

KAVN010008652024



**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS
JUDGE, VIJAYANAGARA DISTRICT, HOSAPETE.**

PRESENT: **SRI D. P. KUMARA SWAMY**

B.Com., LL.M.,
Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Vijayanagara District, Hosapete

DATED THIS 7th DAY OF **MARCH, 2026.**

Miscellaneous No.5074/2024

Petitioner: Smt.Dombar Parvathamma @
Dombar Parvathamma,
W/o Shanthappa @ D.Shanthappa,
aged about 70 years,
R/o Kudligi Tq., Vijayanagara District.

(By Sri. C.K.Nagaraj -Advocate)

V/s

Respondent : The Executive Engiener (Elec.)
Karnataka Power Transmission
Company Limited, (KPTCL),
Major Works Division,
Moka Road, Ballari.

(By Sri. M.B.Revanna - Advocate)

Date of Institution of Application: 08.07.2024

Total Duration : Year/s Month/s Day/s

: -01- -07- -00-

**(D. P. KUMARA SWAMY),
ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE
VIJAYANAGARA DISTRICT, HOSAPETE**

ORDERS

This is a petition under Section 16(3) of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885.

2. Shorn off the unnecessary details, the facts of the case of the petitioner constituting cause of action for this petition may be stated to the following effect:

2.1. The petitioner is the wife of D.Shanthappa. D.Shanthappa is the absolute owner, possession and enjoyment of 1 Acre 23 Cents of land in Sy.No.931/1 situate at Kudligi village, Kudligi Hobali, Kudligi Tq., Vijayanagara District. After the death of D.Shanthappa, the petitioner became the absolute owner, possession and enjoyment of the said property.

2.2. The respondent Karnataka Power Transmission Company Limited has drawn 66 KV High Tension Power Line having width of 18 mtrs over the said land of the petitioner.

2.3. Before drawing the said line, the respondent KPTCL has not issued prior notice to the petitioner and not taken the consent of the petitioner. The said portion of the said land over which the said line is drawn has become completely useless and cannot be used by the petitioner effectively in undertaking any developmental activities.

2.4. At the time of drawing the said line, the respondent KPTCL has destroyed the Chilli crop standing on the said portion of the land. In view of the destruction of the said standing crops, the petitioner has suffered loss to the tune of Rs.1,00,000/-.

2.5. The respondent has erected a huge tower over the said land of the petitioner.

2.6. The market value of the said land is Rs.20,00,000/- per acre. The said line is drawn to a length of 18 mtrs. The said line is drawn on the middle portion of

the said land of the petitioner. The area in which the said land is drawn ad-measures 18 guntas.

2.7. The petitioner has claimed that drawing of line would cause various health problems noted in the petition.

2.8. The petitioner has claimed compensation to a tune of Rs.20,00,000/- which is split up as follows:

Sl. No.	Sustained Loss	Amount (Rs.)
1	For diminution of land value	18,00,000/-
2	For loss of crop	1,00,000/-
3	For loss of trees	1,00,000/-
	Total compensation payable	20,00,000/-

2.9. The said line is drawn in the year 2023. The cause of action for the petition arose during 2024 when the respondent denied to pay the compensation to the petitioner. The petitioner has claimed compensation of Rs.20,00,000/- alongwith interest at 24% p.a. from the date of drawing of line till realization.

3. The respondent KPTCL has denied all the facts of the case of the petitioner concerning the allegations to the effect that the drawing of the said line over the said land has resulted in diminution of the value of the said land; and also resulted in health related issues.

3.1. 66 KV High Tension Power Line corridor of about 18 mtrs width and 52.28 mtrs length is drawn over the petitioner's land.

3.2. The respondent has paid compensation towards crop loss as evaluated by Horticulture department.

3.3. There is no cause of action for the petition.

3.4. The claim of compensation to a tune of Rs.20,00,000/- by the petitioner is abnormal, untenable and not sustainable in the eye of law. Petition may be rejected.

4. The petitioner got himself examined as PW1 and got marked documents at Ex.P1 and Ex.P2.

5. Per contra with the consent of learned Advocate for the respondent, M.O.P is marked as Ex.R1.

6. Heard the arguments of the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the Respondent.

6.1. I have taken into consideration the anxious submissions made by learned Advocates appearing for the parties.

7. Points that arise for consideration are :

- 1) What is the compensation to which the petitioner is entitled ?
- 2) What order ?

8. Answers to the above points are as under:

Point No.1	:	In the negative
Point No.2	:	As per final orders for the following

REASONS

9. Point No.1:- In the course of examination-in-chief by way of affidavit, PW1 has reiterated the pleaded facts of his case.

10. During the course of cross-examination, PW1 has deposed to the following effect:

10.1. PW1 has not produced any document to show that the petitioner has grown trees in the said land.

10.2. At the time of drawing the said line, there were no crops in the said land.

10.3. PW1 has not produced any documents to show that the valuation of the said land is Rs.20,00,000/- per acre.

10.4. The petitioner has not produced any document to show that the petitioner has suffered total loss of Rs.20,00,000/-.

10.5. PW1 has not conducted any survey measurement of his land to show the extent of uncultivated land due to drawing of the said land.

10.6. No document is produced to show that there existed a borewell in the said land and that the

borewell was damaged at the time of drawing the said lane.

11. On perusal of the entire materials on record, it is noticed that the respondent has not specifically stated the date on which the line was drawn over the said land of the petitioner.

12. The calculation of the compensation is as follows:

12.1. The said line is drawn over the land of the petitioner to a width of 18 mtrs and a length of 52.28 mtrs.

12.2. Based on Ex.R1, length of the line is 52.28 mtrs width of the line is 18 mtrs, and the area covered by the corridor in terms of guntas is 9.303.

12.3. A tower is erected in the said land of the petitioner occupying 5.5 mtrs width and 5.5 mtrs length.

The tower is having four legs. Area covered by the tower in terms of guntas is 0.299 (as per field report – Ex.R1)

13. Market value of the said land as in the year 2023-24 as per Ex.P2 is Rs.5,00,000/-. On guess work, the market value of the said land as in the year 2023, is taken as Rs.4,00,000/-, the same will be work out to Rs.10,000/- per gunta. The diminutive value of the land used for erecting electricity lines, is considered at 30% of the market value. So, Rs.10,000/- X 30% = Rs.3,000/-

14. Calculation of compensation :

1.	Compensation towards loss of corridor area	9.303 3000	X	Rs.27,909/-
2.	Compensation towards Tower Foot Area	0.299 X 3000		Rs.897/-
Total				Rs.28,806/-

15. So, the total compensation towards loss of diminution of land value with respect to the corridor will come to Rs.28,806/-. During the course of cross-examination, PW1 has clearly admitted that he has

received compensation of Rs.1,03,992/- from the respondent towards erection of tower in his land. Hence, the petitioner is further not entitle for any compensation, as claimed. Hence, Point No.1 is held in the negative.

16. Point No.2: Hence, the following

ORDER

The Petition filed by the petitioner under Section 16(3) of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, is hereby dismissed.

Draw award accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, typed and computerized by him, corrected and signed by me and then pronounced in the open Court, on this the 7th day of **MARCH, 2026**).

**(D. P. KUMARA SWAMY),
ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
VIJAYANAGARA DISTRICT, HOSAPETE.**

ANNEXURE

Witnesses examined on behalf of Petitioner :

P.W.1 : Parvathamma

Document marked on behalf of the Petitioner

Ex.P1 : RTC

Ex.P2 : Valuation certificate

Witnesses examined on behalf of Respondent :

NIL

Document marked on behalf of the Respondent

Ex.R1 : MOP

**(D. P. KUMARA SWAMY),
ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
VIJAYANAGARA DISTRICT, HOSAPETE.**

(Order pronounced in the open Court
vide separate order)

ORDER

The Petition filed by the petitioner under Section 16(3) of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, is hereby dismissed.

Draw award accordingly.

**(D. P. KUMARA SWAMY),
ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
VIJAYANAGARA DISTRICT, HOSAPETE.**