



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN

WRIT PETITION NO. 23290 OF 2025 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. KARNATAKA HOUSING BOARD
PENSIONERS UNION (R)
ASSOCIATION REGISTERED UNDER KARNATAKA
SOCITIES REGISTRATION ACT, 1960
HAVING REGD. OFFICE AT CAUVERY BHAVAN,
KEMPEGOWDA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560009.

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
SRI MARULA SIDDAPPA,
AGED 76 YEARS,
S/O LATE GANGAPPA,
R/O H.NO.79, 3RD MAIN ROAD,
MARUTHINAGAR,
NAGARABHAVI MAIN ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 072.

2. SRI B.N. NANJAPPA,
AGED 83 YEARS,
S/O LATE SRI NINGEGOWDA,
R/O NO.16, 'PREETHI NILAYA,
KHB EXTENSION, NANDINI LAYOUT,
BENGALURU-560 096.
3. PUTTAIAH H.K.
AGED 77 YEARS,

Digitally
signed by
GEETHA P G
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



S/O LATE KENCHEGOWDA,
R/O NO.108, 4TH MAIN,
KEB LAYOUT,
BTM 1ST STAGE,
BENGALURU-560 029.

4. R.NAGARAJA,
AGED 77 YEARS,
S/O LATE RANGAPPA
R/O NO.957, 16TH B CROSS,
KHB IIND STAGE,
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN,
BENGALURU-560 064.
5. G.M.SHIVARUDRACHARY,
AGED 79 YEARS,
S/O LATE MALLACHARY.
R/O NO.4288, IIND STAGE,
KUMARA SWAMY LAYOUT,
BENGALURU-560 063.
6. V.NARAYANASWAMY
AGED 78 YEARS,
S/O LATE VENKATESHAPPA,
R/O NO.423, 15TH 'B' CROSS,
B SECTOR, IIND STAGE,
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN
BENGALURU-560 064.
7. H. NARAYANASWAMY,
AGED 78 YEARS,
S/O LATE HANUMAPPA,
R/O THAMBIHALLI, HUTHUR POST,
KOLAR TALUK AND DISTRICT.



8. H. NANJAPPA,
AGED 82 YEARS,
S/O LATE SHIVANNAGOWDA,
R/O NO.1576, I CROSS,
CHANDRA LAYOUT,
BENGALURU - 560 040.
9. J.M. NAGANNA SETTY,
AGED 81 YEARS,
S/O MUDDA SETTY,
R/O NO.9, MIG, KHB COLONY,
K. NARAYANAPURA,
BENGALURU - 560 077.
10. N.K. RANGARAMU,
AGED 74 YEARS,
S/O LATE R. KRISHNAMURTHY,
R/O NO.367, 10TH CROSS,
NIMISHAMBANAGARA,
KUVEMPUNAGAR,
MYSORE - 570 023.
11. B.N.SHIVARAMU,
AGED 81 YEARS,
S/O LATE NANJUNDEGOWDA,
R/O NO.94, 23RD MAIN,
POST OFFICE ROAD, J.P.NAGAR,
IIND STAGE,
BENGALURU - 560 078.
12. GOPALAPPA,
AGED 74 YEARS,
S/O LATE RAMAIAH,
R/O NO.232, PRASHANTHANAGAR,
WARD NO.22,



DEVANAHALLI - 560 110.
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT.

13. VENUGOPAL M.S.
AGED 79 YEARS,
S/O M.S. SIDDALINGAIAH,
R/O NO.1069, 16TH MAIN
7TH CROSS, 1ST STAGE,
BTM LAYOUT,
BENGALURU-560 029.

14. SMT LEELAVATHY
AGED ABOUT 77 YEARS,
W/O A MOHAN RAJ,
R/O NO.103, 3RD CROSS,
7TH BLOCK,
KORAMANGALA LAYOUT,
BENGALURU-560095

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. R.S. HEGDE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING,
VIKASA SOUDHA,
DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
FINANCE DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,



BENGALURU-560 001.

3. THE KARNATAKA HOUSING BOARD,
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
3RD AND 4TH FLOOR,
CAUVERY BHAVAN,
KEMPEGOWDA ROAD.
BENGALURU - 560 009.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. BOPANNA BELLIAPPA, AGA FOR R1 AND R2
SRI. H.L. PRADEEP KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO) ISSUE WRIT OF
CERTIORARI, ORDER OR DIRECTION TO QUASH THE
IMPUGNED ORDER/ENDORSEMENT 11.06.2025. VIDE
ANNEXURE-A AND IMPUGNED ORDER/ENDORSEMENT 27/28-
11-2024 VIDE ANNEXURE-B BOTH ISSUED BY RESPONDENT
NO.1 AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN



ORAL ORDER

Petitioner Nos.2 to 14 are said to be the former employees of Karnataka Housing Board (Respondent No.3) and petitioner No.1 is said to be an Association formed by the retired employees of Karnataka Housing Board.

2. Respondent No.3 has been established under the provisions of the Karnataka Housing Board Act, 1962. The said Act has been enacted with the object of providing quality and affordable housing accommodation to all sections of the Society.

3. It is submitted that respondent No.3 has come up with a scheme for allotting houses to its employees and has allotted sites to them on preferential basis. The grievance of the petitioners is that the same facility has to be extended for them also. As the same is not done, the present writ petition is filed.



4. Respondent No.3 prays for dismissal of the writ petition on the ground that acceding to the demands of the petitioner is not financially viable.

5. Respondent Nos.1 and 2 - State also supports the contention of respondent No.3.

6. Apart from the submissions made by the contesting parties, there is a larger question that requires to be answered. That is whether the present employees or earlier employees can be treated on a preferential basis by respondent No.2 and by treating them as a class by themselves can it allot sites to them on preferential basis.

7. As already mentioned above, the Karnataka Housing Board Act has been enacted with the object of providing quality and affordable housing accommodation to all sections of the society. It is not a profit making organization. It can acquire land without consent from common man by paying compensation. That can be utilized only for a public purpose. That is for allotting sites



to persons in the society without discrimination, if they do not have an already existing site. The object is to provide a necessary house for everyone in the society who do not have a house. Respondent No.3 should avoid allotting sites to persons who already own a house or a site and take steps to discourage purchase of houses through respondent No.3-Society for speculative purposes. That is the reason why when site is allotted by respondent No.3 or other similarly placed authorities like Bengaluru Development Authority, there exist a condition that, first a lease-cum-sale agreement is entered into, where it is mandated that a person has to put up a construction within a period of two years from the date of allotment and after a lapse of 10 years only the absolute sale deed is executed. Further, guidelines are also laid down as to how the sites are to be allotted or by way of lottery, subject to the applicant satisfying all other conditions.



8. When such is the object of the Karnataka Housing Board Act, 1962, the employees or ex-employees in the Board cannot be considered as a class of themselves and it does not amount to a reasonable classification as contemplated under Article 14 of the Constitution of India. They would be entitled for allotment of a site only along with a common man or general public. For that reason, the request of the petitioners cannot be granted.

The Writ Petition is accordingly ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(M.I.ARUN)
JUDGE**

KA
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 32
CT: SG