



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF APRIL, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

MISCELLANEOUS FIRST APPEAL NO. 1045 OF 2026 (AA)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI P. NAGARAJU
S/O LATE PUTTASWAMIAH
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
RESIDING AT MAYAGANAHALLI
KASABA HOBLI
RAMANAGARA TALUK
BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT - 562 128

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI M.R RAJAGOPAL, SENIOR ADVOCATE A/W
SRI THILAKRAJ S.V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
AND COMPETENT AUTHORITY
NH - 275, MUNICIPAL BUILDING
B.M. ROAD, MAHAVEER CIRCLE
B.M. ROAD, MANDYA TOWN
MANDYA - 571 401
2. THE PROJECT DIRECTOR (TECHNICAL)
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UNIT
NH - 275, BASAVANAPURA VILLAGE
(RAMADEVARAPADA), MAYAGANAHALLI POST
KASABA HOBLI
RAMANAGARA TALUK AND DISTRICT
CURRENTLY BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT





3. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
ARBITRATOR N.H. 275
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT
RAMANAGARA
CURRENTLY BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT - 562 128
...RESPONDENTS

THIS MFA IS FILED UNDER SECTION 37(1)(c) OF THE ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT, 1996 PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER 29/11/2025 PASSED BY THE LEARNED PRINCIPLE DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANAGARA IN ARBITRATION APPLICATION No.82/2023 TO THE EXTENT OF REMANDING THE MATTER TO THE DESIGNATED ARBITRATOR.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal under Section 37(1)(c) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 [**A&C Act**], impugning an order dated 29.11.2025 [**impugned order**] passed by the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramanagara [**District Court**] in Arbitration Application No.82/2023. By the impugned order, the District Court had set aside the arbitral award dated 04.07.2023 passed by respondent No.3 and had remanded the matter for consideration a fresh.



2. It is the appellant's contention that the District Court ought to have examined the appellant's claim for enhanced compensation and ought not to have relegated the appellant to a fresh round of litigation before the Arbitral Tribunal (respondent No.3).
3. The issue raised in the present appeal is similar to the issue raised by the appellant in the connected appeal, MFA No.1034/2026 (AA), which has been disposed of by a separate order passed today.
4. For the reasons stated in the said order, the present appeal is dismissed.
5. The pending interlocutory application also stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE