



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

WRIT APPEAL NO. 87 OF 2026 (LA-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

1. NANDI INFRASTRUCTURE
CORRIDOR ENTERPRISE LIMITED
NO.1, MIDFORD HOUSE
MIDFORD GARDENS
OFF MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD
BENGALURU-560 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
AUTHORISED SIGNATORY
MR. SRINATH MANGALORE

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. DHYAN CHINNAPPA, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. NITIN PRASAD., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. SMT. RATHNA S. REDDY
W/O Y. M SRINIVAS REDDY
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.4, SRINIVASA NILAYA,
Y.V. ANNAIAH ROAD, YELACHENAHALLI,
KANAKAPURA ROAD, BENGALURU-560 078.
2. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
REPRESENTED BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY



M.S. BUILDINGS,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALORE-560 001.

3. THE SECRETARY,
INDUSTRIES AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENT,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
VIKAS SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001.
4. KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL
AREAS DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
KHANIJA BHAVAN, 4TH AND
5TH FLOORS, EAST WING,
RACE COURSE ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND
EXECUTIVE MEMBER.
5. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,
BMICP, KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL AREAS
DEVELOPMENT BOARD, NO.14/3,
1ST FLOOR, ARAVINDA BHAVAN,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.
6. THE SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
KIADB, BENGALURU DISTRICT,
BEHIND KANDAYA BHAVANA, K.G. ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY DR. RAVINDRA V.REDDY, SPL. COUNSEL FOR R2 & R3;
SRI. H.N.SHASHIDHAR, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. H.S.SUHAS FOR C/R1;
KIADB IS SERVED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED
ORDER DATED 05.12.2025 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE



JUDGE IN WP No. 20824/2025 (LA-KIADB) AND
CONSEQUENTLY, DISMISS WP No. 20824/2025, ETC.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING,
THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S RACHAIAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH)

Heard Mr. Dhyan Chinnappa, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. Nitin Prasad, learned counsel for the appellant, Mr. H.N. Shashidhar, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. H.S. Suhas, learned counsel for respondent No.1 and Mr. Ravindra V Reddy, learned Special Counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 - State.

2. The present intra Court appeal has been filed challenging the land acquisition proceedings initiated by the State Government under the provisions of the Karnataka Industrial Area Development Act (hereinafter referred to as 'the KIAD Act') in respect of the petitioner's land as their land was the subject matter of the preliminary notification dated 14.06.2006 under Section 28(1) of the KIAD Act and final notification dated 16.10.2008 issued under Section 28(4) of the



said Act. The aforesaid land came to be acquired for the purpose of Bangalore-Mysore Infrastructure Corridor Project, (for short 'the BMICP'). The said project has remained a distinct dream of the residents of Bangalore and the State. But, admittedly till date no award has been passed in respect of the petitioner's land and their land is said to have been acquired finally by the notification dated 16.10.2008.

3. The petitioner places reliance on the endorsement dated 05.06.2025 issued by the Bangalore-Mysore Infrastructure Corridor Area Planning Authority stating that no ramp, interchange, link alignment or BMICP facility exists or is proposed on the petitioner's land in Sy No.41/5 and consequently, that said land is not required for the BMICP.

4. The learned Special Counsel appearing for the State Government submitted that the State Government had taken a categorical stand before the Supreme Court on affidavit in Contempt Petition (C) No.139/2012 that 554 acres of excess land had already been handed over to the project proponents of the Bangalore-Mysore Infrastructure Corridor Project and no further land is required or would be delivered.



5. Considering the fact that for 17 long years no compensation was paid to the landowners and the stand of the Government is that the said land is not required for the purpose of BMICP, the learned Single Judge has quashed the land acquisition proceedings in respect of the petitioner's land, as a person cannot be deprived of his property without payment of due compensation. The right to property may not be fundamental right, but still it is a constitutional right as provided under Article 300A of the Constitution of India.

6. Mr. Dhyani, Chinnappa, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that the stand of the State before the learned Single Judge is incorrect. The land falls in interchange section which is required for formation of ramp and in fact the project proponents have built the ramp.

7. We are unable to accept this submission in view of the categorical stand taken by the State that the said land is not required for BMICP and no ramp, interchange, link alignment or BMICP facility exist on the said land of the petitioner in Sy No.41/5.



8. The learned Special Counsel for the State has further submitted that the project proponents have not paid the amount of compensation and therefore, award has not been passed till date and this assertion is undisputed.

9. It is between the State Government and the Project proponents to sort out their issues or disputes. However, the fact remains that the landowners have not been paid compensation for their land, which according to the respondents stood acquired way back in 2008. We, therefore, do not find that the learned Single Judge has committed an error which warrants an interference by this Court. Accordingly, the writ appeal stands ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(S RACHAIAH)
JUDGE**

RKA
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 1