



PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA

Sub: Approval to the project proposal of M/s GM Infinite Dwelling India Pvt. Ltd. to establish "Integrated Township with Tech Park, Shopping Mall, Hospitals, In-House Residential Apartments and Clubs etc." at Doddakannalli Village, Bengaluru East Taluk, Bengaluru Urban District.

- Read:** 1. Government Order No. CI 132 SPI 2017, dated 06.06.2017.
2. Proceedings of the 58th State High Level Clearance Committee (SHLCC) meeting held on 18.04.2022.

-:0:-

Preamble:

State High Level Clearance Committee (SHLCC) in its 47th meeting held on 20.04.2017 has approved the project proposal of M/s GM Infinite Dwelling India Pvt. Ltd., to establish "Integrated Township with Tech Park, Shopping Mall, Hospitals, In-House Residential Apartments and Clubs etc." with an investment of Rs.4795.90 crore, in 73 acres 24 guntas of land at Doddakannalli Village, Bengaluru East Taluk, Bengaluru Urban District and accordingly Government Order vide (1) above was issued.

Company vide its letters dated 14.09.2021 & 02.12.2021 has stated that they have taken following effective steps to implement the project and reason for delay:

1. The total extent of 73 Acres 24 guntas of land in various sy no's 1/1, ½, 1/3, ¼, 1/5, 3/1, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4, 4/5, 5/1, 5/2, 5/8, 5/10, 7, 103/1, 104/1a, 104/1b, 105/1, 105/2, 105/3, 110/2, 111, 112, 113/1, 113/2, 114, 115/1, 115/2, 115/3, 115/4, 115/5, 116/1, 116/2, 116/3, 116/4, 116/5, 116/6, 116/7, 116/8, 116/12, 116/13, 116/14, 116/15, 116/16, 116/17, 116/18, 116/19, 116/20, 116/21, 116/22, 90/4, 90/5, 90/6, 90/7, 90/10, 90/11, 88/6, 118/1, 122, 123/1, 117/2, 117/3, 117/4, 117/5, 117/6, 119 all situated at Doddakkanahalli Village, Varthur Hobli, Bengaluru East Taluk, Bengaluru Urban District.
2. Out of above, land parcel of 20.17 acres are purchased and registered in the name of the company in various sy no's of 114, 105/3, 105/2, 105/1, 113/2, 116/7 [116/18], 116/8 [116/21], 116/5 [116/22], 111, 117/4 [117/2], 116/13, 116/4, 110/2, 113/1, 90/5, 5/1, 116/6, 117/1 now 117/3, 117/2, 112, 7, 103/1, 5/2, 4/1, 5/8, 7, 5/2 & 4/2.

3. The land parcels intended to be purchased for the project are owned by multiple persons in the area with small bits, scrutiny of the title documents and measurements by digital survey had consumed considerable time.
4. Further, it is stated that the land parcels abutting the lake in the said project are affected by the NGT order and only after the said NGT order was quashed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, company could make the progress in buying the remaining land parcels.
5. It is stated that due to the NGT Order dated 04.05.2016 holding that no development or construction activities be carried out within 75 - meter from the lake buffer zone has caused inordinate delay.

NGT order was set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court wherein the Supreme Court had overruled the National Green Tribunal's order of having a 75 - meter lake buffer zone by holding that 30 Meter buffer Zone as prescribed by the RMP was held valid vide its Judgement dated 05.03.2019 and The company has a big relief of the Project.

6. There was considerable delay of about 2 years in purchase of land parcels due to COVID-19 and prevailing Pandemic infections, subsequent lock downs and restrictions
7. The company has tied-up with an international company by duly signing the term sheet for establishing a software tech park of international standard in the project with substantial investment
8. The project will provide employment opportunity to more than 5 lakh educated and skilled youths.
9. The subject land is in the Industrial Hi-tech Zone as per the Master Plan 2015 of BDA.
10. It is stated that the subject land parcels are abutting the mega development of IT corridors and parks namely RMZ Tech Park and Embassy Tech Park, Wipro Corporate Office and also abutting Boganahally and Kaikondarahally villages falling under the Hi-Tech Industrial zones wherein KIADB was the Approving Authority for Plan sanction and construction activities and the Project land parcels are also coming under Industrial Hi-Tech zone and abutting the above. Hence the company has requested to consider the KIADB shall be the approving authority for the sanction plan and all construction activities for the present project also.

Company has stated that the present project shall be developed within the prescribed norms and guideline of the National Green Tribunal and competitive Authorities in the implementation of the Project.

Letter have been sent from KUM to the Commissioner, BDA on 19.01.2022 seeking opinion on the NGT order & request of company to consider KIADB as the Planning authority for plan approvals etc since the subject land is adjacent to KIADB land.

Letter has been sent from KUM to CEO, KIADB on 19.01.2022 seeking opinion on the request of company to consider "KIADB to act as the competent authority for approval of the development plan & building plan for their project".

Letter has been sent from KUM to M/S Lex Plexus, Advocates/ Legal Counsel on 19.01.2022 seeking opinion on the NGT order dated 04.05.2016 & subsequent decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 05.3.2019 & its applicability on the subject matter of M/S GM Infinite Dwelling (India) Pvt. Ltd.

The Law firm M/S Lex Plexus, Advocates/ Legal Counselhas opined as follows:

Since various builders / developers and other stake holders were aggrieved by the said order dated 04.05.2017 passed by the NGT, the same was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 5016 of 2016 along with other connected matters and the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its Order dated 05.03.2019 set aside the order dated 04.05.2016 passed by the NGT, in O.A. No.222/2014.

Thereafter, the Commissioner, Bhruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike (BBMP) vide Office Order dated 19.03.2019, bearing No.HeNiNaYo/PR/1084/2018-19 has clearly stated that the buffer zone prescribed by the NGT has been set aside and set that while issuing plan sanctions, etc, the existing RMP rules are to be followed.

Hence, since the buffer zones as stated by the NGT have been set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is the buffer limits as per the revised RMP 2015 that is in force as on date.

In view of the same, M/s. GM Infinite Dwelling (India) Pvt. Ltd has no impediment to acquire the lands by taking 30 mtrs. As buffer zones for lakes and hence a reasonable time limit maybe fixed for M/s CGM Infinite Dwelling (India) Pvt. Ltd. to acquire the land, while granting any extension of time for completion of the project.

Subjects are placed for discussion in the LAC that amendment request for Extension of time by 3 years to implement the project & KIADB to act as the competent authority for approval of construction plans

Recommendation of 93rd LAC meeting held on 02.03.2022:

Representative of Company has requested for approval of the following:

1. Change of activity from “Integrated Township with Tech Park, Shopping Mall, Hospitals, In-house Residential Apartments & clubs etc” to “Industrial Tech Park for IT / ITES”.
2. KIADB to be the Competent Authority for layout plan and Building Plan approval
3. Extension of time by 3 years to implement the project.

The Committee noted the opinions of:

1. M/s Lex Plexus, Advocates / Legal Counsel submitted on 03.02.2022 that the NGT order dated 4.5.2016 & subsequent decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 05.3.2019, the company has no impediment to acquire the lands by taking 30 mtrs as buffer zones for lake
2. In response to letter sent to Commissioner, BDA on 19.01.2022, BDA vide its letter dated 02.03.2022 has opined as follows:-

“As per zoning regulations of RMP-2015 maximum area required for Integrated Township is 40 hectares (100 acres) and in subject proposal, the extent of land is less than 100 acres and it can be rejected.

The committee deliberated on the request of company that KIADB to be the Competent Authority for layout plan and building plan approval.

CEO & EM, KIADB has opined that KIADB has in the past, in few cases on the approval of SLSWCC /SHLCC has considered such requests.

In the Industrial Policy 2020-2025 Column 8.1 2.1.3 regarding the Private Industrial Parks the following facts are to be noted.

- The private developer can acquire land for development of sectoral parks in own land for development of Industrial Parks subject to compliance of land use pattern in the approved Master Plan by LPA.
- KIADB bye laws to be followed across all Integrated / Multi / Sectoral / Logistics in Industrial Park & facilities.

In the Industrial Policy **Column 8.1 2.1.3.3** regarding Approvals / Permissions

- SLSWCC/SHLCC permit sublease of lands by Private developers, while approving the project.

- Layout plans / Master Plan shall be approved by KIADB and the developer may take up phase-wise development and shall carry out plot allotments only after basic infrastructure facilities have been implemented. Building plan for individual units will be approved by KIADB.

Further the Committee noted that this is the first private industrial tech park project proposal being considered under Karnataka Industrial Policy 2020-25.

In view of the above facts, the committee resolved to recommend the following requests of company to SHLCC:

1. Change of activity from "Integrated Township with Tech Park, Shopping Mall, Hospitals, In-house Residential Apartments & clubs etc" to "Industrial Tech Park for IT / ITES".
2. Extension of time by 3 years to implement the project.
3. With regard to the request of the company that KIADB should act as the competent authority for layout plan and building plan approval, the Committee resolved to seek directions of the SHLCC as this is first such case after the New Industrial Policy came into force and any decision taken in this case will become a precedent for all future cases.

ಮುಂದುವರೆದಂತೆ, ನಗರ ಯೋಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರ ರವರ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಬೆಂಆಪ್ರಾ/ನಯೋಸ/ ಜಿವಿಟಿ-491/ 19937/2021-22, ದಿನಾಂಕ 04.03.2022 ಪತ್ರ ಪಡೆಯಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ವಿವರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

1. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಗರ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಯೋಜನಾ ಕಾಯ್ದೆ 1961 ಕಲಂ 2 ರ 7 (a) (i) ರನ್ವಯ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಯೋಜನಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವು ಯೋಜನಾ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಬೃಹತ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಹಾನಗರ ಪಾಲಿಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊರತುಪಡಿಸಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಕ್ಷೆ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುವ ಸಕ್ಷಮ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.
2. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಗರ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಯೋಜನಾ ಕಾಯ್ದೆ ಕಲಂ 76 M ರನ್ವಯ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇ ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಗರ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಯೋಜನಾ ಕಾಯ್ದೆ 1961 ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಮತಿ ಪಡೆಯದೇ ಇತರೆ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಪಡೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದೇ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಅಂತಹ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನು ಸಮ್ಮತವಾಗಿ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಗರ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಯೋಜನಾ ಕಾಯ್ದೆ 1961 ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಡೆಯಲಾಗಿರುವ ಅನುಮತಿಯು ಉರ್ಜಿತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

3. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸರ್ವೋಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಅಫೀಲ್ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 9684/2011 ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಂತರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಯ ವಿಮಾನ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಯೋಜನಾ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಬಿರ್ಲಾ ಸೂಪರ್ ಬಲ್ಡ್ ಟರ್ಮಿನಲ್ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿನ ಆದೇಶದ ಉದ್ಧೃತ ಭಾಗವು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

The Planning Authority constituted under KTCP Act is entrusted with the functions of granting approval for any development on the land within its jurisdiction including the land acquired and allotted by the Board under KIAD Act. Per contra, the enactment of KIAD Act is to make special provision for securing the establishment of the industrial area in the State and for that purpose to establish Industrial Areas Development Board. The provisions of both the Acts make the intention of the legislature very clear. As rightly submitted by the learned senior counsel for the appellant that if there are two possible interpretations of an enactment, one should avoid the construction which would reduce the legislation to futility and should rather accept the broader interpretation. A statute is designed to be workable and the interpretation there of by the court should be to secure that object. In so far as the "industrial area" allotted by KIADB, the interpretation given by the High Court to the provisions of KTCP Act would render the existence of the planning Authority like the appellant to futility.

While on the one hand, the High Court has directed the first respondent to obtain permission from the Planning Authority under KTCP Act and that the appellant-Authority to scrutinize those plans only to ensure that they are in conformity with the Regulations etc. At the same time, the High Court is saying that the appellant - Authority cannot collect the betterment fees. In our considered view, such findings are contradictory to each other and cannot be sustained.

The High Court held that KIAD Act being a Special Act, the same will prevail over KTCP Act which is a General Act. KTCP Act is applicable to all the developmental activities in respect of any land coming within the area of Outline Development Plan (ODP) and the lands in question even though situated in industrial area comes within the area of ODP of the Planning Authority. The developmental activities over the said land have to be carried on only with the permission of the Authority and both the enactments have to be harmoniously construed so as to give effect to each of the Acts enacted by the State Government.

The question to be considered in this regard is whether KIAD Act is a special enactment and KTCP Act a general Act and whether the maxim "Generalia Specialibus Non Derogant" is applicable as held by the High Court. Rule of interpretation says that a statute is best interpreted when we know why it was enacted, which can be seen from the preamble of an Act. As discussed earlier, as per the preamble of the KIAD Act, it is an Act to make special provision for securing the establishment of industrial areas in the State of Karnataka and generally to promote the establishment and orderly development of industries therein. KTCP Act on the other hand, as we have pointed out earlier, was enacted to provide for the regulation of planned growth of land use and development and

for the making and execution of town planning schemes in the State of Karnataka.

Thus, considering the legislative intent of the two enactments, it is seen that there is nothing in the KIAD Act to destroy the authority of the Appellant which has its own assigned role to perform under the provisions of the KTCP Act. Considering the object and purpose for which both the Acts were enacted, there is no inconsistency or overlapping between the two enactments and the power of authorities constituted under the Acts. As the areas of operation of KIAD Act and KTCP Act are wholly different, there is no question of applicability of the maxim Generalia Specialibus Non Derogant.”

ಮುಂದುವರೆದು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡವಾಣಿ / ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಯೋಜನೆ / ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಕ್ಷೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡುವಾಗ ಕೆರೆ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ/ ನಾಲಾಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಫರ್‌ಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕುರಿತಂತೆ RMP-2015 ರ ವಲಯ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯ ಕ್ರಮ ವಹಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ನಂತರ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಯ ಹಸಿರು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಂಡಳಿಯ (NGT) Original Application No.222/2014ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ:04.05.2016 ರಲ್ಲಿ ನೀಡಿರುವ ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ ಕೆರೆ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ / ನಾಲಾಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಫರ್‌ಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು.

ಸದರಿ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಯ ಹಸಿರು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಂಡಳಿಯ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸರ್ವೋಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಅಫೀಲ್ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ:5016/2016, ದಿನಾಂಕ 05.03.2019 ರಲ್ಲಿ set aside ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಚಾಲ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ದಿನಾಂಕ 25.06.2007 ರಂದು ಅನುಮೋದನೆಯಾಗಿರುವ RMP-2015ರ ವಲಯ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಕೆರೆ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ / ನಾಲಾಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಫರ್‌ಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡವಾಣಿ/ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಯೋಜನಾ ನಕ್ಷೆ / ಕಟ್ಟಡನಕ್ಷೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಯೋಜನಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಬಡವಾಣಿ ನಕ್ಷೆ / ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಯೋಜನಾ ನಕ್ಷೆ / ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಕ್ಷೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ನೀಡುವ ಶಾಸನಾತ್ಮಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಈಮೂಲಕ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ವಿಷಯ ಮುಂಡಿಸಿದೆ.

KIADB letter dated 16.03.2022

KIADB vide its letter dated 16.03.2022 has provided opinion as follows.

The said is a private property and not a part of KIADB layout or KIADB acquired properties. Hence KIADB is not authorized to sanction the building plans for the said property. Also the proceedings of the Govt. of Karnataka dated 17.09.2021 does not recommend the organization to follow KIADB Zonal Regulations in any clause. The said property belongs to the BDA limits, hence the competent authority to sanction the development plan and the building plan is Bangalore Development Authority.

The proposal of the Company placed in the 58th State High Level Clearance Committee (SHLCC) meeting held on 18.04.2022 for discussion and decision. The

Committee noted the details of the project proposal and after detailed discussion resolved to approve the project proposal of M/s GM Infinite Dwelling India Pvt. Ltd.

Government has examined the recommendations made by the 58th SHLCC Meeting, in all aspects.

Hence the following order.

GOVERNMENT ORDER No. CI 161 SPI 2022, BENGALURU, DATED 13.06.2022

Government is pleased to accord approval for the following proposals of M/s GM Infinite Dwelling India Pvt. Ltd.,

- 1. Change of activity from "Integrated Township with Tech Park, Shopping Mall, Hospitals, In-house Residential Apartments & clubs etc" to "Industrial Tech Park for IT / ITES".*
- 2. The company to approach local planning authority/ Bangalore Development Authority for layout plan and building plan approvals for the project.*

All other terms and conditions indicated in the Government Order CI 132 SPI 2017, dated 06.06.2017 read at (1) above, remain unaltered.

By Order and in the name of the
Governor of Karnataka,

H. Nagarathnamma.
(NAGARATHNAMMA .G) 13/6/2022
Desk Officer (Technical Cell),
Commerce & Industries Department.

To,

1. Principal Accountant General (G&SSA), Karnataka, New Building, 'Audit Bhawan', Post Box No. 5398, Bengaluru.
2. Principal Accountant General (E&RSA), Karnataka, New Building, 'Audit Bhawan', Post Box No. 5398, Bengaluru.
3. Principal Accountant General (A&E), Karnataka, Park House Road, Post Box No. 5329, Bengaluru.
4. Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Finance Department, Vidhana Soudha, Bengaluru.
5. Additional Chief Secretary to Government, ITBT & ST Department, MS Building, Bengaluru.

6. Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Energy Department, Vikasa Soudha, Bengaluru.
7. Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Water Resource Department, Vikasa Soudha, Bengaluru.
8. Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Forest, Ecology & Environment Department, M.S. Building, Bengaluru.
9. Principal Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, M.S. Building, Bengaluru.
10. Secretary to Government, Commerce & Industries Department, Vikasa Soudha, Bengaluru.
11. Commissioner for Industrial Development and Director of Industries and Commerce, Khanija Bhavan, Race Course Road, Bengaluru.
12. Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, Vanijya Therige Karyalaya, Gandhi Nagar, Bengaluru-09.
13. Managing Director, Bengaluru Electricity Supply Company Ltd., (BESCOM), Bengaluru.
14. Member Secretary, Karnataka State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB), 49, Church Street, Parisara Bhavan, Bengaluru.
15. Chief Executive Officer & Executive Member, Karnataka Industrial Area Development Board, Khanija Bhavan, Race Course Road, Bengaluru.
16. Director (Technical Cell), Commerce & Industries Department, Vikasa Soudha, Bengaluru.
17. Additional Director (P&P), Directorate of Industries & Commerce, Khanija Bhavan, Race Course Road, Bengaluru.
18. Managing Director, Karnataka Udyog Mitra (KUM), Khanija Bhavan, Race Course Road, Bengaluru.
19. PS to Hon'ble Minister for Large and Medium Industries, Vidhana Soudha, Bengaluru.
20. PS to Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Commerce & Industries Department, Vikasa Soudha, Bengaluru.
21. M/s. GM Infinite Dwelling India Pvt. Ltd., No.06, G.M.Peal, 1st Stage, 1st Phase, BTM Layout, Bengaluru-68.
22. Guard File / Spare Copies.

