



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

WRIT PETITION NO. 5642 OF 2026 (LA-UDA)

BETWEEN:

1. T. KRISHNA
S/O. THIMMASHETTY,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
R/O.#736, 4TH MAIN, 5TH CROSS,
E AND F BLOCK, RAMAKRISHNA NAGAR,
MYSORE - 570 022.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. KUSUMA M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSE AND URBAN,
M.S. BUILDING,
BANGALORE - 560 001.
2. MYSORE URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
JHANSI LAKSHMI BAI ROAD,
MYSORE - 570 005.
BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
3. SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,
MYSORE URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,

Digitally
signed by
VIJAYA P
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



JHANSI LAKSHMI BAI ROAD,
MYSORE - 570 005.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K.P. YASHODHA, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. POONAM PATIL, ADVOCATE FOR R2 AND R3)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASHING PRELIMINARY NOTIFICATION DATED 12.12.2006, BEARING NO. LAQ(6)CR 434/2005-06 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT AUTHORITY AT ANNEXURE-A TO THE WRIT PETITION IN SO FAR AS SCHEDULE PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE PETITIONERS IS CONCERNED. (OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE) AND ETC.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

ORAL ORDER

Petitioner has called in question the validity of the preliminary notification dated 12.12.2006 insofar as the property of the petitioner is concerned.

2. Petitioner submits that though preliminary notification was passed on 12.12.2006, till date no final notification is passed. It is submitted that in light of the lapse of the sufficient time since 2006, as the respondent – Authorities have not taken any steps to effectuate the



land acquisition proceedings and to complete the same, the land acquisition proceedings may be construed to have been abandoned.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondents 2 and 3 submits that assertion of the petitioner that no further steps have been taken to effectuate the land acquisition proceedings after notification of 12.12.2006 requires acceptance.

4. Taking note that though the notification is passed on 12.12.2006 and no further steps have been taken to conclude the land acquisition proceedings as per the statutory scheme, it could be declared that the land acquisition proceedings insofar as the petitioner's land is concerned has been abandoned.

5. Taking note that no steps have been taken by the respondents to conclude the proceedings despite lapse of sufficient period of time, the preliminary notification dated 12.12.2006 insofar as the petitioner's land is



concerned, is set aside and the acquisition proceedings have been declared to have been abandoned.

6. Accordingly, petition stands ***disposed of***.

SD/-
(S SUNIL DUTT YADAV)
JUDGE

VP