



CNR: KAHC010281132026

NC: 2026:KHC:47196
WP No. 12897 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 31ST DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 12897 OF 2026 (LA-RES)

BETWEEN:

B. RAMAIAH
S/O. LATE BEERAPPA
AGED ABOUT 102 YEARS
RESIDING AT BETTAKOTE VILLAGE,
CHANNARAYAPATTANA HOBLI,
DEVANAHALLI TALUK
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562165

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. G.A. SRIKANTE GOWDA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES
VIKASA SOUDHA
BENGALURU-560001
2. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
AND ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
DODDABALLAPURA SUB DIVISION
BENGALURU-560001

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. POOJA M. KOORSE, HIGH COURT GOVERNMENT PLEADER)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS AND
DIRECT 2ND RESPONDENT TO REFER THE ISSUE/CASE PAPER TO THE
CIVIL COURT UNDER SECTION 18 FOR DETERMINATION OF HIGHER

Digitally
signed by
HEMALATHA J
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



COMPENSATION AT THE EARLIEST AS DIRECTED BY THE LEARNED ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC IN LAC NO.02/2007 DATED 29.11.2022. (ANNEXURE- C) AS PER REPRESENTATIONS DATED 08.12.2022 AND 13.05.2025 (ANNEXURE-D AND E) AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has sought for a writ in the nature of mandamus to direct the respondent No.2 to refer his request under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for enhancement of compensation, as directed by the Additional Senior Civil Judge and JMFC in LAC No.2/2007 dated 29.11.2022, pursuant to his representations dated 08.12.2022 13.03.2025. He has sought for a direction to the official superiors of the respondent No.2 to take action as per the directions of the Court referred above and to direct the respondent No.2 to pay costs of litigation.

2. (i) The petitioner, a 102-year-old senior citizen, is before this Court seeking the aforementioned directions. He contends that he was the owner of land bearing Sy.No.88 of



CNR: KAHC010281132026

Bettakote Village, Channarayapatna Hobli, Devanahalli Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District measuring 03 acres 16 guntas. He contends that the respondents notified 28 guntas of land belonging to him for acquisition. However, the respondents unlawfully took possession of 29 guntas for the purpose of forming an alternate road to the international airport at Devanahalli from Bettakote Village. He contends that in respect of acquisition proceedings, the respondent No.2, instead of taking steps to determine the award as provided under Sections 9 and 10 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 determined a paltry compensation of Rs.4,17,500/- in respect of 29 guntas of land.

(ii) The petitioner submits that he has enclosed the land in question by stone slabs and pillars. The value of the stone slabs and pillars itself is about Rs.1,50,000/-, apart from a sum of Rs.40,000/- spent towards labour charges. He contends that at the time of taking possession of the land, the respondents damaged the pillars and stone slabs. He contends that the market value of the land in question is more than Rs.25,00,000/- per acre and, hence, for the 29 guntas of land



belonging to him, he is entitled to compensation of Rs.18,50,000/-. He contends that the respondents issued a notice dated 05.04.2005 to receive the compensation, which was replied by him on 23.05.2005 contending that the compensation determined was inadequate. He therefore submitted representations dated 11.07.2005 and 17.10.2005, requesting the respondent No.2 to refer the dispute to the Civil Court under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. However, since the respondent No.2 failed to do so, the petitioner filed W.P. No.14602/2006. However, this court after noticing Section 18(3)(B) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 directed the petitioner to move a petition before the Civil Court. Accordingly the petitioner filed a petition before the Civil Judge Senior Division at Devanahalli in LAC No.2/2007.

(iii) He contends that the respondent No.2 remained absent even after the notice of the proceedings was served. After considering the case and recording the evidence of the petitioner, the petition filed in LAC No.2/2007 was allowed in terms of an order dated 29.11.2022 and a direction was issued



to the respondent No.2 to refer the dispute under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 within 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the said order.

(iv) He contends that the petitioner then submitted representations dated 08.12.2022 and 13.03.2025 along with the copy of the order passed by the Additional Senior Civil Judge and JMFC, Devanahalli. He contends that even after receipt of the representations the respondent No.2 did not take any steps. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court seeking for a direction to respondent No.2 to refer the dispute under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

3. The learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 and 2 submitted that in view of the order passed by the Additional Senior Civil Judge and JMFC, Devanahalli, in LAC No.2/2007, respondent No.2 would take necessary steps to refer the dispute under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

4. The acquisition in question was concluded by a notification dated 21.01.2004. The petitioner issued a reply to



the award on 23.05.2005 itself and had followed it up by giving representations dated 11.07.2005 and 17.10.2005 bringing to the notice of the respondent No.2 that the compensation determined was inadequate and requested the respondent No.2 to refer the dispute to the Civil Court. Thereafter, the petitioner approached the reference Court in LAC No.2/2007 under Section 18(3)(b) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 which was disposed of on 29.11.2022. The petitioner brought to the notice of the respondent No.2, the order passed by the Additional Senior Civil Judge and JMFC, Devanahalli in LAC No.2/2007 by filing a representation on 08.12.2022. The respondent No.2 appears to have not taken any steps to refer the dispute. This therefore shows the apparent negligence on the part of the respondent No.2 in not complying with the statutory duty prescribed under the Land Acquisition Act and also the order passed by the Additional Senior Civil Judge and JMFC, Devanahalli.

5. In that view of the matter, the respondent No.2 is liable to be hauled up for playing around with the life of the petitioner so despicably. Hence, the petition is ***allowed***. The



NC: 2026:KHC:47196
WP No. 12897 of 2026

respondent No.2 is directed to refer the dispute under Section 18(3)(b) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

6. In addition, respondent No.2 shall pay compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- to the petitioner for harassing him in not considering his just request for referring the dispute under Section 18(3)(b) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 from the year 2005 till date. The compensation shall be paid within a period of 01 month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, failing which, the drawing officer of the respondent No.2 shall deduct a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- from the salary of the officer responsible for the delay and who was in office when the petitioner gave his representation dated 08.12.2022 along with a copy of the order passed in LAC No.2/2007.

7. List this petition for compliance on 23.11.2026.

Sd/-
(R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE

HJ
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 24