



**IN THE COURT OF THE IV ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE AND
ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND
RESETTLEMENT AUTHORITY, BAGALKOT.**

Dated this the 6th day of March, 2026.

Present;

Sri. K. Rajesh Karnam., B.Sc., LL.B., LL.M.,
IV Addl. District & Sessions Judge & Special Judge.,
Bagalkot.

L.A.C. No.21/2020 Clubbed with
Case Nos.23/2020, 27/2020 and 30/2020

L.A.C.No.21/2020

Petitioner/s:
Claimant/s:

Sanjeevappa S/o Bhimappa Pujari,
Age: 50 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o: Chabbi, Tq: & Dist: Bagalkot.
(Rep.by Sri.R.G.P., Advocate)
-V/s-

Respondent/s:
Opponent/s:

1. The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
Malaprabha Project No.3, Navanagar
Bagalkot.
2. The Executive Engineer,
KNN.LTD Dv.No.1,
Navanagar, Bagalkot.
3. The Deputy Commissioner,
Navanagar, Bagalkot,
Tq: & Dist: Bagalkot.
(Rep. by Sri. K.M.P , Advocate for R-2)
(Rep. by Sri. D.G.P., Advocate for (R-1 & R-3))

KABK010000632020

**LAC No.23/2020****Petitioner/s:**
Claimant/s:Irayya S/o Shankrayya Hiremath,
Age: 66 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o: Chabbi,
Tq:& Dist: Bagalkot.

(Rep.by Sri.R.G.P., Advocate)

-V/s-

Respondent/s:
Opponent/s:

1. The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
Malaprabha Project No.3,
Navanagar Bagalkot.
2. The Executive Engineer,
KNN.LTD Dv.No.1,
Navanagar, Bagalkot.
3. The Deputy Commissioner,
Navanagar, Bagalkot, Tq: & Dist: Bagalkot.
(Rep. by Sri. D.G.P., Advocate for R-1 & R-3)
(Rep. by Sri. K.M.P., Advocate for R-2)

KABK010000672020

**LAC No.27/2020****Petitioner/s:**
Claimant/s:Havalavva W/o Rangappa Madar,
Age: 62 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o: Chabbi,
Ta: & Dist: Bagalkot.

(Rep.by Sri.R.G.P., Advocate)

-V/s-

Respondent/s:
Opponent/s:

1. The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
Malaprabha Project No.3,
Navanagar Bagalkot.

2. The Executive Engineer,
KNN.LTD Dv.No.1,
Navanagar, Bagalkot.
3. The Deputy Commissioner,
Navanagar, Bagalkot, Tq: & Dist: Bagalkot.
(Rep. by Sri. D.G.P., Advocate for R-1 & R-3)
(Rep. by Sri. K.M.P., Advocate for R-2)

KABK010000702020

**LAC No.30/2020****Petitioner/s:**
Claimant/s:

Sunandavva Shivayogeppa Meti,
Age: 53 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o:Chabbi, Tq:& Dist: Bagalkot.
(Rep.by Sri.R.G.P., Advocate)
-V/s-

Respondent/s:
Opponent/s:

1. The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
Malaprabha Project No.3,
Navanagar Bagalkot.
2. The Executive Engineer,
KNN.LTD Dv.No.1,
Navanagar, Bagalkot.
3. The Deputy Commissioner,
Navanagar, Bagalkot, Tq: & Dist: Bagalkot.
(Rep. by Sri. D.G.P., Advocate for R-1 & R-3)
(Rep. by Sri. K.M.P., Advocate for R-2)

L.A.C.No.21/2020

1. Land Acquisition Case No. : 123/2004-05
2. Purpose of Acquisition : Ghataprabha Project.
3. Village : Chabbi.
4. Taluka/District : Bagalkot/Bagalkot.

5. Date of 11(1) Notification : 17.11.2016
6. Date of Award : 07.03.2018
7. Date of Possession : --
8. Name of the Awardee : Sanjeevappa Bhimappa Pujari
9. Name of the interested persons : Sanjeevappa Bhimappa Pujari
10. Description of properties : Land.
11. Sy.No. : 57/6
12. Land acquired for the area under the project : 00-06-00.
13. Total compensation awarded : 194757-00
14. Date of service of notice U/s 37(2) : --
15. Date of application filed U/s 64 by the applicant. : 17.04.2018
16. Date of institution : 04.01.2020
17. Date of judgment : 06.03.2026.
18. Total duration : 06 years, 02 months and 03 days.

L.A.C.No.23/2020

1. Land Acquisition Case No. : 123/2004-05.
2. Purpose of Acquisition : Ghataprabha Project.
3. Village : Chabbi.
4. Taluka/District : Bagalkot/Bagalkot.
5. Date of 11(1) Notification : 17.11.2016
6. Date of Award : 07.03.2018
7. Date of Possession : --
8. Name of the Awardee : Irayya Shankrayya Hiremath
9. Name of the interested persons : Irayya Shankrayya Hiremath

10. Description of properties : Land.
11. Sy.No. : 59/2B
12. Land acquired for the area under the project : 00-15-00.
13. Total compensation awarded : 499874-00
14. Date of service of notice U/s 37(2) : --
15. Date of application filed U/s 64 by the applicant. : 17.04.2018
16. Date of institution : 04.01.2020
17. Date of judgment : 06.03.2026.
18. Total duration : 06 years, 02 months and 03 days.

L.A.C.No.27/2020

1. Land Acquisition Case No. : 123/2004-05
2. Purpose of Acquisition : Ghataprabha Project.
3. Village : Chabbi
4. Taluka/District : Bagalkot/Bagalkot.
5. Date of 11(1) Notification : 17.11.2016
6. Date of Award : 07.03.2018
7. Date of Possession : --
8. Name of the Awardee : Havalavva W/o Rangappa Madar
9. Name of the interested persons : Havalavva W/o Rangappa Madar
10. Description of properties : Land.
11. Sy.No. : 61/5A
12. Land acquired for the area under the project : 00-10-00
13. Total compensation awarded : 324595-00
14. Date of service of notice U/s 37(2) : -

15. Date of application filed U/s 64 by the applicant. : 17.04.2018
16. Date of institution : 04.01.2020
17. Date of judgment : 06.03.2026.
18. Total duration : 06 years, 02 months and 03 days.

L.A.C.No.30/2020

1. Land Acquisition Case No. : 123/2004-05
2. Purpose of Acquisition : Ghataprabha Project.
3. Village : Chabbi
4. Taluka/District : Bagalkot/Bagalkot.
5. Date of 11(1) Notification : 17.11.2016
6. Date of Award : 07.03.2018
7. Date of Possession : --
8. Name of the Awardee : Sundavva Shivayogeppa Meti
9. Name of the interested persons : Sundavva Shivayogeppa Meti
10. Description of properties : Land.
11. Sy.No. : 51/3
12. Land acquired for the area under the project : 00-29-00.
13. Total compensation awarded : 941325-00
14. Date of service of notice U/s 37(2) : --
15. Date of application filed U/s 64 by the applicant. : 17.04.2018
16. Date of institution : 04.01.2020
17. Date of judgment : 06.03.2026.
18. Total duration : 06 years, 02 months and 03 days.

COMMON JUDGEMENT

These cases registered as per the reference made by the Special LAO Bagalkot, Development authority Bagalkot, as per the notification No.LAQ:SR:123/2004-05 dated 16.03.2018.

The respective claimants are the absolute and exclusive owners in possession of the above said properties respectively. The specified area has been acquired for construction of Ghataprabha Right Bank Canal by acquisition authority i.e., S.L.A.O. M.P.3 Navanagar Bagalkot under the Provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

In receipt of award notice under Section 37(2) of the R.F.C.T in LARR Act 2013 and they have been awarded compensation amount as shown against them. Notice has not been served. The representation made by claimant is on 14.03.2018. They have received the compensation amount UNDER PROTEST

and further seek the determination for enhancement of compensation amount.

That the SLAO M.P.3 Navanagar, Bagalkot has not issued any notice of hearing before passing the award hence they have not followed the Mandatory provisions the Act. That the compensation awarded by the SLAO MP-3 Navanagar, Bagalkot is too low as compared with present market value.

The method adopted by the S.L.A.O. relying on the said sale statistics is totally unacceptable and unsustainable. It is well settled that such a method cannot be relied upon in determining the true and adequate market value of the acquired land the S.L.A.O. has also not considered the true potentiality of the acquired land.

The S.L.A.O has not at all considered potentiality of the acquired land is just adjacent to the village limits of Chabbi village and therefore has got the potentiality of building. It is well settled that market value of an acquired land is to be determined

with reference to all its potentialities, while fixing market value, the SLAO has not considered.

Therefore, the claimants make claim an amount of Rs.6,00,00,000/- per acre which is the actual market value for the acquired lands. The claimant claim such market value along with all the consequential statutory benefits as provided under the aforesaid Act. That the SLAO, MP-3 ought to have seen fertility of the land and nature of crops growing by the claimants. That claimants was growing the maize, Groundnut, Sunflower, Cotton Jawar, Onion wheat and other commercial crops in their acquired lands. As such, they have getting gross income from irrigated land Rs.8,00,000/- per year per acre. The acquired land in 09 teak wood trees loss at the time of digging the canal and very low compensation amount passed by the SLAO. The claimant claim per teak wood tree valued more than Rs.5 lakhs and age of tree 16 years old but the SLAO has failed to considered the parameters as per sec.28 of LARR Act,

2013. This is clearly show that the SLAO has not fixed any damages as per sec.28.

2. The claimants have prayed as follows: The claimants submit the properties of claimants in clubbed cases are situated in Chabbi village in Sy.Nos.57/6, 59/2B, 61/5A and 51/3 acquired area as below: The compensation already awarded is paid.

All the lands are within Chabbi village:

Sl. No	L.A.C Nos.	R.S.No.	Name of the land owner	Area Acquired	Compensation paid.
1.	21/2020	57/6	Sanjeevappa S/o Bhimappa Pujari	00A-06G	Rs.1,94,757/-
2.	23/2020	59/2B	Irayya S/o Shankrayya Hiremath	00A-15G	Rs.4,99,874/-
3.	27/2020	61/5A	Havalavva W/o Rangappa Madar	00A-10G	Rs.3,24,595/-
4.	30/2020	51/3	Sunandavva Shivayogeppa Meti	00A-29G	Rs.9,41,325/-

They have in receipt of award notice on 07.03.2018 under section 37(2) of the R.F.C.T in LARR Act 2013 and they have been awarded compensation amount as above and they preferred reference petitions on 16.03.2018 against them under their award.

In the LAC No.21/2020 clubbed the following cases No.23/2020, 27/2020 and 30/2020. The

reference No.21/2020 is of claimant sanjeevappa S/o Bhimappa Pujari reference is namely reference in LAC No.23/2020 is of Irayya Shankrayya Hiremath LAC No.27/2020 is of Havalavva W/o Rangappa Madar, further in LAC No.30/2020 is of Sunandavva Shivayogeppa Meti.

3. The reference applications under section 64(1) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 are filed.
4. The respondent Nos.1 & 3 are represented by District Government pleader has filed objections that claim is vague and devoid of specific grounds challenging the award passed by the SPLAO. It does not disclose any error in computation of compensation, classification of land or methodology adopted under the relevant provisions of the act are duly complied. That the compensation award was determined in accordance with the Sec.26 market value, sec.28 solatium and sec.30 of the act and also proper procedure followed u/s 11 to 15 of LARR Act 2013 and the award passed

on 06.02.2023 after giving sufficient opportunity of hearing and under due process. That the market value was determined based on the instant sale deeds and relevant factors in line with the rules and notifications issued by the Govt. and also claimant has not furnished any documentary evidence to prove the market value. The classification of the acquired land was based on the official revenue records and site inspection and also claimant has failed to establish by furnishing documents at the time of spot inspection. The present claim of classification is improper.

That the SLAO has already granted solatium and additional benefits to the claimant under the relevant provisions and no further monetary claims survive beyond what is granted under law. That the amount demanded by the claimant appears to be exaggerated, speculation and not supported by the documentary evidence such as registered sale deed of complete land or expert valuation reports.

Therefore, it is respectfully prays that, this court dismiss the reference petition with cost by upholding the award passed by the SLAO as fair, legal and in accordance with the act, in the interest of justice and equity.

5. The respondent No.2 is represented by District Government pleader has filed objections has filed objections submitting the reference petition U/s 64 of new LA Act is not in time and not in accordance with the provisions of L.A.R.R. Act 2013. The averments made are not supported by any documents, reasons or materials. Therefore, the petition is not sustainable under the eye of law and it deserves to be dismissed. That all the declarations made in claim petition the new LA Act of the reference petition U/Sec.64(1) of the said Act are totally false and are denied. The Claimant has not suffered any loss or injury on the result of acquisition and Claimant is adequately compensated. The SLAO before passing award has followed all the parameters set out under the said law

with solatium and all other statutory benefits. This court has limited scope as per section 69 of said act.

The claimants cannot claim higher compensation based on compensation paid in earlier occasion in the district as enumerated in explanation 3 of section 26 of LARR Act, 2013 therefore the claimant cannot rely on previous judgments as per law. The claimant has failed to prove his claim in respect of structure open space before the opponent and is not entitled to enhance compensation.

That the valuation is made by expert engineers, taking into considerations the value of the materials of structures, present conditions, labor charges etc, the respondent has followed the provisions of new LA act, The SLAO considered all guidelines of the Karnataka state Govt in awarding compensation and awarded adequate compensation.

The SLAO before passing award has followed all the parameters set out under Section 26 to Section 30 and Chapter V of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation

and Resettlement Act, 2013. The averments of the claimant that he raises double crops in a year is not true. The dry lands newer grow double crops. Petitioner has exaggerated the yield and in come of the land without any materials or bases for it.

Petitioner is failure to receive the compensation under protest has dis-entitled him to file this petition, viewed from any angle the compensation awarded by the respondent no.1 is fair and adequate. Hence, the reference petition may be dismissed with cost.

6. The opponent No.2 submits objections through his advocate to the reference petition filed U.Sec 64 of the RFCTLARR Act,2013. All the averments made in the reference petition except those that are specifically admitted are denied by this opponent. The petition is false and malafied and is also opposed to law and facts and therefore is not maintainable. It is false that no opportunity was given to the claimants by the SLAO. The reference petition is not signed by competent persons. The reference petition u/sec.64

of the LA Act is not in time and therefore it deserves to be dismissed.

The compensation awarded by the SLAO were received without any protest and therefore is not maintainable. The SLAO before passing award has followed all the parameters set out under section 26 to section 30 and Chapter V of the RFCTLARR Act,2013. This court has limited scope as per section 69 of RFCTLARR Act,2013. The claimants cannot claim higher compensation based on compensation pain in earlier occasion in the district as enumerated in explanation of 3 of section 26 of RFCTLARR Act,2013. Therefore the claimants cannot rely on previous judgments as per law. Further claimants cannot claim higher compensation in view of explanation 4 also as SLAO has properly followed sec 26 prior to passing of award.

The claimants are already adequately compensated and government has paid compensation as per First Schedule of RFCTLARR Act,2013 with 100% solatium and all other statutory benefits. The

acquired land was of low quality at the time of acquisition. The raising of crop in the acquired land depended only upon the uncertain rainfall. Therefore it was difficult to raise one crop per year in the acquired land as it had no irrigation facility. The contentions in the reference petitions about the quality of the land, about raising of more than one crop and about existence of trees etc are all false. The documents produced in support of reference petition are all false and are all created for the purpose of this case.

The SLAO has visited the acquired land and has made through enquiry about the quality of the land about the crop raise din the acquired land and has properly determined the market value of the acquired land. Therefore absolutely there are no reason to enhance the compensation amount awarded by the SALO. The amount and interest claimed in the reference petition are false and exorbitant. The claimants are already benefited by the acquisition of land because of lying down of the canal in the land,

which is helpful to irrigation. There are no materials before this court to come to the conclusion that the compensation already awarded is inadequate. The reasons mentioned in the award are also proper answer to the contents of the reference petition.

The acquired lands are not near any village or town and they do not have any facilities for human habitation and they do not fetch more market value than any fallow or subnormal land. The acquired land does not fetch non agricultural potentiality.

Accordingly, seeks to dismiss the reference petitions.

7. The claimants at trial got examined Sanjeevappa S/o Bhimappa Pujari as P.W.1 and has placed documents as Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.26. On hearing both side case is reserved for judgment.
8. The points that would arise for consideration of this court are as follows:-

P O I N T S

- 1) Whether claimants are entitled for enhanced compensation as claim petition is in compliance of section 64(2)(a)?
- 2) What order?

9. My findings to the above points are as follows;
Point No.1 : In the Affirmative,
Point No.2 : As per the final order,
for the following.

REASONS

10. **Point No.1:-** The learned counsel for claimants has submitting arguments that the Sy.No.57/6 of about 06G, in Sy.No.59/2B of about 15G, in Sy.No.61/5A of about 10G, in Sy.No.51/3 of about 29G are being acquired by the Special LAO for Gataprabha irrigation project Kerakalamatti canal block No.32. The LAQ:SR:No.123/2004-05 previous notification No.(123A/2004-05) 20.06.2023 has passed award. The award is not appropriate based on any actual market value of the land. The evidence of claimant is adduced to that effect and documents submitted.
11. At trial claimant has deposed that he is owner of Sy.No.56/6 along with Sanjeevappa Pujari and others as per para-4 his evidence. The other land holders are as per the para-4 of the affidavit. The lands are acquired for the purpose of Ghataprabha Irrigation Project. The notices are being issued before

acquisition and the measurements of land acquired are as shown in the schedule. The Chabbi Rehabilitation Center is proposed and properties are acquired. The house No.518 and 535 are measuring 20X10 meters which has been sold on 21.08.2018 for 12,40,000/- similarly a 10X10 property sold on 19.02.2013 for Rs.5,00,000/- in Chabbi. Which are of same village accordingly, seek compensation. The Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.26 are placed to prove the contentions of the claimants. In fact, claimants were able to get about Rs.08 lakhs per annum income from the crops therein. The lands are rich with Limestone deposit.

12. Therefore, the Chabbi as per the sketch placed on record Ex.P.7 & Ex.P.9. Chabbi and sale deeds onward Ex.P.10 up to Ex.P.15 are of adjacent village and sale deeds are placed.
13. The Hon'ble Supreme court of India has observed to place reliance on highest exemplar based valuation and confirmed the order of the Hon'ble High Court to that effect. Therefore, this court by following the sale

deeds placed of Semikeri village the compensation is to be determined is the prayer.

14. The learned counsel for petitioners submits as per 2021(1) KCCR 231 **Adivappa Hanamantappa Keri Vs. The Special Land Acquisition Officer, Hidakal Dam Hidakal** has observed market value is to be based on sale deeds its only and considering the evidence. Accordingly, seek to considered the sale deed Ex.P.10 to Ex.P.15 and value of the land is to be estimated.
15. Learned DGP and counsel for the respondents argues the claimants property are situated at distance of 14 Km from the sale deed property. As such it cannot be considered. Moreover, no documents placed before the SPLAO to consider the sale deeds before passing award. It is further argued as per citation in ILR 1997 KAR 2063, wherein held that since the acquired is far away from the sale deeds property and property not situated in the same vicinity of the acquired lands, the enhancement cannot be awarded and another decision in MSA No.200065/2016 Smt Gangamma in

respect of agricultural or undeveloped land which has potential value for housing or commercial purpose, normally one third of compensation has to be deducted.

As per decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court (2004) 4 Supreme Court Cases 79 **R.L. Jain (D) by Lrs.- Appellant Vs. DDA and others** has observed the awarding of compensation must commence only from the date of 4(1) notification but not prior to that effect, in the case on hand the award has been passed as per Ex.R.1 on 03.03.2018. Therefore, from that date only claimants can be awarded interest and any amount of compensation that can be awarded as per head note 'd'. Therefore, this decisions has to be followed which has been also followed by the Hon'ble Supreme court (2020) Supreme Court Cases 370 in **Chanabasappa Vs. Karnataka Neeravari Nigam Limited and Another**, wherein similar observations made in (2004) 9 SCC 337 along with R.L. Jain case are being considered while deciding compensation. Therefore, the award passed by SLAO is correct and

he has considered for the year 2016-17 the valuation available as per the market value and awarding compensation which is highest as per the sale guidance value. Therefore, there is no question of reassessing the compensation arises.

16. This court by following all the citations and the sale deed value of lands at Chabbi village the date of notification is 17.11.2016 the Ghataprabha Project and the date of notice 07.03.2018 The notice U/Sec.37(2) is issued on 16.03.2018. The reference applications filed on 17.04.2018. In the case on hand the claimants PW.1 has entered witness box and given his evidence by placing the notices issued, the village being brought within Town planning the endorsement of BTDA as per Ex.P.8, Gazette notification the map of Chabbi village and has placed Ex.P.10 sale deed of house in Chabbi village for Rs.12,40,000/- on 21.08.2018 and Ex.P.11, Ex.P.14 this court by accepting document and arguments of learned counsel for claimant rejected the sale deed is

shall further the Ex.P.15 since it is of Bagalkot, as argued by the Learned DGP.

17. The learned counsel as also brings to the court notice as per Ex.P.10 to 15 if considered, Ex.p.11 for the measurement oif 10 * 10 sq meter the amount of saledeed of Chabbi village is Rs.5,00,000/- if the same is to be considered the land being acquired for irrigation purpose equitable deduction is given as to 20 % by relying on citation 900 INSC 2025 relied in Ex.P.19, the same documents which are also exhibited in this case. Similarly Ex.P.25 cannot be considered which is same property.
18. In the case on hand other sale deeds Ex.P.11 is with regard to 10X10 Sq Mtrs is Rs.5,00,000/-. The value of 1 Sq. Mtr is Rs.5,000/- if the same is converted into gunta will be Rs.5,50,000/- per gunta. However, the present award is passed in the year 2017 the recent sale deed has been placed. If the same is considered as per the award dated 14.03.2018, for the same which is decided by the Special LAO as per the citation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in

2025 INSC 900, Manohar and others Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others. As such claimant has also lost his land and get all the amenities. The award is passed on 14.03.2018.

19. In the case on hand, for each gunta Rs.5,50,000/- plus Rs.2,25,000/- the market value can be considered as Rs.7,75,000/- will be the base value. In the case on hand compensation with regard to tree has been calculated by the SPLAO is considered as appropriate.

This court by relying on the citations by counsel for the claimants placed on record. The 37(2) notice is served 16.03.2018 and reference applications filed on 17.04.2018 are as follows:

Sl. No.	L.A.C. Nos.	Survey No.& Extent	Area Acquired	Market value determined as Per acre	Compensation which includes trees paid	Price of the land calculation	Name of the claimants
1	21/2020	57/6	00A-06G	Rs.46,50,000/-	Rs.1,94,757/-	Rs.6,000/- Sq.ft-	Sanjeevappa S/o Bhimappa Pujari
2	23/2020	59/2B	00A-15G	Rs.1,16,25,000/-	Rs.4,99,874/-	Rs.6,000/- Sq.ft-	Irayya S/o Shankrayya Hiremath
3	27/2020	61/5A	00A-10G	Rs.77,50,000/-	Rs.3,24,595/-	Rs.6,000/- Sq.ft-	Havalavva W/o Rangappa Madar
4	30/2020	51/3	00A-29G	Rs.2,24,75,000/-	Rs.9,41,325/-	Rs.6,000/- Sq.ft-	Sunandavva Shivayogappa Meti

20. In fact as per the citation relied by learned counsel for the claimant of **2025 INSC 900, Manohar and others Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India** has observed as follows:

“33. It can thus be seen that it is a settled position of law that when there are several exemplars with reference to similar land, usually the highest of the exemplars, which is a bona-fide transactions, will be considered. The same was reiterated in the judgment of this Court in the case of Mohammad Yusuf.

40. It is well-settled that the compensation payable to the owner of the land is determined by reference to the price which a seller might reasonably expect to obtain from a willing purchaser. It is further settled law that the land acquire has to be valued not only with reference to its condition at the time of notification under section 4 of the LA Act but its potential value must be taken into account. In this respect, the sale deeds of lands situated in the vicinity and the comparable benefits and advantages which they have, provide a ready method of computing the market value.”

as the discussion made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case on hand this court has to consider the Ex.P.10 to Ex.P.15. Accordingly, this court is satisfied to answer the point No.1 in these cases in the **affirmative**.

21. **Point No.2:-** The highest exemplar value as per the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court 2025 INSC 900, Manohar and others Vs. State of Maharashtra is followed by this court. However, the Ex.P.15 the sale deed available, considered as the base to arrive at the value of land. For the foregoing reasons assigned on point No.1, the following order is passed.

ORDER

The reference petitions filed under Section 64(1) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Re-settlement Act, 2013 are hereby allowed in part with costs.

The base value of the acquired lands are determined at Rs.7,75,000/- per gunta, to the extent of the acquired lands situated at Chabbi village, Tq: & Dist: Bagalkote.

The claimants are entitled for the market value with multiplier factor 02 as per the First Schedule to the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in L.A.R.R. Act, 2013.

The claimants are also entitled to additional market value at the rate of 12% per annum under Section 30(3) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Re-settlement Act, 2013.

The claimants are also entitled for interest at the rate of 9% per annum under Section 72 of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in L.A.R.R. Act, 2013 on the enhanced compensation for one year from the date of Award and thereafter at the rate of 15% per annum for the subsequent period till date of payment or deposit.

The claimants are also entitled for all solatium and statutory benefits as per law.

The amount of compensation if any already paid to the claimants shall be deducted from the said amount.

If any encumbrance, loan other financial debt due on the acquired properties the claimants have to bear the said amount as per law without default, also claimants have to be complied if any judgments or

orders passed by any competent Court of law in respect of acquired properties.

Advocate fee is fixed at Rs.1,000/-.

Office to draw award accordingly.

Office is directed to keep the original copy of this common judgment in main L.A.C. No.21/2020 and a copies of this common judgment in L.A.C. Nos. 23/2020, 27/2020 and 30/2020.

(Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed and typed by her, script corrected and signed by me, then pronounced in the open court on this the 6th day of March 2026.)

K. Rajesh Karnam.

IV Addl. District Judge & Additional
Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation &
Resettlement Authority,
Bagalkot.

ANNEXURES

1. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF CLAIMANTS/PETITIONERS:

P.W.1 : Sanjeevappa S/o Bhimappa Pujari.

2. LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED ON BEHALF OF CLAIMANTS/PETITIONERS:

Ex.P.1 : Reference petitions.

to

Ex.P.4

Ex.P.5 : 04 Award copies.

Ex.P.6 : RTC Extracts.

- Ex.P.7 : Map.
- Ex.P.8 : Letter dated:09.01.2025.
- Ex.P.9 : Map.
- Ex.P.10 : C.C of Sale deeds/Purchase deeds.
to
Ex.P.15
- Ex.P.16 : C.C. of judgment and award in LAC No.747/2019
clubbed with Case No.748/2019 dated:05.12.2024.
- Ex.P.17 : C.C. of judgment and award in LAC No.1244/2018
clubbed with Case No.1228/2018, 1255/2018,
1279/2018 & 1309/2018 dated: 10.07.2025.
- Ex.P.18 : C.C. of judgment and award in LAC No.119/2023
clubbed with Case No.121/2023, 118/2023,
85/2023 & 123/2023 dated:19.09.2024.
- Ex.P.19 : C.C. of judgment and award in LAC No.260/2020
clubbed with Case No.261/2020, 348/2020 &
349/2020 dated:01.12.2025.
- Ex.P.20 : C.C. of judgment and award in LAC No.1086/2013
dated:04.08.2018.
- Ex.P.21 : Official Reminder dated:15.06.2002
- Ex.P.22 : RTC Extracts.
- Ex.P.23 : C.C of Compromise award in LAC.No.575/2017
dated: 21.06.2014.
- Ex.P.24 : Copy of the award of LAQ:SR:NO.123/04-05 of
Special LAO MP-3 Bagalkot dated:09.02.2018
&12.02.2018.
- Ex.P.25 : RTC Extracts
- Ex.P.26 : Letter dated:08.07.2013.

3. LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF
OPPONENTS/RESPONDENTS:

-Nil-

4. LIST OF DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED ON BEHALF OF
OPPONENTS/RESPONDENTS:

Ex.R.1 : Copies of the award of LAQ:SR:NO.123A/04-05 of
Special LAO MP-3 Bagalkot dated:05.03.2018 &
07.03.2018.

K. Rajesh Karnam

IV Addl. District Judge & Additional
Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation &
Resettlement Authority,
Bagalkot.

