IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 2025

PRESENT
THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
AND
THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO
WRIT APPEAL No.893 OF 2023 (LA-KIADB)

BETWEEN:

THE SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER-II BMICP,
THE KARNATAKA INDUSTRIAL
AREAS DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
ARAVINDA BHAVAN, 1ST FLOOR,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BANGALORE – 560 001.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. CHANDRASHEKAR P.V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI RAMAIAH
S/O POOJAIAH

SINCE DEAD
REPRESENT BY HIS LRS

1(a) SMT. LAKSHMAMMA,
WIFE OF RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS,

1(b) SRI. R.RAMESH
SON OF RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,

1(c) SMT. KAMALA,
DAUGHTER OF RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,

Digitally signed by PAVITHRA B
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

1(d) SRI.R.RAGHU,
SON OF RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,

1(e) SRI.R.ASHOK RAJ,
SON OF RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,

ALL ARE RESIDING AT NO.1,
4TH CROSS, 2ND MAIN ROAD,
B.K.NAGAR, YESHWANTPURA,
BENGALURU – 560 022.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY TO HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
M.S.BUILDING, BANGALORE – 560 001.

3. SRI. DHARANESH
S/O RANGAIAH ALIAS PAPAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
R/AT OBALAPURA VILLAGE AND POST,
THYAMAGONDLU HOBLI,
NELAMANGALA TALUK,
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT – 562 123.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.S.G.HEGDE, ADVOCATE FOR R-1(a) TO R1(e);
SMT. SHWETHA KRISHNAPPA, AGA FOR R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER IMPUGNED DATED 21/04/2023 PASSED IN WP.No.8763/2023 BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN SO FAR AS DIRECTING TO REFER THE MATTER U/S 73 OF THE 2013 ACT AND TO PASS SUCH OTHER ORDER/s INCLUDING THE AWARD OF COSTS.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
AND
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN)

Respondent No.1 Ramaiah had filed W.P.No.8736/2023 before this Court and the same was allowed by an order dated 21.04.2023. Against the said order the KIADB has preferred the present appeal.

2. Respondent No.1 Ramaiah died during the pendency of the present appeal, his legal heirs have already been brought on record. Now, the legal representatives of respondent No.1 have decided to withdraw the said writ petition to reach an amicable settlement before the Land Acquisition officer with regard to payment of compensation.

3. The legal representatives of respondent No.1 have filed a memo for withdrawal of the writ petition. Memo is allowed. Accordingly the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

4. The present Writ Appeal does not survive for consideration. therefore, the Writ Appeal is disposed of.

SD/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE

SD/-
(DR.K.MANMADHA RAO)
JUDGE

PB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 53