2014 1181 OF2015 1004 OF2016 1005 OF2016 1020 OF2016 1339 OF2016 418 OF2017 And 694 OF2022(LA-BDA) 2 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 ABOUT44YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.32186/2010 DATED1107/2014. 3 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 ABOUT38YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.31120/2010 DATED1107/2014. 4 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 ABOUT65YEARS1B) SRI. THIMMEGOWDA R. S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT47YEARS1C) SRI. GANGADHAR R. S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT46YEARS1D) SRI. MANJUNATH R. S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT44YEARS1E) SRI. HANUMARAJ R. S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT40YEARS51(F) SRI. PRAKASH R. S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT39YEARS1G) SRI. NAGARAJ R. NAGARABHAVI S/O LATE S. RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT36YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.35628/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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) 6 AND:

1. SMT. ANURADHA W/O DR. M.R. SREEVATHSA AGED ABOUT53YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.13000/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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) 7 AND:

1. SRI. A KANNAIAH S/O LATE AADIYAPPA SETTY AGED ABOUT64YEARS RESIDENT OF BHEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 098.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT MULTISTOREYED BUILDINGS BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. S. VIJAYKUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1; SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.35625- 627/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.1806 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) 8 AND:

1. SRI. K.B. YELLAPPA S/O LATE DODDABYRAPPA AGED ABOUT64YEARS2 SRI. K.B. MUNIRAJU S/O LATE DODDABYRAPPA AGED ABOUT45YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.9842-44/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ROAD9KUMARA 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 ABOUT95YEARS 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 ABOUT74YEARS 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 ABOUT72YEARS NO.14, TARAPORE AVENUE CHETPET CHENNAI-600 031. TAMIL NADU1C) MR. BINOY JOSEPH S/O LATE K.A. JOSEPH AGED ABOUT70YEARS10R/AT NO.3/26, MCNICHOLS ROAD2D MAIN ROAD, CHEPET CHENNAI-600 031. TAMIL NADU2 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.12969- 972/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT51YEARS11RESIDING AT RAMASANDRA KENGERI 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.14913 & 14914/2013 DATED1107/2014. 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 12 1(A) SMT. SHASHIKALA W/O LATE G. LAKSHMINARAYANA AGED ABOUT46YEARS1B) SRI. KUSHAL KUMAR L. S/O LATE G. LAKSHMINARAYANA AGED ABOUT23YEARS1C) INDIRA L D/O LATE G. LAKSHMINARAYANA AGED ABOUT20YEARS1A) TO1C) 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 ABOUT56YEARS3 MANGALA GOWRI W/O N. SHANKAR AGED ABOUT47YEARS4 DEVAKI W/O CHANDRAIAH AGED ABOUT42YEARS ALL ARE RESIDING AT NO.225, 6TH CROSS, RAJAGOPALANAGAR MAIN ROAD, NEAR LAKSHMI DEVI FLOUR MILL, PEENYA2D STAGE BENGALURU-560 058.

5. RANGAPPA S/O PRASURAMAPPA AGED ABOUT52YEARS SINCE DED BY HIS LRs 5(1) HANUMAKKA W/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT67YEARS135(2) K.R. RAMESH S/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT40YEARS53) KRISHNA S/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT37YEARS54) RANGANATH S/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRs 5(4)(A) SMT. PUSHPA W/O LATE RANGANATH AGED ABOUT42YEARS54)(B) SRI. CHETAN S/O LATE RANGANATH AGED ABOUT17YEARS54)(C) TEJASWINI D/O LATE RANGANATH AGED ABOUT15YEARS54)(D) SMT. MAHALAKSHMI D/O LATE K.P. RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT47YEARS 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; 14 VIDE

ORDER
DATED2911/2021 NOTICE TO R5(1), R5(4)(B), R5(4)(C) HELD SUFFICIENT) THIS WRIT APPEAL, IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.29520/2012 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT65YEARS 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) 15 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.33131 & 35309/2011 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT46YEARS 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 AND16SHRI. 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.11025/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT53YEARS 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 FOR17SHRI. 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.40644- 645/2011 DATED1107/2014. 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. SRINIVAS2 THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY REVENUE DEPARTMENT M.S. BUILDING BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS18(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.8901/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT69YEARS SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRs 1(A). SMT. ARUVAMMA W/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT67YEARS1B). SRI. KADARIPATHI S/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT51YEARS1C). SRI. SHIVSHANKARA19S/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT49YEARS1D). SMT. MUNILAKSHMI D/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT47YEARS1E). SRI. NAGARAJU S/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT46YEARS1F). SRI. LAKSHMANA S/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT35YEARS1G). SMT. NETHRAVATHI D/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT33YEARS1A) TO1G) ARE RESIDING AT No.76/1, ISEC ROAD NAGARABHAVI VILLAGE BANGALORE-560 072. 1(H). SRI. SOMASHEKAR S/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT44YEARS RESIDING AT: HOSA BYROHALLI NEAR VEERANJANEYA TEMPLE SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE-560 060. 1(I). SRI. ASHWATH S/O LATE MARAPPA AGED ABOUT41YEARS 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 MARAPPA20AGED ABOUT36YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.12781/2011 DATED1107/2014. 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 NARASIMHAIAH21AGED ABOUT47YEARS RESIDENT OF No.108 THAGGIGUPPE VILLAGE MAGADI TALUK BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT2 SRI. MARIYAPPA S/O LATE BETTAIAH AGED ABOUT62YEARS RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA VILLAGE BHEEMANAKUPPE DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.

3. SRI. BETTAPPA S/O LATE BETTAIAH AGED ABOUT57YEARS RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA VILLAGE, BHEEMANAKUPPE DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.

4. SRI. JAVARAPPA S/O LATE BETTAIAH AGED ABOUT52YEARS RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA VILLAGE, BHEEMANAKUPPE DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.

5. SMT. JAYAMMA W/O LATE HUCHAPPA AGED ABOUT52YEARS RESIDING AT BETTANAPALYA VILLAGE, BHEEMANAKUPPE DHAKALE, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.

6. SRI. K. SHIVALINGAM S/O SRI. KUPPASWAMY AGED ABOUT51YEARS R/AT NO.1121, SAI BABA NILAYA9H CROSS, 2ND BLOCK BSK1T STAGE BANGALORE-560 050. 22

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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.6313- 6318/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT78YEARS2 SRI. VENKATA ARASAPPA23S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA AGED ABOUT76YEARS3 SRI. MARIYAPPA @ VENKATA ARASAPPA S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA AGED ABOUT67YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.46127- 129/2013 DATED1107/2014. 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 FOR24SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. B.R. CHANDRASHEKARAIAH S/O LATE RUDRAPPA AGED ABOUT63YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.42536/2011 DATED1107/2014. 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 FOR25SHRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SRI. K.N. BASAVARADYA S/O NANJUNDARADHYA AGED ABOUT63YEARS RESIDENT OF No.1189/C4H 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.44048/2011 DATED1107/2014. 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 FOR26SRI G LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. . SMT MUNIYAMMA AGED ABOUT79YEARS, D/O.LATE ARALAPPA, SINCE DECEASED BY LRs 1(a) SRI MUDDANNA AGED ABOUT73YEARS S/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA1b) SRI MUNINARASAPPA, AGED ABOUT68YEARS1c) KAMBADANARASAPPA, SINCE DEAD BY HIS LR1c)(i) SRI SANTOSH KUMAR AGED ABOUT26YEARS S/O LATE KAMBADANARASAPPA1d) SMT MUNILAKSHMAMMA AGED ABOUT63YEARS D/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA1e) SRI NAGARAJ AGED ABOUT61YEARS S/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA1f) SRI MUNIRAJU AGED ABOUT57YEARS S/O LATE MUNIYAMMA AND DODDANARASAPPA ALL ARE R/AT KKRISHNASAGAR VILLAGE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE-560 060 2 . SMT. HANUMA NARASAMMA AGED ABOUT74YEARS, W/O LATE GANGAPPA3. SMT. HANUMAKKA27AGED ABOUT71YEARS, D/O LATE NARASAIAH, SINCE DEACEASED BY LRs 3(a) SRI HANUMANARASAIAH AGED ABOUT58YEARS S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASAIAH3b) SRI THIMMAIAH AGED ABOUT56YEARS S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASAIAH3c) SRI LAKSHMANA AGED ABOUT54YEARS S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASAIAH3d) SMT ANNAMMA AGED ABOUT52YEARS D/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND

NARASAIAH3e) SRI K N CHANNAPPA AGED ABOUT50YEARS S/O LATE HAUNUMAKKA AND NARASAIAH ALL ARE R/AT K KRISHNASAGAR VILLAGE, KENGERI 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION296682010 DATED1107/2014 AND ETC. 28 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 ABOUT58YEARS2 SRI. G. SIDDALINGASWAMY AGED ABOUT41YEARS3 SRI. K.G. GURUSANTHA AGED ABOUT37YEARS 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) 29 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.40958/2012 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT66YEARS 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) 30 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3134/2012 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT37YEARS R/AT BETTANAPALYA KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK.

2. SRI. T. NAGARAJU S/O LATE THAYAPPA AGED ABOUT52YEARS R/AT BETTANAPALYA VILLAGE BHIMANAKUPPE DAKALE KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK.

3. SMT. JAYAMMA W/O K.P. NARAYANA MURTHY AGED ABOUT51YEARS R/AT NO.75/1, 2ND CROSS31KANAKANA PALYA2D 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.251-255/2013 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT58YEARS32R/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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.25616/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 AGED63YEARS, S/O LATE VEERAKEMPAIAH, 33 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 AGED42YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION332672011 DATED1107/2014 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) 34 AND:

1. SRI. LAKSHMANA S/O CHIKKACHANNIGAPPA AGED50YEARS R/AT NO.112, CHIKKAKODIGEHALLI KODIGEHALLI POST YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI BANGALORE NORTH TQ BANGALORE-560 091 1(A). SMT. LOLAKSHI W/O LATE LAKSHMANA @ LAKSHMANAPPA AGED ABOUT55YEARS NO.112, CHIKKAKODIGEHALLI VILLAGE KODIGEHALLI POST YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI BENGALURU NORTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 112 1(B). SRI. C.L. NAVEEN KUMAR S/O LATE LAKSHMANA @ LAKSHMANAPPA AGED ABOUT29YEARS NO.112, CHIKKAKODIGEHALLI VILLAGE KODIGEHALLI POST YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI BENGALURU NORTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 112 1(C). SMT. L. CHAITHRA D/O LATE LAKSHMANA @ LAKSHMANAPPA AGED ABOUT55YEARS NO.112, CHIKKAKODIGEHALLI VILLAGE KODIGEHALLI POST YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI BENGALURU NORTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 112 2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT VIKASA SOUDHA BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS35(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.37886/2012 DATED1107/2014 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 ABOUT56YEARS SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRs 1(A) SMT. JAYAMMA W/O LATE SRINIVASA @ SEENAPPA AGED ABOUT45YEARS1B) SRI. NAGESH S. S/O LATE SRINIVASA @ SEENAPPA AGED ABOUT34YEARS1C) SRI. VENKATESH S. 36 S/O LATE SRINIVASA @ SEENAPPA AGED ABOUT23YEARS 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 ABOUT40YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.11306- 307/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 OFFICER37BANGALORE 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 ABOUT61YEARS R/AT No.298, 1ST FLOOR15H 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.12225/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 OFFICER38BANGALORE 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. BASAVARAJU S/O LATE RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT36YEARS R/AT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 060.

2. SRI. DABBAGULLAPPA S/O LATE RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT53YEARS R/AT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 060.

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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.51015/2013 DATED1107/2014. 39 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 ABOUT34YEARS OWNER OF SITE NO.30A, 3, 8 RESIDENT OF943, 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.28146/2010 DATED1107/2014. 40 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 ABOUT48YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.20398- 20414/2010 DATED1107/2014. 41 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 ABOUT51YEARS, 2 . HEMALATHA D/O SRI B. M. KRISHNA MURTHY AGED ABOUT22YEARS3. LAVANYA D/O SRI B. M. KRISHNA MURTHY AGED ABOUT21YEARS4. MASTER KIRAN GOWDA S/O SRI B. M. KRISHNA MURTHY AGED ABOUT20YEARS ALL ARE R/AT BABASAHEBARA PALYA, BASAVESHWARA NAGAR, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE. 5 . M/S N D PROPERTIES PVT. LTD., 42 A PRIVATE LIMITED COMPANY INCORPORATED UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT1OF 1956 HAVING ITS OFFICE AT NO.398, 2ND FLOOR, 7TH CROSS, MICO LAYOUT,

BTM2D STAGE, BANGALORE-560076 REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR MR. M.K.K. DURRANI6. 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.26373/2010 DATED117/2014 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) 43 AND:

1. SMT. SHIVARUDRAMMA W/O LATE REVANABASAPPA AGED ABOUT62YEARS2 SRI. S.R. RENUKA PRASAD S/O LATE REVANABASAPPA AGED ABOUT40YEARS3 SRI. S.R. MOHAN KUMAR S/O LATE REVANABASAPPA AGED ABOUT38YEARS4 SRI. S.R. NIRANJAN KUMAR S/O LATE REVANABASAPPA AGED ABOUT36YEARS ALL ARE RESIDING AT No.44, SULIKERE VILLAGE & POST KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.

5. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT M.S. BUILDING BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. D.L. JAGADEESH, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SHRI. K. PRAMOD, ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R4; SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.13416/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2067 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY44BY 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. CHANDRASHEKARAIAH S/O LATE RUDRAPPA AGED ABOUT64YEARS RESIDING AT BANGALE VILLAGE SULIKERE POST, KENGRI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT2 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.23247/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2068 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY45BY 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 ABOUT67YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.43714/2012 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2069 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BY ITS COMMISSIONER46KUMARA PARK WEST T CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE56002 2 . THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE56002 ... APPELLANTS (BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SRI G LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. . SMT P N NIRANJANI AGED ABOUT65YEARS W/O H M S KUMAR R/A KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 060. 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP BY ITS SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARMENT VIKASA SOUDHA BANGALORE560001 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.19807- 19808/2010 DATED1107/2014 AND ETC. IN W.A. NO.2239 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY47BY 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 ABOUT59YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.32187/2010 AND34096098/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2243 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD48KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020. REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT52YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.40115/2010 DATED1107/2014. 49 IN W.A. NO.2244 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD K.P. WEST, BANGALORE2 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. NANJUNDARADYA AGED ABOUT72YEARS R/AT No.1189/C, 4TH MAIN14H CROSS, M.C. LAYOUT VIJAYNAGAR, BANGALORE-560 040. 2(B) SMT. SHANTHAKUMARI W/O LATE K.N. MURUGENDRARADYA AGE UNKNOWN2C) SMT. LAVANYA D/O LATE K.N. MURUGENDRARADYA AGE UNKNOWN50BOTH ARE RESIDING AT NO.56, 1ST MAIN, 4TH CROSS HOSAHALLI, VIJAYNAGAR BENGALURU-560 085. 2(D) SRI. N. MRUTYUNJAYA S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNDARADYA AGED

ABOUT68YEARS 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. NANJUNDARADYA AGED ABOUT66YEARS R/AT RAJABEEDHI, TAVAREKERE BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK BENGALURU-562 130. 2(F) SRI. K.N. SHIVAPRAKASH S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNDARADYA AGED ABOUT64YEARS 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. NANJUNDARADYA AGED ABOUT62YEARS R/AT No.65, KOMAGATTA SULIKERE, BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK BENGALURU-560 060. 2(H) SRI. K.N. GIRISH S/O LATE K.N. NANJUNDARADYA AGED60YEARS R/AT NO.65, KOMAGATTA ROAD KOMAGATTA, BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK BENGALURU-560 060. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR51SHRI. 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.19118/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT72YEARS2B) RAJESH H.C.K S/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA AGED ABOUT46YEARS522(C) KOMALA KUMARI H.C.K D/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA AGED ABOUT44YEARS2D) PUSHPA KUMAR D/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA AGED ABOUT41YEARS2E) KUSUMA KUMARI D/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA AGED ABOUT39YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.17461/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2248 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD K.P. WEST BANGALORE532. 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 ABOUT31YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.45934/2011 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2249 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD K.P.WEST, BANGALORE2 THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER54BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD K.P.WEST, BANGALORE-560 020. APPELLANTS NO.1 AND2ARE BEING THE DIFFERENT SECTION OF THE SAME AUTHORITY BOTH ARE REPRESENTED BY ALAO .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. SRI. G. RAMAKRISHNAPPA S/O JUNJAPPA AGED ABOUT59YEARS R/AT HUNASEMARADAPALYA KENGERI 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.1753/2013 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2250 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD55KUMARA 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 ABOUT45YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.34191/2011 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A.NO.2251 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD56K.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 ABOUT53YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.22777/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2255 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD57K.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 ABOUT61YEARS RESIDENT OF No.53/5 SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST BANGALORE-91.

3. SMT. ANJINAMMA W/O LATE LAKKAPPA AGED ABOUT48YEARS RESIDENT OF No.53/5 SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST BANGALORE-91.

4. SRI. VENKATASWAMAIAH W/O LATE RAMADASAPPA AGED ABOUT53YEARS RESIDENT OF No.53/3 SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST BANGALORE-91.

5. SRI. VENKATACHALAIAH S/O LATE VENKATAPPA AGED ABOUT59YEARS RESIDENT OF No.53/2 58 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.35445- 35448/2011 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2256 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY K.P.WEST EXTENSION BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT50YEARS NO.112, 7TH MAIN ROAD5H CROSS, SRINIVASANAGAR BANGALORE-560 050. RESPONDENTS59(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.32869/2013 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2259 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD K.P.WEST, BANGALORE2 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 BANGALORE2 SMT. SOUBHAGYAMMA W/O V.K. RAMEGOWDA AGED ABOUT64YEARS R/AT No.38, MIG80FEET ROAD KENGERI SATTELLITE TOWN BANGALORE-560 060. 60

3. K.G. NANDINI ENTERPRISES NANDAAGOKULA LAYOUT REPRESENTED BY ITS JOINT DEVELOPERS NAGARAJU, SY NO.161 RAMASANDRA VILLAGE NEAR SIR M.V. LAYOUT KENGERI 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
DTD2208.2017 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R3 IS DISPENSED WITH) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.44554/2012 DATED1107/2014. 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 & URBAN61DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA M.S.BUILDING DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR BEEDHI BANGALORE-560 001.

2. SMT. GANGAMALLAMMA W/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA AGED ABOUT69YEARS3 SRI. S.M. ARASE GOWDA S/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA AGED ABOUT46YEARS4 SRI. S.M. MUNIYAPPA S/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA AGED ABOUT43YEARS5 SMT. S.M. UMA DEVI D/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA AGED ABOUT41YEARS6 SRI. S.M. ANNAYANNA S/O MUTHURAYAPPA @ ARASAPPA AGED ABOUT39YEARS RESPONDENTS NO.2 TO6ARE 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.33657/2010 & 40928/2010 DATED1107/2014. 62 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 ABOUT48YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.33243- 33246/2011 DATED1107/2014. 63 IN W.A. NO.2263 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD K.P. WEST, BANGALORE2 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 BANGALORE2 SRI. Y.N. CHENNAPPA S/O LATE NAGAPPA AGED ABOUT63YEARS 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 YESHWANTHAPURA HOBLI BANGALORE NORTH TALUK. RESPONDENTS64(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.251-255/2013 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT47YEARS, S/O LATE CHIKKANNA R/AT NO.730 C, 9TH CROSS, 5TH MAIN, M.C.LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR, BANGALORE-560040 65 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION72972010 DATED1107/2014 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 ABOUT39YEARS RESIDENT OF No.59, 9TH CROSS MUNISWAR NAGAR, ULLAL MAIN ROAD JNANABHARATHI POST BANGALORE-560 056. 66

3. SRI. M. VENKATESHWARA REDDY W/O M. RAMAKRISHNA REDDY AGED ABOUT52YEARS R/AT No.1095, MRK REDDY GARDENS PAVITHRA SCHOOL ROAD MANGANAHALLI BANGALORE-60.

4. SRI. SUDHAKAR REDDY S/O C. VENKATESHWARA REDDY AGED ABOUT66YEARS R/AT No.59, 9TH CROSS MUNISWAR NAGAR, ULLAL MAIN ROAD JNANABHARATHI POST BANGALORE-560 056. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1; SHRI. V.N. MADHAVA REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.35001-03/2012 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2267 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 KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020. .APPELLANTS (BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE) 67 AND:

1. SRI. BETTAIAH S/O MUNI HUCHHAIAH AGED ABOUT93YEARS RESIDING AT HUNASEMARANAPALYA VILLAGE RAMOHALLI POST KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-560 060.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT M.S. 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.41227/2011 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2268 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-560020. ..APPELLANTS (BY SRI G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE) 68 AND:

1. . SRI P V JOHNY AGED ABOUT69YEARS, S/O VARGHESE MATHAI, 2 . SMT. SARAMMA JOHNY AGED ABOUT67YEARS, 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 ABOUT42YEARS, 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.32653- 32656/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2269 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BY ITS COMMISSIONER KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020 69 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 ABOUT51YEARS RESIDING AT No.143/96 BANASHANKARI BANAGIRI NAGAR3D STAGE BANGALORE-560 085.

2. SRI. B.C. CHIKKANNA S/O LATE CHIKKANNA AGED ABOUT54YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.11837 AND118382010 DATED1107/2014. 70 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 COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT58YEARS R/AT BANGALE SULIKERE VILLAGE AND POST 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 AND SHRI. P.V. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1; SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) 71 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.15705/2013 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2449 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT51YEARS R/O KENCHANAPURA VILLAGE KENGERI 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) 72 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.36986/2011 DATED1107/2014. 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 COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT26YEARS 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) 73 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.42138/2012 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2470 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY K.P. WEST EXTENSION BANGALORE-560 020. REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT41YEARS2 SRI. K.P. VIRUPAKSHARADHYA S/O LATE PUTTA NANJUNDAPPA AGED ABOUT35YEARS 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. BUILDING74BANGALORE-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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.11966-967/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT43YEARS RESIDING AT No.F10117 MARAMMA TEMPLE STREET3D 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. RESPONDENTS75(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.173/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT53YEARS 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. RESPONDENTS76(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.176/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT49YEARS 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; 77 SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.177/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT51YEARS NO.424, 9TH A CROSS4H MAIN ROAD ANNAPURNESHWARI NAGAR BENGALURU-560 091. 1(B) P.S. SHIVA KUMAR S/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA AGED ABOUT47YEARS NO.424, 9TH A CROSS784TH MAIN ROAD ANNAPURNESHWARI NAGAR BENGALURU-560 091. 1(C) SMT. P.S. GEETHA D/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA AGED ABOUT49YEARS NO.24, SADHASHIVA TEMPLE ROAD RAMASWAMY PALYA BENGALURU-560 033. 1(D) SMT. P.S. KANAKA MANJULA D/O LATE H.S. SHIVALINGAPPA AGED ABOUT55YEARS 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. KALLESHAPPA, 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.179/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.2725 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BY ITS COMMISSIONER KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020. 79

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 ABOUT58YEARS RESIDING AT NO.4, 3RD MAIN EKADANTA BADAVANE K. KRISHNASAGARA VILLAGE KENGERI 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.181/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.2726 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BY ITS COMMISSIONER KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020. 80

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 ABOUT47YEARS RESIDING AT No.V22 RING ROAD VIJAYANAGAR2D 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.182/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 OFFICER81BANGALORE 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 ABOUT45YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3084/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 OFFICER82BANGALORE 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 ABOUT35YEARS RESIDING AT NO.29 43A LAST STOP KATRIGUPPE MAIN ROAD SANESHWARASWAMY TEMPLE3D 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3085/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 OFFICER83BANGALORE 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 ABOUT47YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3086/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ROAD84KUMARA 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 ABOUT58YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3089/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.2808 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE2 THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST85BANGALORE-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 ABOUT62YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3114/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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. .APPELLANTS86(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 ABOUT59YEARS R/AT No.20, 1ST FLOOR4H 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3133/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 FOR87SHRI. 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 ABOUT44YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3115/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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) 88 AND:

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

2. SMT. NANCHARAMMA W/O A. KRISHNAIAH AGED ABOUT52YEARS R/AT NO.19, 13TH C-CROSS KEMPEGOWDANAGAR, BYADARAHALLI MAGADI MAIN ROAD VISHWANEEDAM BANGALORE-560 091. 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.28892/2012 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.2814 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 BANGALORE-560 020. .APPELLANTS (BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE) 89 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 ABOUT58YEARS R/AT69417, 5TH MAIN, 11TH CROSS M.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR BANGALORE-560 040.

3. SMT. SUNANDA D/O A. CHANNE GOWDA AGED ABOUT47YEARS R/AT966 10TH B MAIN ROAD4H E BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR BANGALORE-560 010.

4. SMT. SUMITHRA VISHANKANTA W/O LATE VISHAKANTA AGED ABOUT60YEARS R/AT694 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NOs.33599- 601/2014 & 34378/2014 DATED2807/2014. IN W.A. NO.2815 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD90K.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 ABOUT61YEARS R/AT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE SULIKERE POST, KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK-31.

3. MANJUNATHA S/O LATE RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT49YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.57463- 464/2013 DATED2507/2014. 91 IN W.A. NO.2821 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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. HULLURAIAH S/O HANUMANTHAIAH AGED ABOUT39YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE92

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.12326/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT49YEARS R/AT No.24, EKADANTA BADAVANE K. KRISHNA SAGARA VILLAGE KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE-560 060.

3. SMT. M. GANGA JAYAKUMAR W/O SRI. M.M. JAYAKUMAR AGED ABOUT42YEARS R/AT NO.8, KAVERI NILAYA CHINNAPPANAHALLI, MARATHHALLI BANGALORE-560 037. 93

4. SMT. SHOBHAVATHI T.R. W/O G.M. NARASIMHA MURTHY AGED ABOUT55YEARS R/AT NO.11, 1ST BLOCK PWD QUARTERS, WILSON GARDEN BANGALORE-560 027.

5. SMT. MONTHINE PINTO W/O MR. G. PINTO AGED ABOUT59YEARS 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 ABOUT61YEARS R/AT NO.6/27, 14TH CROSS6H BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR BANGALORE-560 010.

7. SRI. S. BALAJI S/O S. VENKATARAMANAPPA AGED ABOUT46YEARS R/AT No.90, 3RD CROSS MOUNT JOY LAYOUT HANUMANTHNAGAR BANGALORE-560 019.

8. SMT. B.R. SHASHIKALA W/O SRI. NARYANA RAO AGED ABOUT53YEARS R/AT NO.2/5, SARASWATHIPURA NANDINI LAYOUT BANGALORE-560 096.

9. SRI. SHIVA PRASAD GUPTA S/O SRI. KANTHARAJA SHETTY AGED ABOUT41YEARS R/AT NO.104, 3RD A CROSS B.C.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR BANGALORE-560 040.

10. SMT. GAYATHRI94W/O MANJUNATHA RAO AGED ABOUT61YEARS R/AT No.V-60, 6TH CROSS PIPELINE, MALLESWARAM BANGALORE-560 003.

11. SMT. PUSHPA SHIVALINGAPPA W/O DR. B.M. SHIVALINGAPPA AGED ABOUT58YEARS R/AT No.159. T/2 SAMPOORNA APARTMENTS 8TH MAIN, BETWEEN7H AND8H CROSS MALLESHWARAM BANGALORE-560 003.

12. SMT. SARASU VENUGOPAL W/O G.R. VENUGOPAL AGED ABOUT62YEARS R/AT NO.5, BEHIND SRI. RAMA VIDYALAYA NAVYANAGARA JAKKUR BANGALORE-560 064.

13. SMT. PADMAVATHAMMA W/O SRI. K. NARAYANA MURTHY AGED ABOUT40YEARS R/AT NO.26, 10TH CROSS3D FLOOR, CITY CHAIRS UPSYTAIRS PIPELINE, VIJAYANAGAR BANGALORE-560 040.

14. SMT. MANJULA RAVINDRA PUROHIT W/O RAVINDRA V. PUROHIT AGED ABOUT44YEARS 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 ABOUT66YEARS R/AT No.U-57, SRI VEKATESH NILAYA1T CROSS, PADARAYANAPURA BANGALORE-560 026.

16. SMT. NANCHARAMMA95W/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 ABOUT40YEARS 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 ABOUT71YEARS 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 ABOUT60YEARS R/AT NO.608/1, 80 FEET ROAD7H BLOCK, 2ND PHASE, BSK III STAGE BANGALORE-560 085.

20. SRI. KIRAN S. PAMADI S/O P.R. SAMPANGIRAMA SHETTY AGED ABOUT34YEARS 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 ABOUT53YEARS 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 DTD1301/2020 96 R3 TO R21 NOTICE IS DISPENSED WITH V/O DTD1201/2017 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.16364/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 ABOUT63YEARS RESIDING AT No.U-57 SRI. VENKATESH NILAYA1T 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; 97 SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3116/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT60YEARS RESIDING AT No.608/1 80 FEET ROAD, 7TH BLOCK2D PHASE, BSK III STAGE BANGALORE-560 085.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS98(BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2 R1 - SERVED) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3117/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT70YEARS 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. RESPONDENTS99(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3123/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT44YEARS RESIDING AT NO.28 BILIGIRI KUTEERA BANK OF BARODA COLONY7H 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. RESPONDENTS100(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3129/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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. VENKATESHARAIAH AGED ABOUT55YEARS 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 SOUDHA101BANGALORE-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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.20330/2014 DATED0108/2014. 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 MOODALAIAH AGED ABOUT75YEARS2 SMT. NANJAMMA W/O LATE KEMPAIAH AGED ABOUT58YEARS3 SMT. LAKSHMAMMA W/O LATE VENKATESHAPPA AGED ABOUT56YEARS4 SRI. CHIKKAKEMPAIAH102S/O LATE DODDA MOODALAIAH AGED ABOUT60YEARS RESPONDENTS1TO4ARE RESIDENTS OF BETTANAPALYA, BHEEMANAKUPPE DHAKALE KENGERI 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.31401- 402/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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) 103 AND:

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

2. SMT. UMADEVI W/O LATE D. SHIVALINGAPPA AGED ABOUT38YEARS R/AT No.894, 8TH A MAIN ROAD3D STAGE, 3RD BLOCK BASAVESHWARANAGAR BANGALORE-560 079. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1; SHRI. M.C. PRABHUJI, ADVOCATE FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3096/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.2877 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 THE 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) 104 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 ABOUT56YEARS R/AT GONGGADIPURA VILLAGE KODIGEHALLI, YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI BANGALORE NORTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 091.

3. SRI. RAMACHANDRA S/O LATE DODDAHANUMANTHAPPA AGED ABOUT49YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.41802/2013 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.2879 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020. 105

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 ABOUT34YEARS No.448, 3RD CROSS4H 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.38953/2013 DATED0208/2014. 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 OFFICER106BANGALORE 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 ABOUT50YEARS R/A NO.10/5, ARUNA KIRANA NILAYA4H C MAIN, ANJANEYANAGARA BANGALORE-560 085 (SINCE DEAD BY LRS) 2(A). JAYANTHI W/O LATE C.N. RAJANNA AGED ABOUT55YEARS2B). ARUN GOWDA C.R S/O LATE C.N. RAJANNA AGED ABOUT35YEARS2C). KIRAN GOWDA C.R S/O LATE C.N. RAJANNA AGED ABOUT32YEARS ALL ARE RESIDING AT NO.20/4, 5TH C MAIN ARUNAKIRANA NILAYA BSK III STAGE BANGALORE-85 3. SMT. GOWRAMMA W/O SRI. GUNDAPPA107AGED ABOUT53YEARS R/AT NO.29, 2ND CROSS T.R.SHAMANNA NAGAR SRINAGR BANGALORE-560 050 4. SMT. K.R. YASHODHA W/O G. SRINIVAS AGED ABOUT41YEARS R/O NO.34, 7TH CROSS12H MAIN, RAGHAVENDRA BLOCK SRINAGAR BANGALORE-560 050 5. SMT. SHANTHA W/O MAHESHWARAPPA S.H AGED ABOUT47YEARS R/AT SAMASTHITHI GURU LAYOUT BEHIND GOVERNMENT POLYTECHNIC TUMKUR-572 103 6. SRI. A.S. RUDRAMURTHY S/O SIDDARAMAIAH A.S AGED ABOUT50YEARS 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 ABOUT45YEARS R/AT NO.M/15, 3RD MAIN JAYAMAHAL EXTENSION BANGALORE-560 046 8. SRI. T.R. LOKESH S/O D.S. RUDRAMUNIYAPPA AGED ABOUT54YEARS R/AT KAVERI, MAHALAKSHMINAGAR TUMKUR-572 103 9. SRI. M.S. SREEDHAR S/O M.R. SUBBARATHNAIAH AGED ABOUT34YEARS R/A NO.149, 8TH CROSS 1081 ST MAIN, KALYANA NAGAR MUDALAPALYA BANGALORE-560 072 10. SMT. RADHA W/O RAMESH AGED ABOUT41YEARS R/AT NO.1, 5TH CROSS KILLARI ROAD BANGALORE-560 001 11. SMT. B. SUSHEELA W/O S. UMESH AGED ABOUT42YEARS R/AT SRI GANESH HOTEL YEDIYUR, YEDIYUR HOBLI KUNIGAL TALUK TUMKUR DISTRICT12 SMT. INDIRA W/O SURESH AGED ABOUT42YEARS R/A NO.525,

7TH CROSS7H MAIN, HANUMANTHANAGAR BANGALORE-560 019 13. SRI. B.J.

KUMAR S/O JAVAREGOWDA AGED ABOUT40YEARS R/A NO.1181, 4TH CROSS11H MAIN, RAGHAVENDRA BLOCK SRINAGAR BANGALORE-560 050 14. SMT. T.S.V. LAKSHMI W/O K.R. UDAY KUMAR AGED ABOUT52YEARS R/A RAILWAY STATION ROAD GANDHINAGAR TUMKUR-572 101 15. SRI. C. ANAND S/O P. CHANNAGALARAVA AGED ABOUT34YEARS R/AT NO.25/1, BESIDE SRINIVAS109KALYANA MANTAPA ANJENEYA NAGAR, ITTAMADU3D BLOCK, BANASHANKARI3D STAGE BANGALORE-560 085 16. SRI. JAVARAYAPPA S/O LATE KAPANIGOWDA AGED ABOUT57YEARS R/A NO.9/B, 2ND MAIN DWARAKANAGAR HOSAKEREHALLI BANASHANKARI3D STAGE BANGALORE-85 RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1; SHRI. R. KUMAR ADVOCATE FOR R2(A-C), R3 TO R16 AND R3) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.58707-721/2013 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.2881 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) 110 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 ABOUT61YEARS R/AT NO.298, 1ST FLOOR15H CROSS, 5TH PHASE, J.P. NAGAR BANGALORE-560 078.

3. SRI. JANARDHANA K. S/O SRI. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA SETTY AGED ABOUT61YEARS 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 ABOUT73YEARS R/AT No.2731, MANJUNATH NILAYA2D CROSS, GOKULA BADAVANE MANDIR ROAD, KYATHASANDRA ROAD TUMKUR-04.

5. SRI. M. SADHASHIVAIAH S/O C. MALLAIAH AGED ABOUT57YEARS 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 ABOUT42YEARS R/AT No.100/42, 18TH CROSS15H MAIN, R.K. LAYOUT PADMANABHA NAGAR111BANGALORE-61.

7. B. RAVI S/O BALAKRISHNA AGED ABOUT38YEARS R/AT No.37, 22ND CROSS ITMADU MAIN ROAD BANASHANKARI3D STAGE BANGALORE-85.

8. SMT. SHARADA S/O J.

SIDDALINGAIAH AGED ABOUT43YEARS R/AT NO.34, 7TH CROSS12H MAIN, RAGAVENDRA BLOCK SRINAGAR BANGALORE-50.

9. SMT. K.S. GNANESHWARI W/O B.J.

KUMAR AGED ABOUT37YEARS R/AT No.1181, 4TH CROSS11H MAIN ROAD, RAGAVENDRA BLOCK SRINAGAR BANGALORE-50.

10. SMT. KARIYAMMA W/O B.T. RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT53YEARS R/AT NO.825, HRUSHABAVATHI NAGAR2D STAGE, KAMALANAGAR BANGALORE-79.

11. SMT. B.N. NAGARATHNAMMA W/O M.L. PARAMESHAIAH AGED ABOUT48YEARS R/AT No.3, BANDI NILAYA3D CROSS, HAVALAHALLI MYSORE ROAD BANGALORE-26.

12. SMT. B.N. RAJALAKSHMI W/O B.K. NAGESH KUMAR AGED ABOUT44YEARS R/AT NO.647, 80 FEET, 2ND PHASE112GIRINAGAR BANGALORE-85.

13. SRI. K. CHANDRASHEKAR S/O M.N. KRISHNNAPPA AGED ABOUT48YEARS R/AT No.14/23, 5TH CROSS16H MAIN, 2ND STAGE, SRINIVASA NAGARA MYSORE BANK COLONY BANGALORE-50.

14. SMT. BINDUMATHI. P. D/O PUTTALINGAIAH AGED ABOUT34YEARS R/AT No.7, 19TH MAIN ROAD MUNESHWARA BLOCK MYSORE ROAD BANGALORE-26.

15. KUM. GANANESHWARI. P. D/O PUTTALINGAIAH AGED ABOUT31YEARS R/AT No.7, 19TH MAIN ROAD MUNESHWARA BLOCK MYSORE ROAD BANGALORE-26.

16. SRI. K.P. MAHALINGE GOWDA S/O PUTTALAKEGOWDA AGED ABOUT45YEARS AND SMT. SUDHA V W/O K.P. MAHALINGE GOWDA AGED ABOUT43YEARS 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) 113 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.726-740/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT36YEARS R/AT NO.51, 3RD CROSS5H 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) 114 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3130/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT33YEARS 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) 115 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3124/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT51YEARS R/AT No.39/89, 1ST E CROSS REMCO LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR2D STAGE BANGALORE-560 040. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1) R2 - SERVED116THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3119/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT61YEARS 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) 117 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3118/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT40YEARS 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) 118 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3125/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT51YEARS S/O LATE SHESHADRI GUPTA R/AT No.343, 3RD CROSS2D 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) 119 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3092/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT52YEARS 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 SERVED120THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3112/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 ABOUT41YEARS 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) 121 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT

ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3088/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.2957 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT45YEARS No.44/1, MKK ROAD NAGAPPA BLOCK BANGALORE-560 021.

3. SMT. M.N. SHOBHA W/O LATE M.V. NARAYANA MURTHY AGED ABOUT48YEARS No.2394, 10TH MAIN122E BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR BANGALORE-560 010.

4. SMT. M. ANITHA W/O M.G. MURALIDHARA AGED ABOUT37YEARS No.51, 8TH MAIN ROAD SBM COLONY, BRINDAVA NAGAR MATHIKERE BANGALORE-560 054.

5. SMT. SUNITHA HARISH W/O HARISH C.J.

AGED ABOUT33YEARS No.660/9-1, 11TH CROSS7H BLOCK, JAYANAGAR BANGALORE-560 082.

6. SRI. B.S. VANITHA W/O P.S. DAKSHINAMURTHY AGED ABOUT50YEARS No.88, IV BLOCK, 3RD STAGE IV MAIN, BASAVESHWARANAGAR BANGALORE-560 078.

7. SRI. V. SRIDHARA S/O LATE B.G. VASUDEVA AGED ABOUT61YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.251-255/2013 DATED1107/2014. 123 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 ABOUT48YEARS R/AT EWS768 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3120/2014 DATED2507/2014. 124 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 ABOUT46YEARS 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. SOMASHEKHARAIAH, ADVOCATE FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.19193/2013 DATED1208/2014. 125 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 ABOUT55YEARS3 SRI. G.T. NARAYAN S/O G.S. TARKARAMASETTY AGED ABOUT52YEARS4 SMT. G.T. KRISHNAMURTHY S/O LATE G.S. TARAKARAMASETTY AGED ABOUT46YEARS RESPONDENT No.2 TO4NO.16, R.K. STREET SESHADRIPURAM BANGALORE-560 020. RESPONDENTS126(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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.46130-33/2013 DATED0408/2014. 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 ABOUT51YEARS R/AT NO.201/3, BHRAMARA NILAYA 4TH MAIN ROAD, 4TH CROSS CHAMARAJAPET BANGALORE-560 018. 127

3. SMT. B.M. CHANDRAKALA D/O SRI N. MARIYAPPA AGED ABOUT42YEARS 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 ABOUT60YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.9081-83/2013 DATED3007/2014. 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) 128 AND:

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

2. SRI. T. GOVINDARAJU S/O LATE THAGADE GOWDA AGED ABOUT32YEARS R/AT No.353, 3RD CROSS12H MAIN ROAD, SHIVANAGAR RAJAJINAGAR BANGALORE-560 010. 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3126/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3049 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) 129 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 ABOUT42YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3127/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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) 130 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 ABOUT52YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3131/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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) 131 AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA BANGALORE-560 001.

2. SRI. N. PADMAVATHAMMA S/O SRI. K. NARAYANA MURTHY AGED ABOUT40YEARS R/AT NO.26, 10TH CROSS3D FLOOR, CITY CHAIRS UPSTAIRS PIPELINE, VIJAYANAGAR BANGALORE-560 040. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1; SMT. MAMMATHA G. KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3128/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3077 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

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

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. J.C. KUMAR, ADVOCATE) 132 AND:

1. SRI. P.S. RAGHAVENDRA S/O SRI P. SATHYANARAYANA GUPTA AGED ABOUT44YEARS R/AT NO.137, GROUND FLOOR13H A MAIN, RAGHAVENDRA MUTT ROAD, MATHIKERE BANGALORE-560 054.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. M.R. RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SHRI. H.N. BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R1; SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.186/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3078 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020. .APPELLANTS133(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 ABOUT44YEARS R/AT No.202, 6TH MAIN2D 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.189/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 COMMISSIONER2 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 FOR134SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SMT. C.B. PARVATHY W/O SRI. P.B. CHINNAPPA AGED ABOUT58YEARS R/AT NO.32, 2ND MAIN, 1ST CROSS AREKERE MICO LAYOUT2D 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.180/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3082 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 FOR135SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SMT. M.S. GAYATHRI W/O SRI. M.B. SUBASH AGED ABOUT58YEARS R/AT No.117, 7TH MAIN3D STAGE, BEML LAYOUT RAJARAJESHWARINAGAR BANGALORE-560 098.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.184/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3083 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020. .APPELLANTS136(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SMT. GAYATHRI W/O SRI MANJUNATHA RAO AGED ABOUT60YEARS R/AT No.V-60, 6TH CROSS PIPE LINE, MALLESHWARAM BANGALORE-560 003.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3090/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3084 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020 .APPELLANTS137(BY SHRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SRI. M.M. JAYAKUMAR S/O M.P. MUDDAPPA AGED ABOUT44YEARS R/AT No.8, KAVERI NILAYA CHINNAPPANAHALLI MARATHHALLI BANGALORE-560 037.

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) R1 - SERVED THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.191/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3085 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020. REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 FOR138SHRI. B.S. SACHIN, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SRI. NIRANJAN S. PAMADI S/O SRI. P.R. SAMPANGIRAMA SHETTY AGED ABOUT25YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.183/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3086 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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) 139 AND:

1. SRI. V. NAGARAJU S/O LATE VENKOBA SA AGED ABOUT45YEARS R/AT NO.150, 60 FEET ROAD PATTEGARAPALYA BASAVESHWARANAGAR BANGALORE-560 079 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.16/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3087 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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) 140 AND:

1. SRI. S. KRISHNA SHETTY S/O LATE SHAMANNA SHETTY AGED ABOUT64YEARS R/AT NO.12, 1ST MAIN ROAD2D CROSS, OPP. NANDA GOKULA SCHOOL KAVERIPURA, KAMAKSHIPALYA BANGALORE-560 079 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.187/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3088 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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) 141 AND:

1. SRI. V.N. SRINIVAS S/O LATE NANJUNDA SHETTY AGED ABOUT74YEARS R/AT NO.20, SHIVA SADANA 4TH MAIN ROAD CHAMARAJPET BANGALORE-

560 018 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) R1-SERVED) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.192/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3089 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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) 142 AND:

1. SMT. SATHI CHITRA W/O M. ANAND AGED ABOUT41YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.188/2014 DATED2507/2014. IN W.A. NO.3091 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020. REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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) 143 AND:

1. SRI. KANTHANNA S/O THIMMAIAH AGED ABOUT46YEARS R/AT C.P.W. QUARTERS182 13TH BLOCK H.S.R. LAYOUT BANGALORE-560 102.

2. SRI. K. JAGADEESH S/O KEMPARAJU AGED ABOUT52YEARS R/AT M-109, 5TH CROSS7H 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.770-771/2014 DATED2507/2014. 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 FOR144SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. DR. VAMANA ACHARYA S/O NARASIMHA ACHARYA AAYI AGED ABOUT60YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.3107/2012 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.3160 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 FOR145SHRI. G. LAKSHMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SRI. M. MANJUNATHA S/O M. MUNIRAJU AGED ABOUT32YEARS OCCUPATION: AGRICULTURIST R/AT BHEEMANA KUPPE VILLAGE KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 060.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT M.S. BUILDINGS BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. B.S. NAGARAJ, ADVOCATE FOR R1; SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.30102/2012 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.3162 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER (LAND ACQUISITION) BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BANGALORE-560 020.

2. THE ADDITIONAL 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) 146 AND:

1. SRI. B. ESHWARA S/O SRI BYRAPPA @ DODDABYRAPPA AGED ABOUT52YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.46491/2011 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.3163 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 RANGASWAMAIAH147S/O SRI NADUTHIRAIAH AGED ABOUT66YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.28892/2012 DATED1107/2014. 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. JAICHAND148S/O DEEPCHAND AGED ABOUT67YEARS RESIDING AT NO.6 1ST CROSS, VASANTH NAGAR BANGALORE-560 052.

2. SMT. J.

RAJKUMARI W/O D. JAICHAND AGED ABOUT61YEARS RESIDING AT NO.6 1ST CROSS, VASANTH NAGAR BANGALORE-560 052. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. S.V. GANESH, ADVOCATE) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.19475/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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, BANGALORE560020 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 KARNATAKA149REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, M.S. BUILDING, DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR BEEDHI, BANGALORE56000 2 . SRI. SOMASHEKAR S/O SRI HUCHAPPA, AGED ABOUT64YEARS, RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE3. SRI H. RAVINDRA S/O SRI HUCHAPPA, AGED ABOUT57YEARS, RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE4. SRI H.S. DEEPAK S/O SRI. SOMASHEKAR, AGED ABOUT36YEARS, RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE5. SMT. LEELAMMA W/O SRI. SOMASHEKAR, AGED ABOUT58YEARS, RESIDING AT KOMMAGHATTA VILLAGE, KENGERI 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE150

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION1292735/2010 DATED1107/2014 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 COMMISSIONER2 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. NAGAMANGALAIAH S/O LATE KENDANNA AGED ABOUT68YEARS 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) 151 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.1379/2015 DATED2701/2015. 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) 152 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.33858/2011 AND342822011 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.1010 OF 2015 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020. REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT82YEARS2B) K.B. RAJASHEKAR153S/O LATE K.M. BASAVARADHYA AGED ABOUT62YEARS2C) K.B. GIRISH S/O LATE K.M. BASAVARADHYA AGED ABOUT60YEARS2D) K.B. GURUPRASAD S/O LATE K.M. BASAVARADHYA AGED ABOUT58YEARS2E) 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.9101- 9102/2010 DATED1107/2014. 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 FOR154SHRI. MURUGESH V. CHARATI, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. SRI. N. GANGANARASIMHAIAH S/O SRI NARASIMHAIAH AGED ABOUT62YEARS2 SRI. DEVARAJU S/O SRI N. GANGANARASIMHAIAH AGED ABOUT33YEARS3 SRI. SHIVASHANKAR S/O SRI N. GANGANARASIMHAIAH AGED ABOUT27YEARS4 SRI GANGANARASIMHAMURTHY S/O SRI N. GANGANARASIMHAIAH AGED ABOUT25YEARS ALL ARE RESIDENTS OF SEEGEHALLI VILLAGE YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI BANGALORE NORTH TALUK PIN:

560. 067.

4. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA M.S. BUILDINGS DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI BANGALORE-560 001. RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. G.S. VENKATA SUBBARAO, ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R4; SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R5) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.39390/2012 AND409942012 DATED1107/2014. 155 IN W.A. NO.1166 OF 2015 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT54YEARS OCC: AGRICULTURIST BHEEMANA KUPPE VILLAGE

KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 060.

2. MRS. M. SWETHA D/O SRI MUNIRAJU AGED ABOUT33YEARS OCC: AGRICULTURIST BHEEMANA KUPPE VILLAGE KENGERI 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; 156 SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R3) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.38252- 253/2012 DATED1107/2014. 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 COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT66YEARS 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-560 001 157 3. THE SECRETARY URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA BANGALORE-560 001 4. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT BANGALORE-560 001 5. THE TAHASHILDAR BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 001 RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R-R5; SHRI. N.R. NAIK, ADVOCATE FOR R1) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.20417/2010 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.1172 OF 2015 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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. LAKSHMIDEVAMMA158W/O B.M. VENKATESH AGED ABOUT62YEARS R/AT No.554, 6TH MAIN ROAD4H 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.43470/2012 DATED1107/2014. IN W.A. NO.1173 OF 2015 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT52YEARS FARM HOUSE, RAMASANDRA159KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE-560 060.

2. SRI. NANJUNDAPPA J.H. S/O J.P. HALAPPA AGED ABOUT73YEARS RESIDENT OF1271 4TH MAIN7H CROSS, CHANDRA LAYOUT BANGALORE-560 040.

3. SRI. DOBBAGULAPPA S/O SRI RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT52YEARS RESIDENT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE BANGALORE SOUTH BANGALORE DISTRICT PIN:560 060.

4. SRI. MANJUNATH S/O SRI RANGAPPA AGED ABOUT39YEARS RESIDENT RAMASANDRA VILLAGE KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH ZONE BANGALORE DISTRICT PIN:560 060.

5. SMT. GOWRAMMA W/O SRI VENKATESH AGED ABOUT41YEARS RESIDING AT NO.16 50 FEET ROAD MUNESHWARA BLOCK BANGALORE-560 026.

6. SRI VENKATESH S/O SRI SHIVARAMAIAH AGED ABOUT44YEARS RESIDING AT NO.16 50 FEET ROAD MUNESHWARA BLOCK BANGALORE-560 026.

7. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS SECRETARY160DEPARTMENT 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.251-255/2013 DATED1107/2014. 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. 161 AGED ABOUT65YEARS R/AT No.7, MANGANAHALLI VILLAGE YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI BENGALURU-560 060. 1(B) SMT. JINNUBAI NAGARAJU W/O M. NAGARAJU AGED ABOUT46YEARS R/AT No.1, MANGANAHALLI VILLAGE BENGALURU-560 060. 1(C) SMT. NAGAMANI M.V. W/O RAJANNA AGED ABOUT41YEARS 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 ABOUT39YEARS R/AT MANGANAHALLI VILLAGE YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI BANGALORE-560 060. 1(E) SRI. KUMAR V. S/O LATE VENKATARASAPPA AGED ABOUT37YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE162

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.6705/2014 DATED2003/2015. 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 ABOUT45YEARS 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. KARUMBAIAH, ADVOCATE FOR R1; SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE163

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.51495/2014 DATED1902/2016. 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 ABOUT48YEARS 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 DATED1306.2013 NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.25087/2015 DATED1803/2016. 164 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 ABOUT41YEARS RESIDING AT NO.6 C/O SHILPA PRINTERS1T MAIN, VINAYAKANAGARA HALE GUDDADHALLI, MYSORE ROAD BANGALORE-560 026.

2. SRI. S. VENKATESH S/O LATE G.N. SRIKANTAIAH AGED ABOUT65YEARS RESIDING AT NO.1555 17TH B MAIN ROAD5H BLOCK, 1ST STAGE HBR LAYOUT BANGALORE-560 043.

3. SRI. S.G. NAGARAJ S/O LATE GANGAPPA AGED ABOUT61YEARS RESIDING AT No.446 8TH CROSS, 29TH MAIN165BTM EWS LAYOUT BANGALORE-560 076.

4. DR. H. SANTHOSH S. SHETTY W/O DR. A. SANTHOSH SHETTY AGED ABOUT55YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.12699- 12702/2016 DATED1403/2016. 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) 166 AND:

1. SRI. SHANTHARAJU S/O LATE SHIVANNA AGED ABOUT62YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.20168/2015 DATED0104/2016. 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) 167 AND:

1. SRI. MARAPPA S/O LATE CHIKKANNA AGED ABOUT56YEARS2 SMT. BYRAMMA W/O MARAPPA AGED ABOUT51YEARS3 SRI. M. CHANDRASHEKAR S/O MARAPPA AGED ABOUT33YEARS4 SMT. MANGALAGOWRAMMA D/O MARAPPA AGED ABOUT31YEARS5 SRI. M. HANUMANTHA RAJU S/O MARAPPA AGED ABOUT29YEARS6 SRI. NARASIMHA MURTHY S/O LATE CHIKKANNA AGED ABOUT53YEARS7 SMT. VARALAKSHMI W/O NARASIMHA MURTHY AGED ABOUT48YEARS8 SRI. N. GANGARAJU S/O NARASIMHA MURTHY AGED ABOUT29YEARS9 SMT. N. ANNAPOORNA D/O NARASIMHA MURTHY AGED ABOUT25YEARS10 SMT. N. BHAGYALAKSHMI D/O NARASIMHA MURTHY AGED ABOUT23YEARS ALL ARE RESIDENTS OF GONGADIPURA VILLAGE168KODIGEHALLI 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 ABOUT34YEARS 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.15508- 517/2015 DATED0104/2016. 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. .APPELLANTS169(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 KENGERI - 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.55794/2014 DATED0404/2016. 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 ROAD170KUMARA 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 CHANDRASEKARAIAH S/O LATE K.R.SHIVARUDRAIAH AGED ABOUT62YEARS 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 ABOUT57YEARS12 . SPOORTHI K.C D/O LATE K.S. CHANDRASHEKAR AGED ABOUT28YEARS13 . SWATHI K.C. D/O LATE K.S. CHANDRASHEKAR AGED ABOUT27YEARS 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)) 171 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION2055716 DATED124/16 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 COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT37YEARS RESIDING AT NO.3871 VISHWESHWARAIAH 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) 172 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.46816/2014 DATED0203/2016. IN W.A. NO.2105 OF 2016 BETWEEN:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 BY ITS COMMISSIONER2 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 ABOUT37YEARS RESIDING AT No.3871 VISHWESHWARAIAH 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) 173 THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.46817/2014 DATED0403/2016. 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 ABOUT44YEARS2 SRI. B.M. ANJINAPPA S/O LATE MUNIVENKATAPPA AGED ABOUT42YEARS3 SRI. B.M. SRINIVAS S/O LATE MUNIVENKATAPPA AGED ABOUT40YEARS4 SRI. B.M. GALI ANJINAPPA174S/O LATE MUNIVENKATAPPA AGED ABOUT38YEARS5 SRI. MUNIYAPPA S/O LATE VENKATAPPA AGED ABOUT61YEARS ALL ARE R/AT HOSABYROHALLI SOOLIKERE POST KENGERI HOBLI BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 085 6. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT VIKASA SOUDHA BANGALORE-560 001 RESPONDENTS (BY SHRI. PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, AG ALONG WITH SHRI. JEEVAN J.

NEERALGI, AGA FOR R6; R1 TO R5 - SERVED) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.32054-58/2015 DATED2602.2016. IN W.A. NO.1798 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BY ITS COMMISSIONER, KUMARA PARK WEST, T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, BANGALORE-560 020. REP. BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER, 2 . THE LAND ACQUISITION, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, KUMARA PARK WERST, 175 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. RANGASHAMAIAH, AGED ABOUT73YEARS, 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION338992011 DATED117/14 AND ETC. IN W.A. NO.2245 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . THE BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD, * Retyped and Replaced vide Court Order dt. 22.08.2024 176 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER, KUMARA PARK WEST, BANGALORE-560 020. 2 . 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 MURUGESH V CHARATI, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS SECRETARY, URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, M S BUILDING DR AMBEDKAR VEEDHI BANGALORE01 2 . SMT JAYAMAMMA AGED ABOUT77YEARS D/O DODDAIAH W/O LATE K MYLARAPA3. SRI VENKATESH M S/O LATE K MYLARAPPA AGED ABOUT52YEARS, SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRs 3(a) ROOPASHREE W/O M VENKATESH AGED ABOUT50YEARS3b) DR RAKSHIT AGED ABOUT28YEARS * Retyped and Replaced vide Court Order dt. 22.08.2024 177 BOTH ARE RESIDING AT KODIGEHALLI, GOLLARAHATTI CROSS, MAGADI MAIN ROAD, VISHWANEEDAM POST BANGALORE56009 RESPONDENTS (BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R1 SRI K R KRISHNAMURTHY, ADVOCATE FOR R2, R3(A &B)) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.40110-112/2010 DATED117/14 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) * Retyped and Replaced vide Court Order dt. 22.08.2024 178 AND1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP. BY ITS SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VIKASA SOUDHA, DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI, BANGALORE. 2 . SRI KRISHNAMURTHY AGED ABOUT45YEARS, S/O LATE VENKATAPPA, RESIDENT OF NO.53/5, SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST, BANGALORE-560 091. 3 . SMT. THULASAMMA AGED ABOUT73YEARS, S/O LATE VENKATAPPA, RESIDENT OF NO.53/5, SKANDANAGAR, KODIGEHALLI POST, BANGALORE-560 091. 4 . SMT. SHIVAMMA, AGED ABOUT53YEARS, W/O LATE BETTASWAMY, R/AT NO.3, 8TH CROSS, KOTTIGEPALYA, MAGADI MAIN ROAD, BANGALORE-560 091. 5 . SMT. RATHNAMMA, AGED ABOUT49YEARS, W/O LATE CHIKKAHANUMANTHAIAH, R/AT KODIGEHALLI POST, BANGALORE-560 091. 6 . SRI N KRISHNAPPA, AGED ABOUT53YEARS, S/O LATE NARASAIAH, R/AT NO.35/5, 179 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.34413-423/2011 DATED117/14 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 ABOUT46YEARS, NO.8, 7TH MAIN, SHIVANAGAR, RAJAJINAGAR, BANGALORE-560 010. 180 2 . SRI. SYED ASHRAF S/O SRI. SYED UMAR SAHEB AGED ABOUT59YEARS, FLAT No.410, VIJAYA MANSIONS VIJAYANAGAR BANGALORE-560 040. BY HIS GPA HOLDER3. SRI. V. THIMMAIAH S/O SRI DODDA VENKATAPPA AGED ABOUT64YEARS, MAGADI MAIN ROAD, SUNKADAKATTE YESHWANTHPUR HOBLI, BANGALORE NORTH TALUK BANGALORE-560 010. 4 . SMT. DEEPA SALUNKI W/O SRI R.S. SALUNKI AGED ABOUT59YEARS, 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 ABOUT47YEARS, NO.8, 7TH MAIN SHIVANAGAR, RAJAJINAGAR BANGALORE-560 010. 5 . SMT. SUMATHI SADASHIVA W/O SRI SADASHIVA SALUNKI AGED ABOUT82YEARS, 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 ABOUT47YEARS, NO.8, 7TH MAIN SHIVANAGAR, RAJAJINAGAR, BANGALORE-560 010. 181 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 DTD177.2023, R1 & R3 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION No.14140- 14147/2010 DATED1107/2010 AND ETC. IN W.A. NO.2708 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY BY ITS COMMISSIONER KUMARA PARK WEST T CHOWDAIAH ROAD BANGALORE56002 2 . THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST

BANGALORE560020 ... APPELLANTS (BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR SRI K KRISHNA, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. . SR.UMESH S/O SRI CHANDRASHEKAR AGED ABOUT38YEARS182RESIDING AT NO.93 2ND FLOOR, 3RD MAIN ROAD3D CROSS, VINAYAKA LAYOUT3D STAGE, VIJAYANAGAR BANGALORE56004 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP BY ITS SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA BANGALORE560001 RESPONDENTS (BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.174/14 DATED257/14 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 OFFICER2. 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) 183 AND:

1. . SRI.P.S.KRISHNA MURTHY S/O SRI P V SURYANARAYANA RAO, AGED ABOUT51YEARS, 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.175/2014 DATED2507/2014 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. LAND184ACQUISITION 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 ABOUT54YEARS, 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3082/14 DATED257/14 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 OFFICER185BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST, BANGALORE-560020 REPRESENTED BY TIS ADDL. LAND ACQUSITION 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 ABOUT53YEARS, 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3083/2014 DATED2507/2014 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. 186 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 ABOUT60YEARS R/AT No.6/27, 14TH CROSS6H 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION30872014 DATED2507/2014 AND ETC. 187 IN W.A. NO.2817 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T CHOWDAIAH ROAD, K P WEST, BANGALORE. REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2. 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 DEAPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT M S BUILDING, BANGALORE-560001 2 . SMT. MUNIYAMMA AGED ABOUT61YEARS, W/O MUNINAGAPPA, R/AT134 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.58892/2013 DATED287/2014 AND ETC. 188 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 ABOUT57YEARS, 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 ABOUT45YEARS, NO.41, HARINIMITHA, IST BLOCK, JNANABHARATHI LAYOUT, R.V.POST, BEHIND SHRIKE APARTMENTS BANGALORE-560 059. 4

. SRI SHIVARATHNA KUMAR M.S. 189 W/O LATE SIDDARAJU, AGED ABOUT52YEARS, M.D.NO.60-61, NISCHALA NILAYA IST FLOOR6H MAIN, GNANAJYOTHINAGAR, MALLATHAHALLI BANGALORE-56. 5 . SMT.G.PADMA W/O T.M.NAGARAJA, AGED ABOUT59YEARS, NO.150, 6TH MAIN ROAD, AVALAHALLI BDA EXTN., BSK III STAGE, BANGALORE-560 085. 6 . SRI NAGARAJ S/O LATE KENCHAIAH, AGED ABOUT70YEARS, NO.316/1, NTB ROAD, KAMATH BUILDING, JANNA PURA BHADRAVATHI-577 301 SHIMOGA DISTRICT. 7 . SMT.K.UMAMAHESHWARI W/O K.KUMAR, AGED ABOUT58YEARS, NO.1, NEW NO.3767, DHEEMANDALA LAYOUT, SRINIDHI LAYOUT2D PHASE, M.S.PALYA ROAD, VIDYARANYAPURA, BANGALORE-560 097. 8 . SMT.G.S.SWARAJ LAKSHMI W/O G.M.SRIRAM AGED ABOUT25YEARS, NO.802, THEJAS NILAYA, 14TH MAIN ROAD, 13TH CROSS, BANGALORE-72. 9 . SMT.S.BABITHA D/O SATISH BABU, AGED ABOUT25YEARS, 190 NO.205/P. 1ST CROSS, SRIGURUNIVAS DEVASANDRA K.R.PURAM, BANGALORE. 10 . MEGHANA S D/O M.SURESH BABU, AGED ABOUT19YEARS, 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 ABOUT69YEARS, NO.651, TCH COLLEGE ROAD, 1ST MAIN MARATHALLY, BANGALORE-560 037. 12 . SMT.R.SUNITHA W/O H.G.DEVARATHAN, AGED ABOUT51YEARS, NO.77, RAMANJANEYA LAYOUT, NEAR "MURALI GAS", 3RD CROSS, MARATHALLY, BANGALORE-560 037. 13 . SMT.JAYAMMA W/O LATE RANGASWAMY, AGED ABOUT73YEARS, C/O K R GANGAJANAKA, NO.68, 80TH CROSS, KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT, BSK1T STAGE, BANGALORE-560 078. 14 . SMT.ANKAMMA W/O LATE RAMAKRISHNA, AGED ABOUT51YEARS, NO.8, 2ND FLOOR, 2ND B MAIN, JUGANAHALLI, NEAR MARAMMA TEMPLE, RAJAJINAGAR, BANGALORE-10. 15 . SRI KODANDARAM191S/O DASAPPA, AGED ABOUT43YEARS, NO.342, 3RD MAIN ROAD, 1ST CROSS, VIJAYANANADA NAGAR, BANGALORE-560 096. 16 . P.M.KHALIDH S/O P M IBRAHIM, AGED ABOUT44YEARS, NO.412, 14TH MAIN ROAD, M.C.LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR, BANGALORE-560 040. 17 . SRI PURUSHOTHAM S/O SUBRAMANI, AGED ABOUT36YEARS, 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 ABOUT55YEARS, R/AT NO.86, BHEL COLONY, NANDINI LAYOUT, BANGALORE-560 096. 19 . SMT.ANKAMMA W/O LATE RAMAKRISHNA, AGED ABOUT51YEARS, 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 ABOUT68YEARS, FLAT NO.207, BLOCK A SAKET PRANAM KAPRA, HYDERABAD-500062. 192 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 DTD177.2023, R5, R6, R8, R9, R10, R15, R16 AND R17 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.58873- 58891/2013 DATED0208/2014 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 ABOUT42YEARS, S/O SRI HUCHAGANGAIAH, R/AT NO.3, SY.NO.46/1, KODIGEHALLI VILLAGE, 193 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.12324/14 DATED257/14 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 ABOUT56YEARS, W/O DR. B M SHIVALINGAPPA, 194 R/AT NO.159, T/2, SAMPOORNA APARTMENTS, 8TH MAIN, BETWEEN7H AND8H CROSS, MALLESHWARAM, BANGALORE-560 003. RESPONDENTS (BY SRI VIKAS ROJIPURA, AGA FOR R1 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD159.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3134/2014 DATED2507/2014 AND ETC. IN W.A. No.3079 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, KUMARA PARK WEST, BANGALORE560020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, KUMARA PARK WEST, T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, BANGALORE560020 ... 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 ABOUT57YEARS, R/AT No.49, 3RD MAIN EKADANTA BADAVANE K. KRISHNA

SAGARA, KENGERI HOBLI, 195 BANGALORE-560 060. 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA, BANGALORE560001 RESPONDENTS (BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALAGI, AGA FOR R2 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.3111/2014 DATED2507/2014 AND ETC. IN W.A. No.3081 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION, BANGALORE56002 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, KUMARA PARK WEST, T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, BANGALORE56002 ... 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 ABOUT43YEARS, R/AT No.836, 17TH "F" MAIN ROAD, 5TH BLOCK, RAJAJINAGAR196BANGALORE-560 010. 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT VIDHANA SOUDHA, BANGALORE560001 RESPONDENTS (BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R2 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.185/2014 DATED2507/2014 AND ETC. IN W.A. No.3090 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, KUMARA PARK WEST EXTENSION, BANGALORE560020 REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, KUMARA PARK WEST, T.

CHOWDAIAH ROAD, BANGALORE560020 ... 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 ABOUT58YEARS R/AT NO.11,1ST BLOCK P.W.D QUARTERS197WILSON GARDEN BANGALORE560030 2 . THE STATE OF KARNATAKA BY ITS SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VIDHANA SOUDHA, BANGALORE560001 RESPONDENTS (BY SRI JEEVAN J NEERALGI, AGA FOR R1 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R2 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.178/2014 DATED2507/2014 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 SALAO2. 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 KARNATAKA198THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT M S BUILDINGS BANGALORE560001 2 . SRI MAHESH NAGAPPA ATHANI S/O NAGAPPA AGED ABOUT49YEARS R/AT NO.24, APMC YARD FLAT NAVANAGAR, BAGALKOT587101 3 . SRI BYATAPPA S/O CHANNINGE GOWDA AGED ABOUT50YEARS NO.417, 3RD STAGE12H MAIN ROAD MANJUNATHANAGAR BANGALORE56001 4 . SRI HONGALA ANILA BASAVARAJ S/O LATE BASAVARAJ NO.43/192, JEEVAN RELIANCE HOME6H CROSS, KIRLOSKAR COLONY BASAVESHWARANAGARA BANGALORE560079 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 DTD159.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED

U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.31607/2013 DATED68/2014 AND ETC. IN W.A. No.3165 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD199SANKEY 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 ABOUT53YEARS No.417, 3RD STAGE12H 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.31609/2013 DATED68/2014 AND ETC. IN W.A. No.3166 OF 2014 BETWEEN:

1. . THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY200SANKEY 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 ABOUT55YEARS No.43/192, JEEVAN RELIANCE HOME6H 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.31608/2013 DATED68/2014 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 AUTHORITY201KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 ... APPELLANTS (BY SRI B S SACHIN, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. . SRI K H LAKSHMANA GOWDA S/O SRI HUCHEGOWDA AGED ABOUT31YEARS R/AT No.67, MUNESWARA LAYOUT, KODIGEHALLI YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI BANGALORE-560 091 2 . SRI N SRINIVAS S/O P NARAYANA AGED ABOUT36YEARS R/AT No.17, POORNIMA NILAYA5H CROSS, DEFENCE COLONY H G ROAD, BANGALORE-73 3 . SRI CHAKRAPANI S/O LATE VENKATACHALAPATHY AGED ABOUT50YEARS R/AT No.304/B, 3RD MAIN MANJUNATH NAGAR BANGALORE-560 010 4 . SMT SHASHIKALA D/O SRI VENKATEGOWDA AGED ABOUT31YEARS R/AT No.42/3, 1ST CROSS RAGHAVANAGAR BANGALORE-560 026 5 . SRI NANJEGOWDA S/O SRI GENDEGOWDA AGED ABOUT65YEARS R/AT BYLADAKERE VILLAGE HEBBURU POST, THAGURU HOBLI MADDUR TALUK MANDYA DISTRICT-571 428 202 6 . SRI OMESHAIAH S/O SRI CHIKKAKARI GOWDA AGED ABOUT50YEARS R/AT No.137/B, BTS LAYOUT ULLAL MAIN ROAD BYADRAHALLY BANGALORE-560 091 7 . SMT PREMA W/O SRI A M MAHADEVAIH AGED ABOUT35YEARS R/AT No.787, NEAR GANESHA TEMPLE, KAMAKSHIPALYA BANGALORE-560 079 8 . SMT HEMA W/O LATE C KRISHNAPPA AGED ABOUT44YEARS R/OF KALENAHALLY VILLAGE/POST KOTHATHI HOBLI MANDYA DISTRICT-571 434 9 . SRI. MAHADEVAIAH S/O LATE CHIKKAKARIGOWDA, AGED ABOUT54YEARS, R/OF GOWDAGERE

VILLAGE /POST, MALUR HOBLI, CHANNAPATNA TLAUK, RAMANAGARA DISTRICT PIN:

562. 108. 10 . SRI. ASWATHANARAYANA S/O SRI VENKATAPPA AGED ABOUT41YEARS R/AT No.10/1, 1ST MAIN NEW GUDDADAHALLI, MYSORE ROAD, BANGALORE-560 026. 11 . SMT TEJASWINI.R. GOWDA W/O SRI. RUDREGOWDA AGED ABOUT31YEARS, R/AT NO.212 6TH MAIN G.K.W. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR203BANGALORE-560 040. 12 . SRI. P.H. LAKSHMINARASIMHA S/O P.S. HANUMANTHARAO AGED ABOUT47YEARS, R/AT No.195, RMV2D STAGE, NAGASHETTYHALLI BANGALORE-560 094. 13 . SRI. K.K. SADHANANDA S/O SRI LATE PALLANTE KARIGOWDA AGED ABOUT39YEARS, R/AT NO.133, 5TH MAIN, 7TH CROSS, NAGARABHAVI, MARUTHI NAGAR BANGALORE560072. 14 . SMT. SAVITHRI W/O K.K. SADHANANDA AGED ABOUT32YEARS, R/AT NO.133, 5TH MAIN, 7TH CROSS, NAGARABHAVI MARUTHI NAGAR BANGALORE560072. 15 . SMT. JAYAMMA W/O SRI. GOVINDAIAH AGED ABOUT53YEARS 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, 204 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 DTD177.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION2280722102/2012 DATED1107/2014 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 ABOUT48YEARS, 205 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 DTD159.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION251392015 DATED1703/2016 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 OFFICER2. 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) 206 AND:

1. . SMT M H MAMATHA W/O LATE M.N.HARINATH, AGED ABOUT48YEARS, 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 DTD159.2023) THIS WRIT

APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION250862015 DATED1603/2016 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 OFFICER2. THE ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE-560 020 REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDL. LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER207... 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 ABOUT48YEARS, 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 DTD159.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION251382015 DATED213/16 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 OFFICER2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, KUMARA PARK WEST, BANGALORE-560020. 208 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 ABOUT86YEARS, R/O SULIKERE BUNGALOW, RAMASANDRA DHAKLE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE-560060. SINCE DECEASED BY HIS LRs. 1(A) SMT GANGAMMA W/O LATE B R REVANNA AGED ABOUT85YEARS1B) SRI BASAVARAJ S/O LATE B R REVANNA AGED ABOUT65YEARS1C) SRI SHIVAKUMAR S/O LATE B R REVANNA AGED ABOUT46YEARS ALL ARE RESIDING AT R/O SULIKERE BUNGALOW, RAMASANDRA DHAKLE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE-560060. 2 . SRI. SHIVAKUMAR S/O B.R. REVANNA, AGED ABOUT40YEARS, R/O SULIKERE BUNGALOW, RAMASANDRA DHAKLE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE-560060. 209 3 . SRI. SHIVASHANKARAIAH S/O LATE SIDDALINGASWAMY, AGED ABOUT54YEARS, 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/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER

PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION338992011 DATED117/14 AND ETC. IN W.A. No.418 OF 2017 BETWEEN1. 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. 210 REPRESENTED BY ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER. ...APPELLANTS (BY SRI. G.S. KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SRI SACHIN B S., ADVOCATE) AND1. SMT. SHARADHA W/O

GANGA MALLESHAPPA, AGED ABOUT39YEARS, R/AT BETTANAPALYA, BHEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE-560 072. 2 . SRI.KRISHNEGOWDA S/O THAYAPPA @ LAKSHMINARASIMHAIAH, AGED ABOUT61YEARS, R/AT BETTANAPALYA, BHEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE, KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK, BANGALORE-560 072. RESPONDENTS (BY SRI R HEMANTH RAJ, ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE

ORDER
PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION45965966/2014 DATED234/2016. IN W.A. No.694 OF 2022 BETWEEN:

1. . THE COMMISSIONER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE56002 2 . THE ADDITIONAL SPECIAL211ACQUISITION OFFICER BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY KUMARA PARK WEST BANGALORE56002 ... APPELLANTS (BY SRI G S KANNUR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR SRI G LAKSMEESH RAO, ADVOCATE) AND:

1. . SRI NAGARAJU S/O KENDANNA AGED ABOUT56YEARS R/AT BEEMANAKUPPE VILLAGE KENGERI -2, HOBLI56006 BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT MULTISTORIED BUIDLING BANGALORE56000 RESPONDENTS (BY SRI VIKAS RAVIPURE, AGA FOR R2 SERVICE OF NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT V/O DATED159.2023) THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S4OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED

ORDER
OF THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE PASSED IN WP No-55793/2014 DATED2803.2016 AND THERE BY DISMISS THE WP IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND ETC. THESE APPEALS HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR

JUDGMENT

ON1512.2023, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, CHIEF JUSTICE, DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

212.

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 213 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:

214. Name of Name of Name of the Name of the Village Total extent the District Taluk Hobli Acre- Guntas Bangalore Bangalore Yeshwanthpur

1) Sheegehalli 99-38 North

2) Kannelli 413-13

3) Kodigehalli 453-25

4) Manganhalli 37-24 Bangalore Bangalore Kengeri

5) Kommaghatti 721-34 Urban South

6) Bheemanakuppe 833-25 7)Bheemanakuppe- 40-27 Ramasagara

8) Sulikere 318-14 9)Kenchanapura 250-38 10)Ramasandra 391-14

11) Kommaghatti- 154-12 Krishnasagara 12)Challaghatta 328-03 GRAND TOTAL404327 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:

215. 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, BESCOM 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:

216. 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. 217 (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. 218 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 219 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 220 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) 221 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 222 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 223 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 224 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?. 225 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:

226. (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:

227. (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 Commissioners 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 228 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:

229. (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. 230 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. 231

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:

232. 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 233 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 KAR608234 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 235 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 KAR318236 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) 237 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 238 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 239 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 & Ors4 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 240 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 SCC129241 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) 242 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 Karnataka8 it was further observed as follows:

7. (2018) 9 SCC1228 order dated 3.12.2020 passed in Misc. Application No.1614-1616/2019 243 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 244 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 245 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 Commissioner9 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 AIR1988 Kar 312 246 37.1. The Honble 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 247 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 SC1272. 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. . 248

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 Honble Supreme Court in the case of Roma Sonkar Vs. Madhya Pradesh State Public Service Commission and others10 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 SCC106249 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 or 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 Sonkar10 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 250 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 251 as well as the Honble 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) 252 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) 253 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 254 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 Ramaswamy6 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 255 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 256 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. 257

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 258 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 259 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 260 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 261 after acquisition of the land that the authority can seek permission for change of land use. The very fact than there is at 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. 262 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 263 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 264 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) 265 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 CE427As 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. 266 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 BDA267that 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, BDA5, 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 268 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 Honble Supreme Court in the case of Bondu Ramaswamy6 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 269 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 270 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:

271. 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 LA272Act wherein, the lands have been deleted from acquisition, the details of which are as follows: Sl. Date Sy. Extent Extent Village Name of the No.No.Acquired With- Kathedar A - G drawn 1 22.5.2010 8 99.21

2.00 Sulikere H.V.Subbakrishna (nursery land) 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:

273. 54.1 Order dated 2.4.2014 WP No.9097- 9100/2010 & 9103-9106/2010, which reads as follows:

ORDER

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. Sl.No.Sy.No.Extent Village 1 111 9 acres Ramasandra 2 116 1 Acre 30 guntas Ramasandra 3 115 27 guntas Ramasandra 4 75 2 acres 21 guntas Kommaghatta 5 76 03 guntas Kommaghatta 6 77/1 1 acre 19 guntas Kommaghatta 7 77/2B3acres 36 guntas Kommaghatta 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 Honble 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. 274

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.Gopalaswamy, 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 275 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.Gopalaswamy, 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 276 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.HUD478MNX86 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 277 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 Haryana11, 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 SCC621278 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 279 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 SCC248280 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 KAR160414 [1998 (6) SCC1 281 (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 282 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 Jharkhand16 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 Bengal17 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 SC96816 2022 SCC OnLine SC691283 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 284 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 Honble 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 285 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, BDA286shall 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 20x30' 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:- 287 (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 288 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. 289 (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. 290 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 Ramaswamy6 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 Sriramapura, BDA is directed to reconsider the objections to the acquisitions having regard to the fact that large areas were not initially notified 291 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); 292 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 293 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. Visweswaraiah 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 294 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 - 295 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. 296 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 Honble Supreme Court in Bondu Ramaswamy,6, the same was not

followed, which has resulted in this Court in the case of Sri K.P.Anjanappa11 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 KAR1794297 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 298 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:

299. 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) 300 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, 301 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 Honble 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 302 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 303 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 Gangaiah18 and Junjamma & Ors.,4 as noticed in para 63 hereinabove are merely two 304 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:

305.

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.UDD51MNX2010 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):

306. 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; 307 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 308 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 309 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. 310 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

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com