

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).10294-10298/2009

(From the judgement and order(s) dated 24/10/2008 in CRP No.58/2005,dated 24/10/2008 in CRP No.538/2005,dated 24/10/2008 in CRP No.809/2005,dated 24/10/2008 in CRP No.831/2005,dated 24/10/2008 in CRP No.1059/200 of The HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE)

SPL.LAQ.OFFR.BANGALORE DEVT.AUTH.& ANR Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

A.L.NANJAREDDY ETC. Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for substituted service and office report)

Date: 25/08/2011 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATNAIK

For Petitioner(s) Mr. S.K. Kulkarni,Adv.
Mr. M. Gireesh Kumar,Adv.
Mr. Ankur S. Kulkarni,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

In terms of the signed order, the special leave petitions are disposed of.

1

(O.P. Sharma) (M.S. Negi)
Court Master Court Master
(Signed order is placed on the file)

2

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NO. 10294-10298 OF 2009

Special Land Acquisition Officer,
Bangalore Development Authority & Anr. etc. ... Petitioners

Vs.

A.L. Nanjareddy etc. ..Respondents

O R D E R

We find that the High Court has directed calculation of interest in terms of Gurpreet Singh v. Union of India - 2006 (8) SCC 457 and payment thereof.

2. The petitioner contends that certain execution petitions in land acquisition matters were closed between 1995 to 2000 on full payment being made; and that those cases could not be re-opened for awarding interest on solatium, after the decision in Sunder v. Union of India - 2001 (7) SCC 211. But we find that the execution petitions were not closed by entering full satisfaction. On the other hand they were closed subject to the result of CRP No.83 of 1997. It is not in dispute that CRP No.83/1997 was disposed of in terms of the judgment in Sunder v. Union of India.

Therefore we find no reason to interfere with the impugned
3

order of the High Court. Special leave petitions are disposed of accordingly as the order of High Court does not call for interference.

.....J.
(R V Raveendran)

New Delhi;
August 25, 2011.

.....J.
(A K Patnaik)