KABG010102172019

Presented on: 17.09.2019
Registered on: 17.09.2019
Decided on: 27.07.2026
Duration:6 years 10 months 9 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 27th day of July, 2026

L.A.C. No.841/2019

Petitioners:

1. Shivalingappa Venkappa Dalawai, since deceased by his Legal Heirs

1A. Smt.Dundavva Shivalingappa Dalawai, Age:76 Yrs, occ. Household work, R/o.Koujalagi, Tal Gokak, Dist Belagavi.

1B. Sri Ashok S/o.Shivalingappa Dalawai, Age:57 Yrs, Occ.Agriculture, R/o.Koujalagi, Tal Gokak, Dist Belagavi.

1C. Smt.Shakuntala W/o.Mahadev Kotennavar, Age:51 Yrs, Occ.Household work, R/o.Koujalagi, Tal Gokak, Dist Belagavi

1D. Smt.Laxmi Hanamant Waderatti, Age: 51 Yrs, Occ. Household work, R/o.1st Cross, Vivekanand Nagar, Tal Gokak, Dist Belagavi

1E. Smt.Vankavva W/o.Hanamant Amani, Age:44 Yrs, Occ.Household work, R/o.Sunadoli, Tal Mudalagi, Dist Belagavi.

1F. Sri Shivanand Shivalingappa Dalawai, Age:43 Yrs, Occ:Agriculture, R/o.Koujalagi, Tal Gokak, Dist Belagavi

(R/by Sri R.V.N. Adv)

SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD

Digitally signed by SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD
Date: 2026.07.27 16:48:14 +0530

//Vs//

RESPONDENTS:

1. The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
   Hidkal Dam
2. The Executive Engineer,
   (K.N.N.L. Div No.5, Koujalagi)

   (R-1:- R/by DGP)

   (R-2:- R/by Sri M.I.P. Adv.)

Meta Data

(The following Meta Data is entered as per the order passed by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Kalaburagi Bench in MFA No.202752/2023 dated 12.03.2026)

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	Rameshwar Lift Irrigation Project
3	Purpose of acquisition	Formation of Venkatapura Main canal under Rameshwar Lift Irrigation Scheme
4	Beneficiary of acquisition	The Executive Engineer, KNNL Div No.5, Koujalagi, Tal Gokak (Karnataka Niravari Nigam Niyamit)
5	Acquisition file No.	LAQ.SR. No.7/12-13
6	Date of social impact report	Not applicable
7	Date of preliminary notification (Gazette Publication)	24.05.2012

8	Date of final notification (Gazette Publication)	30.01.2014
9	Date of possession/Date of award	28.04.2015
10	Location of property (District/Taluk/Village)	Kulgod Village, Tal. Hukkeri, Dist. Belagavi
11	Survey number	Sy.No.396
12	Extent of land acres/ guntas/ sq.meters / sq.feet	14 guntas
13	Market value awarded by acquiring authority (per acre/Gunta/Sq.Mtr/ Sq. Ft) with factor	Rs.1,93,600/- per acre Factor-2
14	Market value awarded by Reference Court/Authority (Per Acre/Gunta/ Sq.mtr.,/Sq.Ft.,) with factor	Rs.7,93,300/- per acre Factor-2
15	Market value awarded by appellate court (Per Acre/Gunta/Sq.Mtr/ Sq. Ft) with factor, if applicable	-
16	Date of filing reference	23.11.2015
17	Date on which issues were framed	--
18	Date on which evidence commenced and concluded	Commenced on 18.07.2026 Concluded on 18.07.2026
19	Date of disposal	27.07.2026
20	Amount awarded by Reference Court	Rs.7,93,300/- per acre
21	Amount awarded by appellate court (if applicable)	--
22	Compensation amount already paid by the SLAO to the claimant/s	Rs.2,88,416/-

JUDGMENT

The Special Land Acquisition Officer, Hidkal Dam, Tal Hukkeri, 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.07/2012-13 dated 28.04.2015, for enhancement of compensation.

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

The Petitioners are owners of acquired land bearing Sy.No.396 measuring to the extent of 14 guntas situated at Kulgod village. The said land has been acquired by the respondents for the purpose of construction of Rameshwar Lift Irrigation Project. The respondent No.1 has passed the award. Being dissatisfied with the quantum of compensation awarded by the respondent No.1, the land owners have submitted the 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 respondents as required under Section 66 of the Act. Upon service of the notice, the applicants have appeared through their counsel. The respondent No.1 has appeared through DGP and the respondent No.2 is represented by the panel advocate. Respondent No.1 and 2 have filed separate objections.

4. The Petitioners have contended that while determining the compensation, the respondents have not given an 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 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 his objection that the 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 owner 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 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 is deserves to be dismissed as time barred. It is further stated that the Petitioners have not received the 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 them. 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 required by this authority.

7. The respondent No.2 has further stated in his objection that the respondent No.1 has no authority to refer the reference to this Authority beyond 30 days. The SLAO referred the application to this Authority on 28.8.2019 after lapse of 3 years 8 months 5 days. As per the provisions of section 64(1) of the Act, within a period of 30 Days from the date of application, the SLAO has to make reference application to the Authority. In the event, the SLAO fails to refer reference to this Authority, it is open for the Petitioners to file an application to the Authority requesting the Authority directing the collector to refer the application within 30 days. In this case, the SLAO has not referred the reference

application to this Authority within 30 days from the date of reference. Even the Petitioners have also not filed any application before this Authority seeking direction to the SLAO to send the reference. Under these circumstances, the reference made by SLAO after a lapse of 3 years 9 months 5 days is beyond limitation; same cannot be entertained. With these submissions, the respondent-2 has prayed to dismiss the petition as time barred.

8. To support his claim, the Petitioners have examined plaintiff No.1F as PW1 and produced documents as per Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.5. The respondents have not adduced oral evidence. However, they have got marked the notice and award as Ex.R.1 and 2 with the consent of Petitioners' counsel.

9. Heard both sides.

10. 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 proves 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?

The Petitioners have produced the documents as per Ex.P1 to Ex.P5. Ex.P.1 is the Reference Application, Ex.P.2 is the Certified copy of sale deed dated 20.4.2011 of Kulgod village, Ex.P.3 is the Certified copy of sale deed dated 14.12.2011 of Koujalagi village, Ex.P.4 is the Certified copy of sale deed dated 14.12.2011 of Koujalagi village, Ex.P.5 is the Certified copy of judgment in LAC No.840/2019 dated 09.03.2026.

11. The findings of this Authority 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. **Points No.1 and 2:-** Since these points require common discussion, to avoid repetition of discussion, these points are taken for common consideration.

13. The 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 application for reference in time.

14. As per section 64(1) of the Act, the aggrieved person must make an application seeking reference within 6 weeks from the date of the award, if the person making the award was present or represented before the Collector at the time when he made his award. 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 ie., 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 12.10.2015, whereas the Petitioners have filed the reference on 23.11.2015. 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 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 application. In the event, if he fails to make reference to this Authority, Petitioners shall make an application before this Authority as per the 2^{nd} 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. The submission of learned counsel for the Petitioners is that, since the Act came into force in the year 2014, the courts were not established immediately after making reference. The courts came to be designated as Authority under section 64 of the Act only in the year 2017. Thereafter, the respondent No.1 has made reference on priority basis. Hence, there is delay. This aspect has to be considered while adverting to the contention of the respondent No.2.

17. The learned counsel for the respondent No.2 to support his arguments has placed reliance on the 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. The learned counsel for respondent No.2 has argued that, the time fixed to the Petitioners to approach the court seeking direction to the SLAO/Collector to send reference is 30

days if he failed to make reference within 30 days and the limitation applicable under Article 137 of Limitation Act and total limitation for Deputy Commissioner to make reference is 3 years 30 days. In view of these submissions, 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. In the case on hand, as per the seal of the District Court found on the reference petition, it was received on 28.8.2019 whereas the reference was made before the respondent No.1 on 23.11.2015, which clearly shows that it was referred to the court after lapse of 3 years 9 months 5 days. Certainly, said period is beyond 3 years 30 days. However, the question that remains is whether this delay has extinguished the right of Petitioners. I feel it worth to mention here that after coming into force of the Act, I Additional District Court has been designated as the Authority under section 64 of the Act. As per the submissions made by counsel, this court is designated as Authority only at the end of the year 2017. Thereafter, SLAO started referring the reference applications to the Authority. It appears that, by considering geographical area and on priority basis, the SLAO has made reference to this Authority. The designation of the courts by the Govt itself has taken nearly about 3 years. In that view, unless Authority is constituted, reference cannot be made. In my humble opinion, said period cannot be considered for computation of delay and if such technical approach is adopted, it will tantamount to denying the justice at the threshold itself.

19. No doubt, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforementioned judgment, has clearly held that reference made beyond the stipulated period cannot be entertained and the right of the Petitioners extinguishes. There cannot be any second word about the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the said case. However, circumstances in the present case are entirely different. Taking into account the fact that, the establishment of Authority by the Government has taken nearly 3 years, same cannot be made applicable to the case on hand. After establishing this Authority, the SLAO has submitted the reference petitions within 3 years. There is no delay on the part of the respondent No.1 in referring the reference to this Authority. Hence, the

reference petition is not time barred. In the result point No.2 is answered in the Negative.

20. **<u>Point No.3 and 4:-</u>** Since these points require 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 Petitioners have claimed for enhancement of compensation to the extent of Rs.30,00,000/- per acre as against Rs.1,93,700/- per acre. It is stated in the award that while determining the market value, the respondent No.1 has taken into account the sale deeds of Kulgod village. The Petitioners have contended that the respondent No.1 has not considered the sale deeds of nearest village or nearby vicinity area. The sale deeds considered by the respondent No.1 are of meager value. Hence, the Petitioners have sought for redetermination of the compensation by considering the sale deeds of nearby vicinity area.

23. The mandate of Section 64 of the Act is to consider whether the respondent has followed the parameters set-up under Section 26 to Section 30 of the Act. To determine the market value of the acquired land the respondent No.1 has taken into consideration the sale deeds of Kulgod village registered during

immediately preceding 3 years. It is stated in the award that, out of the available sale deeds the sale deeds in which the highest sale price has been mentioned are taken into consideration. Since this Authority has to redetermine the compensation, the re-determination of the compensation must also be done as per Section 26 of the Act.

24. The Collector has adopted the criteria mentioned under section 26 (1) (b) of the Act. Under such circumstances, this authority has to resort to adopt the same criteria mentioned under Clause-b of Section 26(1) of the Act.

25. The respondent No.1 has taken into account the average sale price of the land situated in the Kulgod village for the reason that the acquired land is situated at Kulgod 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 lands of Kulgod village considering the sale deeds of the same village registered within preceding 3 years. In view of this submission, it is appropriate to refer Section 26 of the Act .

26. Section 26 (1) (b) of the Act says that it is the average sale price for the similar type of land situated in the nearest village or nearest vicinity area which has to be considered, which includes the same village. But, if only the sale deeds of the same village in which the acquired land is situated are considered, it appears to be hyper technical approach. Because, in my opinion, what needs to be given much significance is the average sale price for similar type of land. If the land available in the same village is not of similar type, it cannot be considered for determination of average sale price. If the similar type of land is situated in the nearest village or nearest vicinity area, it is more appropriate to take the average sale price of such lands into account for determination of the market value. If the hyper technical approach is adopted in considering the sale deeds of same village in which the acquired land is situated, in my humble opinion, it would tend to defeat the object of the Act which is to award the fair compensation. Therefore, the compensation can be fair enough only if the average sale price for similar type of land situated in the nearest village or nearest vicinity area including the same

village are considered. Hence, it is appropriate to consider the sale deeds available on record.

27. The Petitioners have produced the sale deeds of Kulgod and Koujalagi villages. The Petitioners have produced 3 sale deeds as per Ex.P.2 to Ex.P.4. Ex.P.2 is the sale deed of Kulgod village, Ex.P.3 and 4 are the sale deeds of Koujalagi village. Ex.P.2 sale deed came to be registered on 20.4.2011, Ex.P.3 and 4 both are registered on 14.12.2011 whereas the notification in the present case for acquisition was issued on 24.5.2012. These three sale deeds fall within the criteria of registered within preceding 3 years. Further, the evidence placed on record by the Petitioners prima facie shows that, these lands are similar type of land. Hence, these sale deeds can be considered. PW-1 has stated in his cross-examination that distance between Kulgod to Koujalagi village is 2-3 kms. There is no contrary evidence on record in this regard. Therefore, it is not disproved that Kulgod is very much near to Koujalagi village. Hence, it is appropriate to consider the sale deeds of both these villages. The extent of lands sold under Ex.P.2 is 10 guntas for sale consideration of Rs.5,10,000/-; extent of land sold under Ex.P.3 is 3 acres 36 guntas for sale

consideration of Rs.20,00,000/- i.e. 156 guntas; the extent of land sold under Ex.P.4 is 11 guntas for sale consideration of Rs.10,00,000/-. The total extent of land sold under these three sale deeds is 177 guntas. The total sale price of these three lands is Rs.35,10,000/-. The average sale price of these three sale deeds will come at Rs.7,93,220/-. (Rs.35,10,000 ÷ 177= Rs.19,830.50 paise X 40= Rs.7,93,220.338/-, same is rounded off to Rs.7,93,300/-.), Thus, taking the average sale price of lands sold under sale deeds as per Ex.P.2 to Ex.P.4, the market value of the acquired land in the present case is re-determined at Rs.7,93,300/- per acre.

28. The acquired land is situated in rural area. So, the market value has to be multiplied by Factor-2 as per First Schedule 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. The Petitioners are entitled for 12% additional market value on the market value from 24.05.2012 to 28.04.2015 under section 30(3) of the Act.

29. 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.

30. In the case on hand, while passing the award, the respondent No.1 has not considered the sale price of lands situated at nearest village or nearest vicinity area. By strictly adopting the technical approach he has considered only the average sale price of lands situated in the same village, in which the acquired land is situated. In that view, the compensation awarded by the respondent No.1 is not fair. By producing the sale deeds pertaining to similar type of lands situated at nearest village the Petitioners have made out reasonable ground for enhancement of compensation. The Petitioners have claimed enhancement of

compensation by re-determining the market value @ Rs.30,00,000/- per acre. However, the market value of the acquired land in the present case is re-determined at Rs.7,93,300/- per acre. Hence, the 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.

31. **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.396 measuring to the extent of 14 guntas situated at Kulgod village is re-determined at Rs.7,93,300/- per acre.

The acquired land is situated in Rural Area, hence, the market value shall be multiplied by Factor-2 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 24.05.2012 to 28.04.2015 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 28.04.2015 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, transcribed by him, script corrected by me and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this 27th of July, 2026)

SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD

Digitally signed by SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD
Date: 2026.07.27 16:48:31 +0530

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

ANNEXURE

List of Witness examined on behalf of Petitioners:

PW-1 :- Shivanand Shivalingappa Dalawayi,
R/o. Kulagod, Tal. Mudalagi, Dist. Belagavi.

List of Documents marked on behalf of Petitioners:

Ex.P. 1 :- Reference application

Ex.P. 2 :- Certified copy of sale deed dated 20.4.2011

Ex.P. 3 :- Certified copy of sale deed dated 14.12.2011

Ex.P. 4 :- Certified copy of sale deed dated 14.12.2011

Ex.P. 5 :- Certified copy of judgment in LAC No.840 of 2019 dated 09.03.2026

List of Witnesses examined on behalf of Respondents:-

-Nil-

List of Documents marked on behalf of Respondents:-

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

SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD

Digitally signed by SUBHASH BASAVANNEPPA SANKAD
Date: 2026.07.27 16:48:23 +0530

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