KABG010083182018

Presented on	03.09.2018
Registered on	04.09.2018
Decided on	11.06.2026
Duration	7 years 9 months 6 days

IN THE COURT OF I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE AND LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT AUTHORITY, BELAGAVI

Present :
Sri SUBHASH SANKAD,
B.A., LL.M
I Additional District Judge, Belagavi.

Dated: This the 11th day of June, 2026

L.A.C. No.626/2018

Petitioners:-

1. Sri Suresh Bapu Awatade,
Age: 45 Yrs, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o. Athani,
Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi.

2. Sri Aravind Bapu Awatade,
Age: 42 Yrs, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o. Athani,
Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi.

3. Sri Premaram Kangaraji @ Kangaram Solanki,
Age: 45 Yrs, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o. Athani,
Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi.

(R/by Sri C.B.P. Adv)

//Vs//

SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD

Digitally signed by SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD
Date: 2026.06.11 16:47:26 +0530

RESPONDENTS:- 1. The Special Land Acquisition Officer, Hipparagi Project, Athani,

2. The Karnataka Niravari Nigam Ltd. Athani

3. The State of Karnataka R/by Deputy Commissioner, Belagavi

(R-1 & 3:-R/by DGP)
(R-2:-R/by Sri SNG Adv.)

Meta Data

Sl. No.	**Particulars**	**Details**
1	Act under which the acquisition is made	The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013
2	Nature of project	Hipparagi Barrage Project
3	Purpose of acquisition	Formation of canal under Karimasuti Lift Irrigation Project
4	Beneficiary of acquisition	Karnataka Niravari Nigam Limited., Hipparagi Barrage Project, Athani
5	Acquisition file No.	LAQ.SR. No.540/2011-2012
6	Date of social impact report	Not applicable
7	Date of preliminary notification (Gazette Publication)	14.07.2011
8	Date of final notification (Gazette Publication)	14.02.2013
9	Date of possession/Date of	04.05.2016

	award	
10	Location of property (District/Taluk/Village)	Athani Village, Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi
11	Survey number	Sy.No.2106/5
12	Extent of land acres/ guntas/ sq.meters / sq.feet	8 guntas of dry land
13	Market value awarded by acquiring authority (per acre/Gunta/Sq.Mtr/ Sq. Ft) with factor	Rs.90,780/- per acre
14	Market value awarded by Reference Court/Authority (Per Acre/Gunta/ Sq.mtr.,/Sq.Ft.,) with factor	Rs.7,07,400/-per acre Factor- 1.5
15	Market value awarded by appellate court (Per Acre/Gunta/Sq.Mtr/ Sq. Ft) with factor, if applicable	-
16	Date of filing reference	06.02.2017
17	Date on which issues were framed	--
18	Date on which evidence commenced and concluded	Commenced on 28.03.2026 Concluded on 03.06.2026
19	Date of disposal	11.06.2026
20	Amount awarded by Reference Court	Rs.7,07,400/- per acre
21	Amount awarded by appellate court (if applicable)	--
22	Compensation amount already paid by the SLAO to the claimant/s	Rs.61,004.16 paise

JUDGMENT(AWARD)

The Special Land Acquisition Officer, Hipparagi Barrage Project, Athani has made this reference under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation & Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred as 'Act' for short), on the application made by the Petitioners for re-determination of compensation in award bearing No.LAQ/JSR-540/2011-12, dated: 04.05.2016.

2. The brief facts of the case are as under:

The Petitioners are owners of the acquired land bearing Sy.No.2106/5 measuring to the extent of 8 Guntas situated at Athani. The said land has been acquired by the respondents for the purpose of Karimasuti Lift Irrigation Project. The respondent No.1 has passed the award, determining the compensation at Rs.90,780/- per acre. Being dissatisfied with the quantum of compensation awarded by the respondent No.1, the land owners have submitted application before respondent No.1 under section 64 of the Act, seeking reference to this Authority for re-determination of the compensation. Accordingly, the present reference is made by the respondent No.1 for re-determination of the compensation.

3. The notice on the reference was caused on the applicants and the respondent as required under Section 66 of the Act. Upon service of notice, the applicants have appeared through their counsel. The respondent No.1 and 3 have appeared through DGP and the respondent No.2 is represented by the panel advocate. The respondent No.1 and 2 have filed separate objections.

4. The Petitioners have contended that while determining the compensation, the respondents have not given proper opportunity of hearing. The respondents have awarded meager compensation to the acquired land without any basis. The Petitioners have further contended that they were growing various commercial crops in the acquired land. Due to acquisition of the land by the respondent Authorities, they have suffered huge loss. The acquired land is fertile irrigated land, without considering the fertility and income generated from the said land, the respondents have awarded meager compensation.

With these contentions, the Petitioners have prayed to enhance the compensation as prayed in the reference petition.

5. The respondent No.1 has stated in the objection that the application for reference filed under section 64 (1) and (2) of the Act is barred by limitation. Hence, the same is not maintainable. It is further contended that while passing the award, the respondent No.1 has followed all the procedures under the Act and conducted the inquiry properly. By considering all the materials arrived at proper conclusion and awarded the compensation as per the provisions of the Act. The respondent No.1 has given notice to the owners before passing the award. Before passing the award, he has not put-forth his claim before the respondent No.1. Therefore, the Petitioners have no *locus standi* to file this application for enhancement of the compensation on any grounds. The respondent No.1 has further contended that while passing the award, the respondent No.1 has considered the sales statistics in the nearby vicinity area for the relevant period. Absolutely, there is no illegality in the amount of compensation fixed by the respondent No.1. With these objections, he has prayed to dismiss the petition.

6. The respondent No.2 has also contended that application for reference is not filed within prescribed time limit. Hence, the same deserves to be dismissed as time barred. It is further stated that the Petitioners have not received compensation amount under protest. The respondent No.2 has further denied the contentions of the Petitioners in the reference petition regarding the compensation awarded is on lower side and the respondent No.1 has not given opportunity to the Petitioners. The respondent No.2 has further contended that the respondent No.1 after complying all the formalities prescribed under the Act and also considering the soil, fertility and locality, proximity of the village has awarded the compensation. The compensation awarded by the respondent No.1 is just and proper. As such, no interference is required by this authority. With these submissions, the respondent-2 has prayed to dismiss the petition as time barred.

7. To support their claim, the Petitioners examined Petitioner No.1 as PW-1 and produced documents as per Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.7. The respondents have not adduced oral evidence.

However, they have got marked two documents as Ex.R.1 and R.2 with consent of Petitioners' counsel.

8. Heard both sides.

9. In view of the contentions raised in the reference petition & objections, the following points arise for consideration:-

Point No.1:-	Whether Petitioners have not made the application seeking reference before the respondent No.1 within time limit?
Point No.2:-	Whether the reference made by the respondent No.1-the Special Land Acquisition Officer is time barred?
Point No.3:-	Whether Petitioners prove that the respondent while passing the award has not determined the proper market value for the acquired land and not awarded the fair compensation?
Point No.4:-	Whether Petitioners have made out reasonable grounds for enhancement of the compensation and consequently the reference petition filed by the Petitioners deserves to be allowed?
Point No.5:-	What Order?

10. The Petitioners have produced the documents as per Ex.P1 to Ex.P7. Ex.P.1 is the reference application, Ex.P.2 is the certified copy of sale deed dated 15.07.2011 of Kasaba Athani,

Ex.P.3 is the Certified copy of sale deed dated 19.04.2011 of Kasaba Athani, Ex.P.4 is the Certified copy of sale deed dated 08.05.2012 of Kasaba Athani, Ex.P.5 is the Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 14.07.2010 of Athani, Ex.P.6 Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 03.12.2010 of Athani, Ex.P.7 is the Certified copy of judgment and award in LAC No.650/2018.

11. My answer to the above points are as under:

Point No.1:- In the Negative

Point No.2:- In the Negative

Point No.3:- In the Affirmative

Point No.4:- Partly in the Affirmative

Point No.5:- As per the final order, for the following:

REASONS

12. **Point No.1 and 2:-** Since these points required common discussion to avoid repetition of discussion, these points are taken for common consideration.

13. Respondent Nos.1 and 2 have stated in their objections that the application seeking reference filed by the Petitioners are not within time and the same is time barred. The suggestions in this regard was also put to PW-1 by the counsel for

respondents. PW-1 has denied the said suggestions and he has stated that he has filed Reference petition in time.

14. As per section 64(1) of the Act, the aggrieved person must make an application seeking reference to the Authority within 6 weeks from the date of the award, if the person making the application was present or represented before the Collector at the time when the award is made by him. In other cases within 6 weeks from the date of service of notice under section 21, or within 6 months from the date of the Collector's award which period shall first expire. There is no materials on record to show that the Petitioners have participated in the award proceedings. Hence, the 2nd clause i.e., within 6 weeks from the date of service of notice has to be taken into account to decide the limitation point. In the present case, as per the schedule prepared under section 64(1) and (2) of the Act, which form the part of the award, the notice which is issued after passing the award was served on the Petitioners on 05.01.2017, whereas the Petitioners have filed the reference on 06.02.2017. The reference petition is filed within 6 weeks from the date of service of notice. Therefore, there is no delay on the part of the Petitioners in making application for

reference to the respondent No.1. Accordingly, point No.1 is answered in the Negative.

15. The respondent No.2 has further contended that, the SLAO has to send the reference to the Authority within 30 days from the date of receipt of the application. In the event, if he fails to make reference to this Authority, Petitioners shall make an application before this Authority, as per the 2nd proviso to Section 64(1) of the Act seeking direction to respondent No.1 to send the reference to this Authority. In the present case, neither the respondent No.1 has sent the reference to this Authority within 30 days nor the Petitioners have filed application before this Authority under section 64(1) of the Act seeking direction to the respondent No.1 to send the reference. Hence, reference petition is beyond limitation.

16. In view of the aforementioned contentions, it is necessary to refer section 64 of the Act. The 1st proviso to section 64(1) of the Act casts duty on the Collector/SLAO to make reference to the Authority within 30 days. Further, 2nd proviso provides that, if the Collector fails to make such reference within the period so specified, the applicant may apply to the Authority,

as the case may be, requesting it to direct the Collector to make the reference to it within a period of thirty days. The 1st and 2nd proviso to section 64(1) corresponds to sub-section (3) clause (a) and (b) to section 18 of the L. A. Act 1894. Section 18(3)(a) casts the same duty on the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference within 90 days. In the event, the Deputy Commissioner fails to make the reference, the applicant may make application to the Court requesting the court to direct the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference. This provision further provides that the court may direct the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference within such time as the court may fix. Though 90 days limitation was fixed for Deputy Commissioner to make the reference to the court under section 18(3)(a) of the old Act, no time limit was fixed under clause (b) to section 18(3). The discretion was left with the court to fix the date for reference to be made by the Deputy Commissioner. However, 2nd proviso to section 64(1) of the Act provides that the Petitioners may directly apply to the Authority, as the case may be, requesting it to direct the Collector to make the reference to it within a period of thirty days. In the case on hand, the Petitioners have made the application before the SLAO seeking for reference on 06.02.2017 and SLAO has forwarded the same to this Authority on 29.08.2018.

17. At this juncture, I feel it appropriate to refer judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Karnataka Vs Laxuman** reported in **(2005) 8 Supreme Court Cases 709**. In this case, while considering identical provision under section 18(3) of L.A. Act (as in force in the State of Karnataka) which is in *pari materia* with the 1st and 2nd proviso to section 64 of the act, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that object of providing time of 90 days to Deputy Commissioner to make reference was to prevent undue delay in making highly belated references, sometimes based on applications clandestinely received. It is further held that since no time limit for applying to the court is fixed by the statute since the application is to the court, under a special enactment, Article 137 of the Limitation Act, 1963, which is residuary article would apply. It is therefore held that such application has to be made within three years of the application for making a reference or the expiry of 90 days after such application. The Hon'ble Apex Court has specifically held that,

having made an application for reference within time before the Deputy Commissioner, the Petitioners may loose his right by not enforcing the right available to him within the time prescribed by law. In the circumstances of the case, Hon'ble Apex Court has held that right of the Deputy Commissioner to make the reference on the application of the Petitioners stands extinguished and right of the Petitioners to move the Court for compelling a reference also stands extinguished on the expiry of 3 years and 90 days from the date of application for reference.

18. If the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court is applied to the case on hand, it is clear that SLAO shall make reference to this Authority within a period of 3 years from the date of application or expiry of 30 days thereafter.

19. In the present case, the reference petition was received on 29.08.2018 whereas the application for reference was made before the SLAO on 06.02.2017. The same is within 3 years. Hence, the reference made by the SLAO is not time barred. In the result point No.2 is answered in the Negative.

20. **Point No.3 and 4:-** Since these points required common discussion, to avoid repetition of discussion these points are taken for common consideration.

21. First contention with regard to enhancement of compensation raised by the respondent No.1 is that the Petitioners have not raised objection before the respondent No.1 by producing necessary documents showing actual sale price. Hence, he has no *locus standi* to claim enhancement of compensation. The contention does not have any force because only because soon after passing the award or before passing the award, the Petitioners have not made any request for re-consideration or re-determination of compensation, that itself will not take away the right of the Petitioners for seeking enhancement of compensation. Further, section 64(1) of the Act confers the right on the land looser to make application before Collector to refer the reference to the Authority for re-determination of the compensation. This is a statutory right conferred by the Act on the land looser. The same cannot be denied only because the land looser has not made any request before the Collector. Therefore, it is held that there is no force in

the contention of the respondents that Petitioners have no *locus-standi* for claiming any enhancement of compensation.

22. The respondent No.1 has taken into account the average sale price of the land situated in Athani village for the reason that the acquired land is situated at Athani village. During the course of oral arguments, the Learned DGP appearing for respondent No.1 and the learned counsel for the respondent No.2 have submitted that while passing the award, the respondent No.1 has taken into account the average sale price of similar type of land of Athani village considering the sale deeds of the same village registered within preceding 3 years. The contention of Petitioners is that the respondent No.1 has not considered the sale deed in which the highest sale price is mentioned. In view of these submission the documents on record are considered.

23. The Petitioners have produced sale deeds of Kasaba Athani village as per Ex.P.2 to Ex.P.4, agreement to sell as per Ex.P.5 and Ex.P.6. When the sale deeds are available it is not necessary to take into account agreement to sell. Hence, it is only the sale deeds as per Ex.P.2 to Ex.P.4 are considered for determination of average sale price. Further, Ex.P.2 sale deed of

Kasaba Athani is dated 15.07.2011, Ex.P.3 sale deed of Kasaba Athani is dated 19.04.2011 and Ex.P.4 sale deed of Kasaba Athani is dated 08.05.2012. Though Ex.P.4 the sale deed of Kasaba Athani is registered on 08.05.2012, which is subsequent to the date of notification, but the sale transaction is dated 08.06.2011 which is prior to the date of notification. Hence, all these transaction in these sale deeds fall within preceding 3 years from the date of notification. Hence, they are taken into account for determination of average sale price.

24. The extent of land sold under Ex.P.2 is 14 guntas for sale consideration of Rs.4,74,000/-. The extent of land sold under Ex.P.3 is 18 guntas for sale consideration of Rs.12,42,000/-. The extent of land sold under Ex.P.4 is 2 acres 38 guntas i.e. 118 guntas for sale consideration of Rs.30,00,000/-.

25. The total extent of land sold under Ex.P.2 to Ex.P.4 is 150 guntas and total sale consideration of these three sale deeds is Rs.47,16,000/-. The average sale price per gunta will be Rs.31,440/-(Rs.47,16,000/150 guntas) Same will be Rs.12,57,600/- per acre (Rs.31,440 × 40).

26. Ex.P.2 and Ex.P.3 convey small extent of lands. At this juncture it is appropriate to refer the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the the case of **Tarlok Singh Vs State of Haryana and others** reported in **(2020) 20 Supreme Court Cases 572**. In this case, the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana had rejected Ex.P.8 to Ex.P.10 for the reason that they belong to small pieces of land and therefore, do not represent the correct market value of acquired land. In an appeal, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that view taken by High Court of Punjab and Haryana in rejecting Ex.P.8 to Ex.P.10 while determining the market value of acquired land was erroneous. However, the Hon'ble Apex Court has specifically observed that there is substance in the view taken by the Hon'ble High Court since Ex.P.8 to Ex.P.10 relates to small pieces of land and they do not represent the correct market value of acquired land. Though the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that action of Hon'ble High Court in rejecting these exhibits is erroneous, but has upheld the observation made by the High Court small pieces of land do not represent the correct market value. It is appropriate to extract the observation of Hon'ble Apex Court which is as below:-

> "7. We, therefore, find that the second ground on which the High Court rejected Exts.P.8 to P-10 while determining the market value of the acquired land was erroneous. However, there is substance in the view taken by the High Court that since Exts.P.8 to P.10 relate to small pieces of land and therefore, do not represent the correct market value of the acquired land. But what extent Exts.P.8 to P.10 are relevant for determining the market value of acquired land, it is for the court of fact to decide."

27. In the light of the aforementioned judgment and in the circumstances of the present case, it is necessary to mention here that the extent of land sold under Ex.P.3 and Ex.P.2 are small i.e. 18 guntas, 14 guntas. It is further appropriate to observe here that whenever small extent of lands are purchased, same cannot be for the purpose of agriculture. Though it is clearly mentioned in these sale deeds that these pieces of land are going to be used for agriculture, it is practically impossible to believe that these small pieces of land measuring 18 guntas and 14 guntas can be used for the purpose of agriculture. They cannot be actually used for cultivation. In that view, it is not appropriate to consider the sale prices of these lands to determine the average sale price. Therefore, as it is held by

Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforementioned judgment that to what extent the small piece of land are relevant for determining the market value has to be decided by this court. It is appropriate to adopt some method of deduction in order to arrive as proper market value of this acquired land.

28. Looking to the extent of lands sold under Ex.P.2 and Ex.P.3, in my considered opinion, it is appropriate to deduct 25% of the average sale price of these sale deeds as well as Ex.P.4. As discussed supra, the average sale price per gunta will be Rs.31,440/- (Rs.47,16,000/150 guntas) same will be Rs.12,57,600/- per acre (Rs.31440 × 40). 25% of sale price is Rs.3,14,400/-. If same is deducted out of Rs.12,57,600/-, it comes to Rs.9,43,200/-.

29. The land sold under Ex.P.2 to 4 are wet lands. The re-determined market value of Rs.9,43,200/- is of wet land. However, the acquired land in the present case is dry land. It is common understanding that the sale price of the wet land cannot be equated with the sale price of the dry land. However, this grievance can be meted out by again adopting same method of deduction to make the average sale price reasonable to the dry

lands. It is settled principle of law whenever the market value of the acquired lands is determined the market value of the wet land will be one and half to that of market value of dry land. In that background, it is necessary to deduct 25% of the sale price out of the average sale price determined for wet lands.

30. The re-determined market value of acquired wet land is Rs.9,43,200/-. 25% of Rs.9,43,200/- is Rs.2,35,800/-. After deduction the amount will come at Rs.7,07,400/-(Rs.9,43,200-Rs.2,35,800/-). The same is rounded off to Rs.7,07,400/-. This appears to be reasonable market value for the acquired dry land situated at Athani Town. Thus the market value of acquired dry land in the present case is re-determined at Rs.7,07,400/- per acre.

31. The acquired land is situated at the limits of Athani Taluk which is a town. It is stated in Ex.R.2 the award that the acquired land is situated at the distance of 5 kms from Athani Town, as per Karnataka Government Notification No.R.D.58/LA/2014 dated 03.05.2014. Hence the factor is taken at 1.5. Even the Petitioners have also contended that acquired land is situated in the limits of Athani Town and the Petitioners have

relied upon sale deeds of Kasaba Athani and the market value is re-determined by considering the same sale deeds. Under such circumstances, the Factor is taken at 1.5 as per Schedule- I of the Act. Further, the Petitioners are also entitled for 100% solatium as per Section 30(1) and Schedule-1 of the Act. Further, the Petitioners are also entitled for additional market value @ 12% per annum on the market value from the date of publication of the notification of the Social Impact Assessment Study till the date of award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier, under section 30(3) of the Act. In the case on hand, there is no evidence on record to show the specific date of taking possession. Hence, the date of the award is considered to calculate the 12% Additional Market Value. Therefore, the Petitioners are entitled for 12% additional market value on the market value from 14.07.2011 to 04.05.2016 as per section 30(3) of the Act.

32. Further, the Petitioners are also entitled for interest @ 9% per annum for a period of one year, on the excess compensation from the date of taking possession. Thereafter,

interest @ 15% per annum till deposit of the amount as per Section 72 of the Act.

33. Though, the respondent No.1 has stated in the Award that, he has considered the sale deeds of Athani, registered within preceding 3 years from the date of notification and taken into account 50% of the sale deeds wherein highest sale price is mentioned, he has failed to award fair compensation. The Petitioners have claimed enhancement of compensation to the extent of Rs.50,00,000/- per acre with statutory benefits. However, by reconsidering the material available on record, the market value of the acquired land is re-determined at Rs.7,07,400/- per acre. In the result, petition deserves to be allowed in part. Accordingly, Point No.3 is answered in the affirmative and Point No.4 is answered partly in the affirmative.

34. **Point No.5:-** In view of reasons on Point Nos.1 to 4, I pass the following:

ORDER

The reference petition filed under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement

Act, 2013 by the Petitioners is hereby partly allowed with costs.

The market value in respect of the acquired land bearing Sy.No.2106/5 measuring to the extent of 8 Guntas situated at Athani village is re-determined at Rs.7,07,400/- per acre.

The acquired land is situated within the Town limits of Athani, hence, the market value shall be multiplied by Factor-1.5 as per Schedule-I of the Act. Further, the Petitioners are entitled for 100% solatium as per Section 30(1) and Schedule-I of the Act.

The Petitioners are entitled for additional market value @ 12% per annum on the market value from the date of publication of the notification of the Social Impact Assessment Studies till the date of the award i.e from 14.07.2011 to 04.05.2016 as per Section 30(3) of the Act.

Further, the Petitioners are also entitled for interest @ 9% per annum on excess compensation for a period of one year from the date of dispossession i.e from 04.05.2016 and thereafter, @ 15% per annum for the subsequent period till the date of deposit of enhanced compensation as per Section 72 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

The Petitioners are entitled for enhancement of compensation in the above terms.

The amount, if any, already paid to the Petitioners, shall be deducted in the total compensation.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Grade-III directly on the computer, then corrected by me and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this 11th day of June-2026)

SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD Digitally signed by SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD Date: 2026.06.11 16:47:45 +0530

(SUBHASH SANKAD)
I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE
& LAND ACQUISITION,
REHABILITATION & RESETTLEMENT
AUTHORITY, BELAGAVI

ANNEXURE

List of Witness examined on behalf of Petitioners:

PW-1 :- Sri Suresh Bapu Awatade, R/o. Athani, Tal. Athani, Dist. Belagavi.

List of Documents marked on behalf of Petitioners:

Ex.P. 1 :- Reference application
Ex.P. 2 :- Certified copy of sale deed dated 15.7.2011 of Kasaba Athani

Ex.P. 3	:-	Certified copy of sale deed dated 19.4.2011 of Kasaba Athani
Ex.P. 4	:-	Certified copy of sale deed dated 08.5.2012 of Kasaba Athani
Ex.P. 5	:-	Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 14.07.2010 of Athani
Ex.P. 6	:-	Certified copy of agreement to sell dated 03.12.2010 of Athani
Ex.P. 7	:-	Certified copy of judgment and award in LAC No.650/2018

List of Witnesses examined on behalf of Respondents:-

-Nil-

List of Documents marked on behalf of Respondents:-

Ex.R.1 Notice
Ex.R.2 Award

SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD

Digitally signed by SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD
Date: 2026.06.11 16:47:36 +0530

(SUBHASH SANKAD)
I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE
& LAND ACQUISITION,
REHABILITATION & RESETTLEMENT
AUTHORITY, BELAGAVI