

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

WRIT APPEAL NO. 944 OF 2024 (LA-BDA)

C/W

WRIT APPEAL NO. 926 OF 2024 (LA-BDA)



IN WA No. 944/2024:

BETWEEN:

SMT AMMAYAMMA
W/O LATE G KRISHNAPPA
SINCE DECEASED BY HER LRS.,

1. SMT GANGAMMA K
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
W/O PUTTA SWAMAYYA T G
D/O AMMAYAMMA
R/AT NO 63/1, KENGERI ROAD,
TAVAREKERE, BENGALURU 562130.
2. SMT KOMALA K
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
W/O SHIVAKUMAR, D/O AMMAYAMMA
R/AT NO 69, GATE RANGAMMA LAYOUT
SHANTHINAGAR, ACHARYA COLLEGE ROAD,
CHIKKABANAVARA POST
BENGALURU 560090.
3. SRI K MUNIRAJU
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
S/O LATE AMMAYAMMA
R/AT NO 15, GUBBALALA
SUBRAMANYAPURA POST



BENGALURU 560061.

4. SMT SARALADEVI
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
W/O H C SRINIVAS
D/O LATE AMMAYAMMA
R/AT MADDURAMA NILAYA
SIMHADRI LAYOUT, MASEEDI ROAD,
UTTARAHALLI, SUBRAMANYAPURA POST
BENGALURU 560061
5. SMT MADHUKUMARI K
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
W/O RAJANNA
D/O LATE AMMAYAMMA
R/AT HIPPE ANJANEYA TEMPLE ROAD,
NELAMANGALA TOWN, TUMKUR ROAD,
NELAMANGALA 562123
6. SRI MAHESH KUMAR K
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
S/O LATE AMMAYAMMA
R/AT NO 15, SUBRAMANYAPURA POST,
GUBBALALA, BENGALURU 560061.
7. SMT MEENARANI K
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
W/O H K LOKESH
D/O LATE AMMAYAMMA
R/AT NO 60/1, 1ST CROSS,
SHAKAMBARI NAGARA
SARAKKI, BENGALURU 560076

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. SIDDHARTH SUMAN., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
VIKASA SOUDHA, VIDHANA VEEDHI,
BANGALORE 560001.
2. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD, K P WEST,
BANGALORE 560020.
3. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD, K P WEST,
BANGALORE 560020.
4. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
(LAND ACQUISITION)
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T CHOWDAIAH ROAD
K P WEST, BANGALORE 560020
5. SRI. V SRINIVASA MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 89 YEARS,
S/o. LATE VASANTHACHAR
R/AT B No. 109, VALLABAHANILAYA,
DODDALASANDRA, 2ND STAGE,
BANGALORE-560 062.
- 5(a) LAKSHMI NARASAMMA
R/AT B No. 109, VALLABAHANILAYA,
DODDALASANDRA, 2ND STAGE,
BANGALORE-560 062
- 5(b) SREEVATHSA
S/O LATE V.SRINIVASAMURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,

R-5(a) & 5(b) ARE R/AT B No. 109,
VALLABAHANILAYA, DODDALASANDRA,
2ND STAGE, BANGALORE-560 062.

6. SRI. B SIDDAPPA
AGED ABOUT 81 YEARS,
S/O LATE BETTE GOWDA
R/AT No. 46, GUBBALALA VILLAGE,
SUBRAMANAPURA POST,
UTTARAHALLI HOBLI,
BANGALORE - 560 061
7. SRI.B M NAGARAJU
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA
8. SRI. CHETHAN
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
S/o. SRI. B. M. NAGARAJU
9. SRI. B M CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
S/o. LATE N MUNIYAPPA
10. SRI. B M MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
S/o. LATE N MUNIYAPPA

SL.No.7 TO 10 ARE
RESIDING AT VAJARAHALLI VILLAGE,
UTTARAHALLI HOBLI,
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK - 560062

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MOHAMMED JAFFER SHAH, AGA FOR R1;
SRI. SACHIN B.S., AVOCATE FOR R2 TO R4;
VIDE ORDER DATED:2.6.2024, NOTICE TO R5(a),
R5(b) & R6 TO R10 ARE DISPENSED WITH)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 08.04.2024 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE COURT IN W.P No. 10331/2013 (LA-BDA) DISMISSING THE SAID WRIT PETITION FILED BY THE APPELLANTS IN SO FAR AS IT RELATES TO THE LANDS OF THE APPELLANT AND TO CONSEQUENTLY ALLOW THE WRIT PETITION No. 10331/2013 (LA-BDA) FILED BY THE APPELLANT IN SO FAR AS RELATES TO THE LANDS OF THE APPELLANT COMPRISED IN Sy. No. 36/1 MEASURING 17 GUNTAS (INCLUDING 01 GUNTA KHARAB) OF

GUBBALALA VILLAGE, UTTARAHALLI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK AS PRAYED FOR AND TO AWARD COSTS AND GRANT SUCH OTHER RELIEF(S) AS THIS HONBLE COURT DEEMS FIT AND EXPEDIENT IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE, IN THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

IN WA NO. 926/2024:

BETWEEN:

V SRINIVASA MURTHY
S/O LATE VASANTHACHAR,
SINCE DEAD BY LRS,

1(a) SMT LAKSHMI NARASAMMA,
W/O V SRINIVASA MURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 94 YEARS.

1(b) SREEVATHSA
S/O LATE V SRINIVASA MURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS.

BOTH ARE R/AT NO. 109,
VALLABHA NILAYA,
DODDALASANDRA, 2ND STAGE,
BENGALURU - 560062.

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. PARASHURAM R HATTARAKIHAL., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
VIKASA SOUDHA, VIDHANA VEEDHI,
BANGALORE -560001
2. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, K.P WEST,
BANGALORE 560020.
3. THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,

T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, K.P WEST,
BANGALORE 560020.

4. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
(LAND ACQUISITION)
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD, K.P WEST,
BANGALORE 560020
5. B SIDDAPPA
S/O LATE BETTE GOWDA
R/AT NO. 46, GUBBALALA VILLAGE,
SUBRAMANYAPURA POST,
UTTARAHALLI HOBLI,
BENGALRUU -61.
6. SMT AMMAYAMMA
W/O LATE G KRISHNAPPA,
SINCE DECEASED BY LRS,
- 6(a) SMT GANGAMMA K ,
W/O PUTTA SWAMAYYA T.G.
D/O AMMAYAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 63/1, KENGERI ROAD,
TAVAREKERE, BENGALURU - 562130.
- 6(b) SMT KOMALA K
D/O LATE AMMAYAMMA,
W/O SHIVAKUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 69, GATE RANGAMMA,
LAYOUT, SHANTHINAGAR,
ACHARYA COLLEGE ROAD,
CHIKKABANAVARA POST,
BENGALURU - 560090.
- 6(c) K MUNIRAJU
S/O LATE AMMAYAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 15, GUBBALALA,
SUBRAMANYAPURA POST,
BENGALURU - 61.

- 6(d) SMT SARALADEVI
W/O H C SRINIVAS,
D/O LATE AMMAYAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
R/AT MADDURAMMA NILAYA,
SIMHADI LAYOUT, MASEEDI ROAD,
UTTARAHALLI, SUBRAMANYAPURA POST,
BENGALURU -61.
- 6(e) SMT MADHUKUMARI K
W/O RAJANNA,
D/O LATE AMMAYAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
R/AT HIPPE ANJANEYA TEMPLE ROAD,
NELAMANGALA TOWN,
TUMAKURU ROAD,
NELAMANGALA,
BENGALURU RURAL DIST.
PIN 562123.
- 6(f) MAHESH KUMAR K
S/O LATE AMMAYAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 15, SUBRAMANYAPURA POST,
GUBBALALA, BENGALURU -61.
- 6(g) SMT MEENARANI K
W/O H K LOKESH,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 60/1, 1ST CROSS,
SHAKAMBARI NAGARA,
SARAKKI, BENGALURU -76.
7. B M NAGARAJU
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA,
8. CHETHAN
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
S/O B M NAGARAJU.
9. B M CHANDASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
S/O LATE N MUNIYAPPA,

10. B M MURTHY
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
S/O LATE N MUNIYAPPA,

R-13 TO R-16 ALL ARE
R/O VASARAJAHALLI VILLAGE,
UTTARAHALLI HOBLI,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK.

R-7 TO R-10 ARE
REPRESENTED BY THEIR PA HOLDER,
SRI. B.MUNIRAJU,
R/AT NO. 38/1, 21ST MAIN,
14TH CROSS, PADMANABHA NAGAR,
BENGALURU -70

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MOHAMMED JAFFER SHAH, AGA FOR R-1;
SRI. MURUGESH V CHARATI, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R4;
VIDE ORDER DATED:07.07.2024, NOTICE TO R5 TO R10
IS DISPENSED WITH)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER DATED 08.04.2024 PASSED BY THE LEARNED
SINGLE JUDGE IN WP No-10331/2013(LA-BDA) IN SO FAR
AS PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED AND CONSEQUENTLY
ALLOW THE WP FILED BY THE PETITIONERS AS PRAYED
FOR.

THESE APPEALS HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED
FOR JUDGMENT ON 04.11.2025, COMING ON FOR
PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE**
D K SINGH PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

CAV JUDGMENT

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

These two writ appeals arise out of the judgment and order dated 08.04.2024 passed in W.P.No.10331/2013 (LA-BDA).

2. Parties are referred to as per their ranking in the writ petition, for sake of convenience.

3. The petitioners' had filed the aforesaid writ petition seeking a declaration that the land acquisition proceedings in respect of the lands of the petitioners under the Preliminary Notification bearing No.BDA/SLAO/A4-PR:194/2002-03 dated 07.11.2002 published in the Official Gazette dated 21.11.2002, as Illegal and *void ab initio* and further that the petitioners' peaceful possession and enjoyment of the lands on the basis of the Final Notification bearing No.UDD/750/LAQ:2003 dated 09.09.2003 published in the Official Gazette on 10.09.2003 or on the basis of the Notification issued under Section 16(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, bearing No.BDA/SLAO/A5/PR/45/2006-07 dated

29.05.2007, should not be disturbed on account of lapsing of the scheme.

4. Petitioners claim to be the owners in possession of the following lands :-

Sl.No	Petitioners	Particulars of Land
1	Petitioner no.1 was Sri V.Srinivasamurthy, Petitioners (a) and (b) being wife and son	16 guntas in Sy.no.37 of Gubbalala village
2	Petitioner no.2 is B.Siddappa	6 guntas in Sy.no.36/2 of Gubbalala village
3	Petitioner no.3 is Late Smt.Ammayamma W/o Late G.Kirshnappa, Petitioners no.3(a) and (g) are his children	17 guntas in Sy.no.36/1 of Gubbalala village
4	Petitioners no.4, 6 and 7 are children of Late Sri B.M.Muniyappa and petitioner no.5 is son of petitioner no.4	23 guntas in Sy.no.33/1 and 13 guntas in Sy.no.33/2 of Gubbalala village

The Preliminary Notification dated 07.11.2002 was notifying 1,532 acres and 17 guntas of Lands comprised in 8 Villages viz., Vajrahalli, Hosahalli, Uttarahalli Manevartekaval, Bada Manevartekaval, Raghuvanahalli, Talaghattapura, Turahalli and Gubbalala for formation of "Further Extension of Banashankari VI Stage by linking existing VI Stage Layout through Kanakapura - Bangalore Main Road".

5. However, the Final Notification dated 09.09.2003 was notified for 750 acres including 142 acres and 1 gunta of Gubbalala Village. In the notification issued under Section 16(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, only 395 acres 37 guntas of lands including 39 acres 10 guntas of Gubbalala Village, was notified.

6. The Bangalore Development Authority (hereinafter referred to as '**the BDA**') in its statement of objections filed before the learned Single Judge stated that in respect of 657 acres 15 guntas of land, covered under Preliminary Notification, a resolution was passed permitting landowners to pay betterment charges and left out such lands from final notification. The petitioners have alleged that they were discriminated, while de-notifying the lands for being left out of acquisition by receiving betterment charges, inasmuch as their lands were not notified for receiving the betterment charges. The contention before the learned Single Judge was that if the scheme was not implemented within the statutory limit of 5 years from the date of the final notification, the scheme had lapsed in view of the provisions of Section 27 of the Bangalore Development Authority Act.

7. The learned Single Judge having considered the submissions, framed the following issues for determination in the writ petition:

- a. Whether petitioners would have locus standi or subsisting interest to maintain the petition?
- b. Whether the writ petition would be barred by the principle of *res judicata* / constructive *res judicata* ?
- c. Whether taking possession of the lands by the BDA, by drawing mahazar would be lawful?
- d. Whether the writ petition suffers from delay and laches?

8. The learned Single Judge held that the claim of the petitioners was based on the fact that the notified khatedar of Survey No.35/1 was Sri.G.B.Harsha and Sri.M.Jayarama in respect to Survey No.35/2A. The original khatedar, never challenged the land acquisition proceedings in respect of Survey Nos.35/1 and 35/2A and therefore, the petitioners would not have *locus standi* to challenge the inclusion of lands in Survey Nos.35/1 and 35/2A while filing the writ petition. Insofar as lands bearing Survey No.36/1, the learned Single Judge has held that Sri.G.Krishnappa, the owner of the land had executed gift deeds

on 21.10.2002 gifting three guntas to each of his five daughters and leaving two guntas for the purpose of the road prior to the Preliminary Notification dated 07.11.2002. Therefore, Sri.G.Krishnappa or his wife would not have any subsisting interest in the lands acquired. However, with the death of Smt.Ammayamma during the pendency of the writ petition, her legal heirs have come on record and therefore, insofar as the lands in Survey No.36/1 is concerned, the legal heirs of Ammayamma would have locus to challenge the land acquisition proceedings.

9. In respect of the writ petition being barred by the principle of *res judicata* / constructive *res judicata*, learned Single Judge has held that the earlier writ petitions were filed by the petitioners challenging the preliminary and final notifications for acquiring the lands. However, no relief was sought referring to the lapse of the land acquisition proceedings in the context of Section 27 of the BDA Act and therefore, the present writ petition wherein the declaration had been sought regarding lapse of the Land Acquisition proceedings in the context of Section 27 of BDA Act,

would not be hit by the principle of res judicata / constructive res judicata.

10. The learned Single Judge took note of the fact that government has granted approval for issuing final notification in respect of 750 acres of lands only and that the original scheme stood modified. Out of the 750 acres notified, the BDA had taken possession of 580 acres 18 guntas of lands, which were handed over for formation of layouts and carving 5,991 sites, out of which 4983 sites had been allotted, to indicate that there has been substantial implementation of the scheme. Therefore, the submission of the petitioners that lapsing of the scheme in the context of Section 27 of the BDA Act has not been found favour. Insofar as drawing nebulous mahazar is concerned, the learned Single Judge has held that the same has to be tested on the basis of totality of circumstances.

11. In the present case, the award was passed on 12.12.2003 in respect of the lands of the petitioners. Thereafter, the Special Land Acquisition Officer issued notice under Section 12(2) of the Land Acquisition Act on 30.12.2003 and on 08.12.2003 calling upon the owners of the lands to hand over possession on

14.01.2004 and 16.12.2004 respectively. The possession of petitioners' lands was taken by drawing mahazars and publishing notification under Section 16(2) of the Land Acquisition Act on 29.05.2007. The award amount was deposited before the Civil Court on 04.02.2005. The mutation was made in favour of the BDA in the record of rights on 02.01.2013, which would indicate virtually seamless flow of events of acquisition and that would also substantiate the stand of the BDA. The learned Single Judge has held that the mode and method of BDA taking possession of the petitioners' lands do not suffer from any irregularity or illegality. Further, the petitioners would be barred from raising the said issue while seeking declaration about lapsing of the scheme under Section 27 of the BDA Act. The learned Single Judge further held that the final notification was issued in the official gazette on 10.09.2003 and five years would expire in 2008, but the petition was filed on 25.02.2013 and no explanation was coming forth. Petitioners' claim that the cause of action for filing the writ petition would be entry of Engineers or Officials of BDA into the petitioners' land on 23.01.2013 was negated inasmuch as the relief sought was declaration regarding lapsing of the land

acquisition proceedings under Section 27 of BDA Act, for which the cause of action had arisen on 10.09.2008 itself. However, the writ petition was filed in the year 2013 without any explanation regarding delay and laches, the learned Single Judge was of the view that the writ petition would be liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

12. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners had submitted that the learned Single Judge vide judgment and order dated 11.04.2016 passed in Writ Petition Nos.57348-57350/2014 (LA-BDA) in respect of the same land acquisition proceedings. had quashed the land acquisition proceedings in respect of the petitioners in those writ petitions on the ground of a nebulous mahazar and the fact that the notification issued under Section 16(2) of the Land Acquisition Act was not produced. The Writ Appeal No.1759/2019 against the said judgment came to be dismissed vide judgment dated 24.02.2020 primarily on the ground of enormous delay and laches of 1104 days. The Supreme Court had dismissed the Civil Appeal No.5455/2024 and 5456/2024, which was filed against the judgment passed by the Division Bench. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of

that case the Supreme Court held that the BDA had reluctantly filed an intra Court appeal with delay of 1104 days and the Division Bench had primarily dismissed the appeal on the ground of inordinate and unexplained delay with some observations regarding failure of the BDA in taking possession of the lands or non-implementing of the scheme was also made. It was also observed that after the decision of the learned Single Judge until the intra Court Appeal was filed, some of the original owners had altered their position and third party rights were created and therefore, in view of the aforesaid facts the Civil Appeals were dismissed.

13. In another batch of Writ Appeals the Division Bench of this Court vide detailed Judgment and Order dated 03.04.2025 passed in Writ Appeal No.1026/2006 (LA-BDA) and connected writ appeals has upheld that land acquisition proceedings in respect of the same layout. The contention regarding the lapse of the scheme was specifically negated in paragraph Nos.31 and 32. It was held that the acquisition process was lawful, fair and necessary for urban planning. Paragraph Nos.31, 32 and 36 of the said judgment are extracted hereunder:-

"31. The betterment tax levied under Section 20 of the BDA Act on 657 acres 15 guntas of deleted land was a justified measure to ensure that those who benefited from the proximity of the developed layout contributed towards urban infrastructure improvements. The BDA had already incurred significant expenses on land leveling, drainage formation, and other development works, spending crores of rupees to implement the scheme. Furthermore, possession of 580 acres 18 guntas was lawfully handed over to BDA's Engineering section for layout formation, while the remaining land was delayed due to court-imposed stay orders. The appellants' claim that the acquisition lapsed under Section 27 of the BDA Act and Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resettlement Act, 2013, is untenable, as possession has already been lawfully taken and utilized for public development. Even the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Offshore Holdings Pvt. Ltd. v. Bangalore Development Authority [(2011) 3 SCC 139]**, has upheld that once substantial development has commenced, acquisition does not lapse, making the appellants' arguments legally unsustainable.

32. The procedural fairness of the acquisition process is further reinforced by the compliance with Sections 15 to 19 of the BDA Act. The development

scheme was prepared in strict accordance with Sections 15 and 16, and the Final Notification was issued after obtaining Government sanction under Section 18(3) of the BDA Act. Though the appellants have argued that they were denied a fair opportunity to present their objections, but this argument is factually incorrect, as public hearings were conducted, their objections were considered, and necessary modifications were made. The BDA Act does not mandate personal or oral hearings beyond the consideration of written objections, and this view is reaffirmed by a judgment of this Court in the case of ***D. Hemachandra Sagar v. State of Karnataka, (1998 SCC OnLine Kar 549)*** holding that, as long as a development scheme is prepared with broad compliance to Section 16 of the BDA Act, procedural sufficiency is maintained.

33.XXXXXXXX.....

34.XXXXXXXX.....

35.XXXXXXXX.....

36. Thus, the BDA's acquisition process was lawful, fair, and necessary for urban planning. The statutory process under the BDA Act, 1976, was rigorously followed, and all procedural safeguards were adhered to. The deletion of lands was based on rational considerations, and the public interest in urban expansion outweighs the individual interests

of the appellants. Given that the acquisition has already resulted in significant urban development, any interference at this stage would cause irreparable harm to public planning and infrastructure development. Accordingly, we are of the view that the BDA's acquisition is legally sound, and the appellants' claims requires to be dismissed in the interest of justice, equity, and public welfare. In that view of the matter, we proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

a) All these writ appeals namely, i) W.A.No.1026/2006, ii) W.A.No.1093/2006, iii) W.A.No.1116/2006, iv) W.A.No.1164/2006, v) W.A.No.1167/2006, vi) W.A.No.1312/2006, vii) W.A.No.1430/2006, viii) W.A.No.1844/2006 and ix) W.A.No.960/2007 filed by the appellants are dismissed.

b) Consequently, i) the order dated 06.06.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.2066/2004, ii) the order dated 06.06.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.2057 to 2065/2004, iii) the order dated 06.06.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.43126-43137/2003, iv) the order dated 06.06.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.54766/2003, 49850/2003, 48158/2003 & 51132/2003, v) the order dated 06.06.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.4147/2004, vi) the order dated 06.06.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.2057/2004, vii) the order dated 06.06.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in

W.P.No.2240/2004 viii) the order dated 29.08.2006 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.50611/2003 and ix) the order dated 14.03.2007 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.17452/2005, are hereby upheld. As a result, the acquisition proceedings are also upheld.

iii) All pending applications stand disposed of as a consequence."

14. Considering the aforesaid facts and the judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench, we are of the view, that no interference is called for in the impugned judgment and order dated 08.04.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge and thus, we ***dismiss*** the writ appeals.

No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(TARA VITASTA GANJU)
JUDGE

NG