

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION No. _____/2016

PRESENTATION FORM

Serial No.

Address for service

Poovayya & Co.
Nalina Mayegowda
Advocates and Solicitors
The Estate, Level One,
No. 121, Dickenson Road,
Bangalore- 560 042
9845172446

BETWEEN

Namma Bengaluru Foundation

AND

State of Karnataka and others

Sl.No	Description of Paper Presented	Court fees Affixed on the Paper	
1.	On Memorandum of Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.		
2.	On Process Fee		
3.	On Vakalath		
	TOTAL		

Number of Copies Furnished
Served

Other side

Presented by


Advocate for Petitioner

Received Paper with
Court-fee labels as

above

Advocate's Clerk

Date: 06.10.2016

Bengaluru

Receiving Clerk

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE
Writ Petition No. / 2016

BETWEEN:

Namma Bengaluru Foundation **....Petitioner**
And
State of Karnataka and others **...Respondent**

INDEX

Sl. No.	Description	Page No.
1.	List of Dates and Synopsis	1-2
2.	Memorandum of Writ Petition	3-20
3.	Verifying Affidavit	21
4.	ANNEXURE - A - Compilation of newspaper reports describing the Project	22-26
5.	ANNEXURE - B - Copy of the Application filed under RTI to UDD, by the Petitioner	27
6.	ANNEXURE - C - Copy of the Application filed under RTI to UDD, by the Petitioner	28
7.	ANNEXURE - D - Copy of the Application filed under RTI to UDD, by the Petitioner	29
8.	ANNEXURE - E - Copy of the Reply received on the RTI to UDD along with translation copy	30-34
9.	ANNEXURE - F - Copy of the Reply received on the RTI to UDD along with translation copy	35-39
10.	ANNEXURE - G - Copy of the Reply received on the RTI to UDD along with translation copy	40-44
11.	ANNEXURE H to H12 Series - Compilation of news paper reports that have recorded public dissent to the Project, including independent representations submitted in this regard	45-57
12.	ANNEXURE J - Copy of the letter sent by the Chief Minister, Government of Karnataka to the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India dated 08.01.2016.	58-59
13.	ANNEXURE K - Copy of the letter sent in reply by the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India to the Chief Minister, Government of Karnataka dated 25.01.2016.	60
14.	Vakalathnama along with Authorisation.	61-62

Bengaluru

Advocate for Petitioners

Date:06.10.2016

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE

Writ Petition No. / 2016

BETWEEN:

Namma Bengaluru
Foundation

....Petitioner


And

State of Karnataka and
others

...Respondent

LIST OF DATES

Sl. No.	Date	Event
1.	March 2014	Karnataka state government announces construction of steel fly over in its 2014-15 budget.
2.	September 2015	A tender floated by Bangalore Development Authority for identifying and appointing an enterprise for the construction of the Steel flyover the project.
3.	08.01.2016	Hon'ble Chief minister writes a letter to Urban Development, Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation to sanction funds for steel flyover.
4.	25.01.2016	Hon'ble Urban Development Minister replies to the Hon'ble Chief Minister letter dated 08.01.2016.
5.	14.07.2016	RTI applications made by the petitioner to




		furnish information regarding the steel fly over.
6.	18.07.2016	Reply by UDD to RTI applications.
7.	September 2016	Appeal filed to RTI response by the UDD.
8.	October 2016	Prospective date for foundation ceremony of the Steel Fly over.

BRIEF FACTS

The Petitioner has filed this writ petition, in public interest, challenging the actions the Respondents in proposing the construction of six lane elevated road from Basaveshwara Circle to Hebbal flyover (to be constructed in Steel) via Le- Meridian and Mekhri Circle, in the city of Bengaluru, by Bangalore Development Authority at an estimated cost of over Rs. 1800 Crores (herein after, the "Project"; elaborated in detail below), as per public domain information. However, the Respondents have not kept available the information pertaining to the Project inasmuch that critical information regarding the Project such as the Detailed Project Report, Feasibility Report and details regarding the financing for the Project etc., for scrutiny by citizenry. This is notwithstanding the lack of public consultation on the Project and concerns as to feasibility raised by the several experts in Urban Planning. Being apprehensive of arbitrary and improper administrative actions being initiated by the Respondents at the cost of State's natural resources and public monies, the Petitioner has preferred the instant writ petition.

Bengaluru

Date: 06.10.2016



Advocate for Petitioner

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE**(Original Jurisdiction)****Writ Petition No. / 2016****Between:**

Namma Bengaluru Foundation
A registered public charitable trust
Having its registered office at
No. 3J, N.A. Chambers
7th C Main, 3rd Cross, 3rd Block
Koramangala,
Bengaluru- 560 034
Represented by its Authorised Signatory
Shri. Sridhar Pabbisetty

Petitioner**And:**

1. State of Karnataka
Represented by the Chief Secretary to Government
Vidhana Soudha
Dr. Ambedkar Veedhi
Bangalore 560 001
2. The Principal Secretary to Government
Urban Development Department
Vikasa Soudha
Dr. Ambedkar Veedhi
Bangalore 560 001
3. The Commissioner
Bangalore Development Authority
T. Chowdaiah Road
Kumarapark West
Bengaluru - 560020
4. Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike
Corporation Building, NR Square
Bangalore-560 002
Represented by its Commissioner
5. Engineer-in-Chief



4

Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike
Corporation Building, NR Square
Bangalore-560 002


6. Comptroller and Auditor General of India
Pocket – 9, Deen Dayal
Upadhyay Marg
New Delhi- 1101024

Respondents

**MEMORANDUM OF WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

The Petitioners above named most respectfully submit as follows:

1. The Petitioner has filed this writ petition, in public interest, invoking the Public Trust Doctrine, assailing the actions the Respondents in proposing the construction of six lane elevated road from Basaveshwara Circle to Hebbal flyover (to be constructed in Steel) via Le- Meridian and Mekhri Circle, in the city of Bengaluru, by Bangalore Development Authority at an estimated cost of over Rs. 1,800 Crores (herein after, the "**Project**"; elaborated in detail below), as per public domain information. The Petitioner is particularly aggrieved by the apparent and unrequited secrecy maintained by the Respondents inasmuch that critical information regarding the Project such as the Detailed Project Report, Feasibility Report and details regarding the financing for the Project etc., are not made available for scrutiny by citizenry. The Petitioner is further aggrieved by actions taken by Respondent towards implementing the Project, which evidently appear to be illegal, arbitrary and irrational, and hit by procedural impropriety.



2. The Petitioner, Namma Bengaluru Foundation, is a public charitable trust with the objectives of, *inter alia*, assisting and participating in developmental activities for the general public of Bengaluru. The Petitioner aims to serve the people by proactively participating in and addressing various problems faced by Bangalore and its citizens, through advocacy, partnership and activism. The Petitioner is actively involved in hosting various public awareness programmes such as fire safety awareness, water conservation awareness, garbage segregation and waste management, etc. to promote civic awareness amongst general public. The Petitioner has also filed various public interest litigations before this Hon'ble Court pertaining to rampant encroachment of public lands in the city of Bangalore and the State of Karnataka and also pertaining to illegal occupation and developments in and around the lakes in the city of Bangalore, causing deleterious effect to such lakes and to the general well being of the public.

The Project

3. The Petitioner understands that the Cabinet of Ministers, Government of Karnataka, have recently accorded their approval for the construction of a 6.7-kilometre-long steel flyover from Basaveshwara Circle to Hebbal, to connect Kempegowda International Airport and other areas of the city. The estimated cost of the project is about Rs.1,800/- crore (an increase from the initial budget of Rs. 1,350/- Crores) and is expected to be completed within 24 months from the date of commencement of the Project. It is further reported that the flyover will be built using about 55,000 tonnes of steel. As per public domain information, the state




objective of the Project is to ease the vehicular traffic congestion en route the Kempegowda International Airport, at Hebbal. A compilation of newspaper reports describing the Project is produced herewith as **Annexure A Series**.

4. The Petitioner further understands from public domain information that pursuant to a tender floated by Bangalore Development Authority, Respondent No.3 herein, in September 2015 to identify and appoint an enterprise for the construction of the said flyover, Larsen and Toubro Ltd (L&T) has been declared the successful bidder for the Project.

Concerns regarding the Project

5. It is submitted that the proposed steel flyover or the Project, suffers from lack of public consultation and has not been pursued by the Respondents in a democratic/transparent manner. An illustrative list of the chief concerns of the Petitioner regarding the Project are as follows:


- a. **Lack of access to information:** Although public domain information is replete with statements given by office bearers regarding the Project, critical details such as feasibility, financial viability and practicality of the Project are not available for public examination. The Petitioner learns from publications made in the media that in fact, an email id that was allegedly advertised by Respondent No.3 for receiving comments on the Project from members of public has been erroneous, effectively scuttling the process of public debate on the Project. In this regard, the



7


Petitioner submits that the Petitioner had made three(3) specific applications to the Authority Concerned, under the Right to Information Act, 2005 on 14.07.2016, seeking details relating to the Project such as Feasibility Report, Detailed Project Report, Details of Public Discussions, details of Environment Impact Assessments conducted in regard to the Project, details of notice inviting tender or decisions on tender published and work orders (if any), to name a few. Copies of the RTI Applications made by the Petitioner dated 14.07.2016 are produced herewith as **Annexure B**, **Annexure C** and **Annexure D**, respectively. However, despite specific queries made by the Petitioner, the Authority Concerned has refused to respond to each of them on evasive grounds. Copies of the Responses afforded by the Competent Authority dated 18.07.2016 is produced herewith as **Annexure E**, **Annexure F** and **Annexure G**, respectively.

- b. **Feasibility of the Project:** It is submitted that ever since the announcement of the Project; the same has attracted substantial objections from general public and experts in the field of infrastructure developments. The fact that there is no material available in public domain to indicate consideration of alternative options or efficiency of the Project raises serious questions as to the feasibility of the Project. Further, a section of the society has raised concerns regarding the potential adverse impact to the environment as there are reliable reports in



newsprint to indicate a potential uprooting of about 812 trees in the route, where the steel flyover is planned. The proposed steel flyover is being constructed against the advisory of the Directorate of Urban Land Transport (DULT) with regard to building of elevated corridors. No material is made available by the Respondents relating to consultation of experts on the subject. Needless to mention, the vigorous attempt made by the State of Karnataka to expend exorbitant sums of money in what turns out to be perhaps an *ad hoc* transpiration arrangement seems to be demonstrably excessive and arbitrary. Further, public domain information suggests that projects similar to the Project under discussion, have not been significantly cost-effective and therefore, there has is nothing that is disclosed by the Respondents to indicate a fair, objective and reasoned consideration for the implementation of the Project. A compilation of news paper reports that have recorded public dissent to the Project, including independent representations submitted in this regard, is produced herewith as **Annexure H Series**.

- c. **Economic repercussions for the Project:** At an estimated cost of Rs. 1800 crores, it appears that the State Government does not have a clear funding plan for the Project. Pursuant to a separate RTI application requesting for records from BDA on the Project, it has emerged that a request made by the Chief Minister, Government of Karnataka to the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India to undertake partial burden of the Project cost has



been turned down by the Government of India. A copy of the letter sent by the Chief Minister, Government of Karnataka to the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India dated 08.01.2016 is produced herewith as **Annexure J**. A copy of the letter sent in reply by the Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India to the Chief Minister, Government of Karnataka dated 25.01.2016 is produced herewith as **Annexure K**. Notwithstanding the above, certain experts have opined that the Project cost has overpriced and the same Project could be implemented at a cost 40% less than the estimated cost. Given the lack of certainty on the funding system to be adopted by the Respondents for the Project and an evident increase in the cost of the Project from its original plan, has certainly raised concerns as to transparency and accountability of the State in implementing the Project, when the larger public discourse, albeit reported as public statements, seem to suggest that the entire Project is being steered by the Steel lobby.

d. Logistics and practical issues/arbitrary approach:


The Petitioner learns that the Respondents have identified certain parcels of land appurtenant to the proposed flyover for acquisition, for the installation of the Steel Bridge. However, despite the tender for construction being awarded to an enterprise, lands as required for the project have not been acquired and history has indicated that invariably, in most infrastructure projects where the land required for

acquisition is not acquired at the time of commencement of the project, such projects are eventually abandoned only leading to a situation of excessive state spending of tax payers' money for no real/tangible benefit.

- e. **Aesthetics of the existing city plan to be adversely affected:** As the Project appears to require lands across the Central Business District of Bengaluru, it would not only impair the existing aesthetics of structures such as *Vidan Soudha*, palace road, historical buildings and may also affect the clear view of the Basaweshwara statue at basaweshwara circle etc., to name a few.

The Petitioner craves leave of this Hon'ble Court to produce material in support of the above concerns and more, that are likely to rise, during the course of the proceedings.

6. It is submitted that given the substantial Project cost indicated by Respondents, and in view of the unyielding secrecy maintained by the Respondents in debating the Project in public domain, it is only natural for the citizenry to be apprehensive about the responsible expending of the Project cost, necessarily warranting higher scrutiny of the accounts maintained by the State, particularly by an independent agency such as the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.
7. The Petitioner further learns that the Project has not been subjected to the scrutiny of independent and constitutional authorities such as the Bengaluru Metropolitan Planning




11

Committee (BMPC) but has, however, been placed before the Bangalore Vision Group, an independent arbitrarily elected body for town planning, whose constitution, among others, is challenged by this Petitioner and another in WP No. 31791/2016 before this Hon'ble Court and is pending consideration of this Hon'ble Court.

8. It is in this background and the overwhelming lack of clarity around the Project, involving substantial public money, that the Petitioner has moved this Hon'ble Court for the reliefs claimed here under, apprehending the suggested commencement of the Project during October 2016.


GROUNDS

9. That it is trite law that administrative action is subject to judicial review on three grounds, namely, (i) illegality, (ii) irrationality, and (iii) procedural impropriety. Where the allegation is that the public authority is guilty of non-performance of its public duty and it is shown that it has failed to perform its constitutional or statutory duty in rational manner, this Hon'ble Court can issue a mandamus to compel performance of a duty and can also examine the propriety and correctness of the decision making process of the administrative wing of the State.
10. That in the absence of public consultation and debate on matters of public development and significance undertaken by the State, any action taken by the State ought to necessarily be subject to higher thresholds to check for



arbitrariness and malice. In the instant Petition, the proceedings initiated by the Respondents, particularly Respondent No.1 and 3, Project has been apparently taken in haste is severely hit by impropriety and arbitrariness, as demonstrated *supra*.

11. That in order to avoid scrutiny of the Project by the Bengaluru Metropolitan Planning Committee (BMPC), established under the Constitution of India, the Respondents have deemed it prudent to place the Project for discussion and debate by the Bangalore Vision Group or the Bangalore Blue Print Action Group, that comprises of mostly private members, nominated without any democratic method of elections. Therefore, subjecting a project of this magnitude to the scrutiny of an extra-constitutional authority and not placing it before the BMPC, grievously undermines the democratic mandate and the Constitution of India.
12. That the Supreme Court of India in *Star Enterprises v. CIDC (1990) 3 SCC 280* has held that the State or its instrumentality entering commercial field must act in consonance with rule of law.
13. That although the project that is being developed by Respondents is ostensibly a flyover, it is, in reality, nothing but a large real estate project. It is noted that the project is not beneficial to the day to day commuters but it is just a project which benefits the steel manufacturing company and the company to which the tender has been allotted. The lack of transparency in the Project, only compels one to believe that the natural resources, i.e., the roads and




other public lands that are to be acquired for the project, are being blatantly misused by the State, detrimental to public interest. As a consequence, it is only appropriate that the Project is scrapped out in its entirety to weed out the vice.

14. That the Supreme Court of India in *Centre for Public Interest Litigation* [(2012) 3 SCC 1] referring to the intrinsic worth of spectrum stated as follows:

"75. The State is empowered to distribute natural resources. However, as they constitute public property/national asset, while distributing natural resources the State is bound to act in consonance with the principles of equality and public trust and ensure that no action is taken which may be detrimental to public interest. Like any other State action, constitutionalism must be reflected at every stage of the distribution of natural resources. In Article 39(b) of the Constitution it has been provided that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community should be so distributed so as to best subserve the common good, but no comprehensive legislation has been enacted to generally define natural resources and a framework for their protection. Of course, environment laws enacted by Parliament and State Legislatures deal with specific natural resources i.e. forest, air, water, coastal zones,"


15. That in view of the apprehensions regarding transparency and propriety of the Project, the Petitioner duly lodged applications under the Right to Information Act, 2005 in order to ascertain the factual background surrounding the Project. However, despite the efforts taken by the Petitioner in ascertaining the factual background, the same has been



rendered ineffective, as the competent authority has rejected the applications on evasive and ill-founded grounds. Therefore, the refusal to share information pertaining to the Project has increased the Petitioner's concerns regarding the Project.


16. That the Respondents, before going about with the project ought to have extensively consulted with members of general public considered the consequence and adverse impact on the environment and traffic congestion at different junctions due the said project. That the Supreme Court of India in *Dinesh Trivedi v. Union of India*, (1997) 4 SCC 306 has held that in modern constitutional democracies, it is axiomatic that citizens have a right to know about the affairs of the Government which, having been elected by them, seeks to formulate sound policies of governance aimed at their welfare.

17. That in the case of *S.P. Gupta v. Union of India* [1981 Supp SCC 87] , decided by a seven-Judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court of India, the Apex Court added a fresh, liberal dimension to the need for increased disclosure in matters relating to public affairs. In that case, the consensus that emerged amongst the Judges was that in regard to the functioning of Government, disclosure of information must be the ordinary rule while secrecy must be an exception, justifiable only when it is demanded by the requirement of public interest. The Court held that the disclosure of documents relating to the affairs of State involves two competing dimensions of public interest, namely, the right of the citizen to obtain disclosure of




information, which competes with the right of the State to protect the information relating to its crucial affairs.

18. That the Supreme Court of India in *Dinesh Trivedi v. Union of India*, (1997) 4 SCC 306 has held that to ensure the continued participation of the people in the democratic process, they must be kept informed of the vital decisions taken by the Government and the basis thereof. The Apex Court further held in this decision that democracy, therefore, expects openness and openness is a concomitant of a free society.
19. That the Supreme Court of India in *S. Subramaniam Balaji v. State of T.N.*, (2013) 9 SCC 659 while considering whether the Comptroller and Auditor General of India has a duty to examine expenditures even before they are deployed held that the Comptroller and Auditor General of India is a constitutional functionary appointed under Article 148 of the Constitution and his main role is to audit the income and expenditure of the Governments, government bodies and State-run corporations. The Apex Court has further held that the CAG also examines the propriety, legality and validity of all expenses incurred by the Government.
20. That a constitutional bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its decision rendered in *Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Assn. v. Union of India*, (1993) 4 SCC 441 has held that Courts will be extremely slow in exercising its extraordinary powers to issue a writ of mandamus compelling performance of a certain duty unless it is fully satisfied that the executive has totally



omitted to pay attention to its constitutional obligation and needs to be awakened from its slumber.

21. That the doctrine of "full faith and credit", which holds that the acts done by the officers and presumptive evidence of regularity of official acts done or performed, is apposite in faithful discharge of duties to elongate public purpose and to be in accordance with the procedure prescribed.
22. That the Supreme Court of India has in *Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Assn. v. Union of India*, (1993) 4 SCC 441 held that the judiciary, under the Constitution, is designed to be an intermediary body between the people on the one side and the executive on the other. It has further held that in order to keep the executive/legislature within the limits assigned to their authority under the Constitution, the interpretation of laws is the proper and peculiar province of the judiciary. It is trite law that the Constitution is the "will" of the people whereas the statutory laws are the creation of the legislators who are the elected representatives of the people. Where the will of the legislature — declared in the statutes — stands in opposition to that of the people — declared in the Constitution — *the will of the people must prevail*.
23. That the respondents have other viable routes which can be developed at the less cost and will serve the airport and the people better.
24. That without prejudice, the authority of the Respondent No.3 to issue such a Notification, for the construction of the steel flyover is bad in law and in excess of its powers.




25. The above grounds are urged without prejudice to one another. The Petitioners crave leave of this Hon'ble Court to urge additional grounds at the time of hearing.

GROUND FOR INTERIM PRAYERS

26. That the Petitioner has already made an application under the RTI Act to the Competent Authority for necessary information and the same has been unreasonably refused by the Competent Authority. As mentioned *supra*, the Petitioner has already preferred a statutory appeal against the said order. Given that the refusal to share information on the Project appears to be *prima facie* motivated by lack of transparency, in the event the interim reliefs as sought for in the Writ Petition are not granted, the same may both frustrate the final prayer in the Writ Petition and the Petitioner's attempt to pursue the Appeal under the RTI Act and procure necessary information.


27. That if the steep escalation of the Project cost even before the implementation of the Project is any indication, in view of there being a successful bidder identified for the Project, commencement of the Project would certainly indicate immediate disbursement of public funds, to the detriment of public interest.

28. That the construction of the flyover is scheduled to start from in the month of October 2016. However, no specific date is made available by the Respondents. Given the overwhelming doubts as regards transparency in the Project, should the construction of the flyover commence,



the same would lead to significant loss of public money, without any scope for recovery.

29. That in case the construction/acquisition of lands by the Respondent is not stayed, the same would result in irreparable damage to the environment, change in topography of the area, traffic congestion, destruction of existing underpass and overpass, critically affect the aesthetic value of the city and also affect all to the residents of Bengaluru.
30. The Petitioners crave leave to raise additional grounds at the time of hearing and submits that the aforesaid grounds are raised without prejudice to one another.
31. No writ or any other proceedings have been initiated by the Petitioner on the same cause of action before this Hon'ble Court or any other Court, Forum or Tribunal.
32. Court fees of Rs. 100/- has been paid on this petition.
33. That this Hon'ble High Court has the necessary jurisdiction to entertain the present writ petition since, the project and land in question is lying within the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court.
34. The Petitioner submits that for the reliefs sought in the instant Petition, the Petitioner does not have any alternative, efficacious remedy apart to this Petition.



PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Petitioners most respectfully pray that this Hon'ble Court, in public interest, may be pleased to:

- (a) Issue a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ or order, the Project, i.e., the construction of six lane elevated road from Basaveshwara Circle to Hebbal flyover (to be constructed in Steel) via Le- Meridian and Mekhri Circle, in the city of Bengaluru, by Bangalore Development Authority.
- (b) Pass such other orders and further orders as may be deemed necessary in the facts and in the circumstances of the case.

INTERIM PRAYERS

Pending consideration of this writ petition, this Hon'ble Court be pleased to:


- (a) Pass an order staying all activity under and pursuant to the Project, i.e., the construction of six lane elevated road from Basaveshwara Circle to Hebbal flyover (to be constructed in Steel) via Le- Meridian and Mekhri Circle, in the city of Bengaluru, by Bangalore Development Authority;
- (b) Direct Respondent No.3 to forthwith call for a due, deliberate and effective public consultation on the Project and submit a report on the recommendations recorded in the public consultation, before this Hon'ble Court; and
- (c) Direct Respondent No.6 to forthwith conduct an audit of the books of account of Respondent No.3,



particularly with regard to monies received and cost incurred by Respondent No.3, in respect of the Project, i.e., the construction of six lane elevated road from Basaveshwara Circle to Hebbal flyover (to be constructed in Steel) via Le- Meridian and Mekhri Circle, in the city of Bengaluru, by Bangalore Development Authority, and submit

- (d) Pass such other orders and further orders as may be deemed necessary in the facts and in the circumstances of the case.

Bengaluru
06.10.2016


Advocate for Petitioner
for **Nalina Mayegowda**

Address for service:
Poovayya & Co.
Advocates & Solicitors
The Estate - Level One
121 Dickenson Road
Bangalore 560 042
080-41156777

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
(Original Jurisdiction)

Writ Petition No. _____/2016

BETWEEN:

Namma Bengaluru Foundation

PETITIONER

AND

State of Karnataka & Ors.

RESPONDENTS

VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT

I, Sridhar Pabbisetty, son of P S Adilakshmi Narayana, aged 37 years, residing at 282, 11th B Cross 3rd Main, 1st Block, BEL Layout, Vidyaranyapura, Bengaluru - 560097 , Karnataka do hereby solemnly affirm and state as under:-

1. That I am the authorized signatory of the Petitioner herein, in the writ petition and I am well acquainted with all the facts and circumstances of the case and as such I am competent to swear to this affidavit.
2. I state that the contents of the Writ Petition in paragraphs nos. 1 to 34 are true to my knowledge derived from the records of the case and last paragraph is prayer to this Hon'ble Court.
3. I state that the Annexures "A" to k annexed to the Writ Petition are true copies of their respective originals.


Verification

I, the deponent herein, do hereby verify and declare that this is my true name and signature and what is stated above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.


Bangalore

Date: 06/10/16

Identified by me


Advocate

For Namma Bengaluru Foundation


**Authorized Signatory
Deponent**

ANNEXURE - 'A'

- 22 -

BDA to call tenders for steel flyover

Bosky Khanna Bengaluru, Sep 2, 2015, DHNS

Tenders for the most awaited and talked about project of Bangalore Development Authority (BDA), the Chalukya Circle steel flyover, will be called for within a week's time.

The BDA had kept the tendering process on hold following protocol after Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike (BBMP) elections were announced. The civic body had aimed to start the construction in May 2015, but has been struggling with the finance.

"We will be calling for tenders for the project within a week's time. It was earlier delayed because of the BBMP elections. The delay will not affect the cost of the project and it will be same as the government has taken a decision on this," BDA Engineer Member P. N. Nayak told Deccan Herald.

This is one of the most ambitious projects of the BDA as it is the first of its kind in the City. The BDA has prepared the maps for the flyover and is presently getting its papers in order for the tender process. They have estimated a cost of Rs 1,200 crore for the 6.9 kilometre-long steel flyover.

The BDA will be acquiring 55,000 tonne of steel for this project and the two existing magic boxes on Sankey Road will be removed. Traffic from the Indira Gandhi Musical Fountain, Vidhana Soudha, Golf Club, High Grounds, Freedom Park, Sankey Road and surrounding areas will move towards Hebbal to ensure smooth connectivity to the international airport.

The BDA was hoping for funds under the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JnNURM), which did not materialise, causing further delay, Nayak added. The authority then decided to call for tenders. The file was also sent to the Union government in January 2015 as the Centre had shown interest in the project.