Compulsory Land Acquisition, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development in India: Farmers' Rights, Livelihood Resilience and the Bidadi Township Case

Janhavi S S
Associate Professor
Dept of Studies & Research in Political Science
Karnataka State Open University
Mysuru
janhaviksou@gmail.com

Abstract

Land is a critical and finite resource for economic development, urbanisation, infrastructure, industrialisation and regional transformation. In a rapidly growing economy such as India, governments require land for transport networks, industrial corridors, housing, townships, technology-oriented developments and other public or strategic projects. Such projects can generate investment, employment, infrastructure and productivity gains, but compulsory acquisition can also impose substantial social, economic and environmental costs on affected communities. Loss of agricultural land may involve not only loss of property but also loss of livelihood, food-production capacity, social networks, cultural identity and long-term economic security. The central policy challenge is therefore to reconcile development requirements with inclusion, social justice and sustainable development.

This paper critically examines compulsory land acquisition in India from a sustainable-development and inclusive-growth perspective, with particular emphasis on compensation, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (R&R), Social Impact Assessment (SIA), livelihood restoration, food security and stakeholder participation. It analyses the Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township (GBIT) project at Bidadi as a contemporary case study of the tensions surrounding large-scale urban expansion and agricultural land acquisition. The Karnataka Cabinet approved the township over approximately 7,481 acres across nine villages, while the first phase notified in June 2026 covered approximately 518 acres across three villages. Contemporary reporting also documents continuing farmer resistance, legal proceedings and competing claims concerning the scale, process and compensation associated with the project.

The study indicates that monetary compensation alone cannot adequately address development-induced livelihood loss. The Bidadi case demonstrates that the economic viability of a development project is only one dimension of its sustainability; social legitimacy, stakeholder inclusion and the resilience of affected livelihoods are equally important. The paper argues for a shift from a narrow 'land acquisition and compensation' approach towards

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

a participatory development and livelihood-restoration framework in which affected communities are treated as stakeholders and partners in development.

Keywords: Compulsory Land Acquisition; Sustainable Development; Inclusive Growth; Bidadi Township; Greater Bengaluru; Farmers' Rights; Rehabilitation and Resettlement; Social Impact Assessment; Livelihood Security; Food Security; Urbanisation.

Introduction

Land is one of the most important resources in the development process. Infrastructure, industries, transport systems, housing, urban expansion and public institutions all require land. In India, rapid urbanisation and economic growth have intensified competition for land, particularly around major metropolitan centres. Land acquisition has consequently remained a significant policy issue because it brings together questions of development, property rights, compensation, displacement, livelihood security and social justice (Asif, 1999; Iyer, 2007).

Bengaluru represents a major example of this transformation. The expansion of the Bengaluru metropolitan region has generated increasing demand for residential, industrial, technological and infrastructure development. Areas surrounding the city have consequently become important locations for new urban and economic projects. However, urban expansion frequently takes place in areas where agriculture and allied activities remain important sources of livelihood. The conversion or acquisition of agricultural land can therefore create a difficult conflict between metropolitan growth and rural livelihood security.

The issue is particularly significant in the proposed Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township at Bidadi. The project has been presented by the government as a major development initiative intended to accommodate future urban and economic growth. At the same time, sections of the farming community have opposed the proposed acquisition, arguing that agricultural land constitutes their livelihood, family asset and social identity. Contemporary reporting indicates dependence in the area on agriculture and allied activities such as sericulture and dairy farming (Mohammed Yacoob, 2026; Kava, 2026).

The Bidadi case therefore provides a contemporary setting for examining a broader economic and governance question: can large-scale urban development be considered sustainable when its implementation involves substantial conversion or acquisition of agricultural land and generates resistance among affected communities? This question cannot be answered solely from the perspective of property law or economic growth. It requires consideration of social justice, sustainable development, stakeholder participation, livelihood security, environmental sustainability and the resilience of local economic systems.

While existing literature has examined land acquisition primarily from legal, compensation and displacement perspectives, this study approaches the Bidadi case by integrating sustainable development with stakeholder management, livelihood security and social legitimacy. This integrated approach is the principal analytical focus of the study.

Objectives of the Study

To evaluate Social Impact Assessment as an instrument of sustainable and participatory land acquisition.

To examine the relationship between agricultural land acquisition and food security.

To analyse the Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township at Bidadi as a contemporary case of development-induced land-acquisition conflict.

To identify the major challenges involved in balancing urban development with farmers' rights, livelihood security and inclusive growth.

Methodology

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design and is primarily based on documentary sources. The research draws upon primary legal and institutional materials, including the Constitution of India, the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (RFCTLARR Act), relevant government notifications, policies, reports, and judicial decisions and orders relating to land acquisition and the Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township at Bidadi. The RFCTLARR Act is particularly relevant because its statutory framework expressly links land acquisition with consultation, transparency, Social Impact Assessment, food-security safeguards and rehabilitation and resettlement (Government of India, 2013).

The Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township at Bidadi is examined as a case study to illustrate the practical challenges involved in balancing urban and infrastructure development with the livelihood, property, social and environmental concerns of affected communities. The analysis evaluates the case from a sustainable-development and stakeholder-management perspective, with emphasis on minimum displacement, meaningful participation, fair compensation, livelihood restoration, rehabilitation and resettlement, and long-term socioeconomic monitoring.

Land Acquisition, Development and Development-Induced Displacement

Land is a fundamental resource for economic development and plays an essential role in infrastructure, industrialisation, urbanisation, housing, transportation and regional development. Governments may therefore require land for highways, railways, airports, industrial projects, townships, power projects, public institutions and technology-oriented developments. Such projects can promote investment, employment, improved connectivity and economic growth. However, land differs from ordinary commodities because it has both economic and social value. For farmers and other land-dependent communities, land is not merely an asset with a market price; it is also a source of livelihood, family inheritance, social security and, in many cases, community identity (Fernandes, 1993; Iyer, 2007).

Compulsory land acquisition may become necessary where land is required for a legitimate public purpose and alternative arrangements are not reasonably available. However, developmental benefits do not automatically justify every acquisition. A sustainable approach requires authorities to determine whether the amount of land proposed is necessary, whether feasible alternatives have been examined, whether displacement can be minimised and whether affected landowners and other livelihood-dependent persons will receive fair compensation and effective rehabilitation and resettlement. Asif (1999) argues for a more participatory approach to acquisition, while the RFCTLARR Act seeks to institutionalise a humane, participative, informed and transparent process.

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

Land acquisition for development projects can result in development-induced displacement, which extends beyond physical relocation. It may involve loss of agricultural land, employment, businesses and other sources of livelihood, thereby creating economic displacement. It can also disrupt established social networks, community relationships and local institutions, while affecting cultural practices, ancestral connections and community identity. These consequences may increase economic vulnerability, particularly among small and marginal farmers, agricultural workers and other groups whose livelihoods depend directly on land (Fernandes, 1993; Sabar, 2010).

Therefore, compulsory land acquisition should be understood not simply as a transfer of property, but as a multidimensional process of development-induced change. A sustainable approach must balance developmental requirements with the rights and interests of affected communities through minimum displacement, fair compensation, meaningful participation, livelihood restoration and effective rehabilitation and resettlement. Compensation should not be treated as a complete substitute for the livelihood, social security and economic opportunities lost through acquisition.

Socioeconomic Impacts, Compensation and Rehabilitation

Compulsory land acquisition can have significant socioeconomic consequences for individuals, families and communities, particularly where people depend directly on land for their livelihood and economic security. The most immediate consequence is loss of livelihood, as farmers may lose their principal source of income following acquisition of agricultural land. Small and marginal farmers may subsequently become dependent on wage employment, self-employment or other uncertain sources of income, increasing the risk of landlessness and economic insecurity. The conversion of agricultural land may also reduce agricultural production and affect local employment and food-security conditions. Thus, the consequences of land acquisition extend beyond the loss of a physical asset and may affect the long-term economic security of affected households (Iyer, 2007; World Bank, 1994).

Land acquisition and displacement can also result in social and cultural disruption. Affected families may experience the loss of established social networks, community relationships, local support systems and access to institutions that have developed over generations. For farming communities, land is often associated with family history, traditional occupations, cultural practices and social identity. Such non-monetary losses are difficult to quantify and may have intergenerational consequences, particularly when families lose inherited agricultural assets, traditional occupations and opportunities to transfer agricultural knowledge. Therefore, assessment of land-acquisition impacts should consider not only immediate property loss but also effects on livelihood security, social cohesion, cultural identity and future economic opportunities (Sabar, 2010).

Although monetary compensation is an essential component of compulsory acquisition, one-time financial compensation may not by itself ensure long-term economic security. Affected families may face difficulties in generating regular income after losing productive agricultural assets, particularly when they lack alternative employment, business opportunities or the skills required to participate in an emerging urban economy. Consequently, compensation should be complemented by effective Rehabilitation and Resettlement (R&R) measures aimed at restoring or improving livelihoods. Such measures may include employment opportunities, skill development, transitional assistance, housing, access to essential social infrastructure and support for alternative income-generating activities.

Particular attention should also be given to agricultural labourers, tenants, sharecroppers and other livelihood-dependent persons who may experience economic losses without holding formal ownership rights over acquired land. A sustainable rehabilitation framework should therefore

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

recognise both landowners and other persons whose livelihoods are substantially affected by acquisition. The objective should be to ensure that affected households are not left economically or socially worse off and, wherever possible, are able to participate in the economic opportunities generated by the project.

A Social Impact Assessment can support this process by identifying major socioeconomic consequences and vulnerable groups before acquisition. Its findings should inform decisions concerning compensation, rehabilitation, livelihood restoration and possible alternatives. In this sense, compensation, R&R and stakeholder consultation should be treated as interconnected elements of responsible land-acquisition management rather than as separate administrative requirements.

The central principle is that development should not impose disproportionate and uncompensated socioeconomic costs on affected communities. This principle is particularly relevant to the Bidadi case, where the proposed conversion of agricultural land for large-scale urban development raises concerns regarding livelihood security, rehabilitation, economic transition and the long-term well-being of affected households.

Food Security and Agricultural Land

Agricultural land possesses a broader public value because it contributes not only to the livelihood of farming communities but also to food production and food security. Large-scale conversion of fertile agricultural land for urbanisation, industrial development and infrastructure may affect agricultural production, rural employment, agricultural livelihoods and local food systems. The issue becomes particularly significant in and around rapidly expanding metropolitan regions, where demand for residential, commercial and infrastructure development places considerable pressure on agricultural land.

From a sustainable-development perspective, land-use planning should recognise differences in the productivity and strategic importance of agricultural land rather than treating all land as economically equivalent. The RFCTLARR Act contains specific provisions concerning the protection of food security and places statutory attention on multi-cropped land and agricultural impacts (Government of India, 2013). Wherever feasible alternatives are available, development planning should therefore prioritise locations that minimise the conversion of productive agricultural land.

Protecting productive agricultural land is also an inclusion and resilience issue. Rural households may depend on farming not only for income but also for food, livestock, informal employment and local economic linkages. The loss of agricultural land can therefore weaken the resilience of an entire local economy rather than affecting only individual landowners. Sustainable urbanisation should consequently seek to accommodate development needs while preserving agricultural resources and livelihood systems wherever reasonably possible.

Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township at Bidadi: Case Study

Background

The Bidadi region, situated on the rapidly expanding metropolitan periphery of Bengaluru, has emerged as an important area for planned urban and economic development. The proposed Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township represents a major initiative aimed at accommodating future growth through planned urban expansion and the development of integrated residential, commercial, infrastructure and economic facilities.

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

For analytical clarity, this paper distinguishes the approved acquisition/project area from broader project-planning references. In May 2026, the Karnataka Cabinet approved implementation of the Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township over approximately 7,481 acres and 21.08 guntas across nine villages, with an estimated project cost of ₹18,133 crore. The government also announced an option for landowners to receive cash compensation or 9,693 square feet of developed residential plot against one acre (The New Indian Express, 2026a). Contemporary reports have also referred to a broader planning footprint of approximately 9,600 acres. Because these figures describe different aspects of the project, this paper uses approximately 7,481 acres when referring to the approved acquisition/project area and treats 9,600 acres as a broader planning reference.

The project has been presented as a means of promoting planned urbanisation, improving connectivity, creating employment opportunities and supporting new economic activities, including technology-oriented development. At the same time, contemporary reporting documents concerns among farmers and land-dependent communities regarding loss of agricultural livelihoods, compensation, displacement, consent and the long-term consequences of converting agricultural land (Kava, 2026; Mohammed Yacoob, 2026).

The Bidadi case is therefore significant for examining the relationship between metropolitan economic expansion and rural livelihood resilience. It illustrates how a project may be economically ambitious while simultaneously generating questions about inclusion, distribution of development benefits and the social legitimacy of acquisition.

Land-Acquisition Process and First-Phase Notification

The land-acquisition process has proceeded in phases. In June 2026, the Karnataka government issued a final notification for the first phase covering approximately 518 acres across three villages and affecting around 754 farmers. The first-phase notification represented a concrete transition from planning and acquisition proposals to implementation and intensified concerns among affected communities regarding compensation, livelihood security, rehabilitation and resettlement (Kava, 2026).

The scale and nature of the proposed acquisition are important because the economic value of agricultural land cannot be assessed solely through its sale price. The reported dependence of local households on agriculture, sericulture, dairy and related activities suggest that land acquisition may have multiplier effects on employment and local economic activity. This strengthens the case for assessing livelihood dependence and local economic linkages before irreversible acquisition decisions are implemented.

Farmer Resistance, Compensation and Judicial Developments

The acquisition process subsequently generated sustained protests. On 13 July 2026, a protest during a land-acquisition survey in Mandalahalli became confrontational, and survey officials were forced to leave the area. Contemporary reporting described the incident as involving villagers using brooms and stones and reported continuing opposition to the proposed acquisition (Express News Service, 2026). These events indicate that conflict over land acquisition can become intensified when affected communities perceive that their objections are not being adequately addressed.

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

The Karnataka High Court's July 2026 dismissal of a PIL challenging the acquisition notification was an important judicial development. The proceeding concerned the state's notification for acquisition associated with the approximately 7,400-acre township proposal. However, the dismissal should not be described as a judicial endorsement of every substantive aspect of the acquisition process. The legal development must therefore be distinguished from the broader social and procedural questions raised by affected communities.

The legal contestation continued in August 2026. The Karnataka High Court stayed further investigation against six farmers accused in a criminal case arising from the July survey protest. This was an interim procedural order and should not be treated as a final determination of the allegations.

Farmers opposing the project also publicised a report prepared by a panel headed by retired Supreme Court Judge Justice V. Gopala Gowda. The report, as described in contemporary reporting, alleged deficiencies in the acquisition process and called for withdrawal of the notifications. These are allegations advanced on behalf of the farmers and should not be presented as judicial findings (The Times of India, 2026).

Compensation has also remained central to the controversy. The government has publicly referred to compensation in the range of approximately ₹2.5 crore to ₹3 crore per acre, while earlier government announcements referred to cash compensation or developed-land alternatives (The New Indian Express, 2026a, 2026b). These figures represent publicly reported government positions and should not be presented as a uniform statutory entitlement applicable independently of the acquisition framework.

The contrasting positions indicate that the dispute cannot be reduced to the monetary price of land alone. It involves broader questions of livelihood security, agricultural sustainability, participation, rehabilitation, consent, environmental impacts and the distribution of development benefits. The case therefore highlights an important distinction between legal authority and social legitimacy.

The Bidadi Case from the Perspective of Economic Growth, Inclusion and Resilience

The Bidadi case can be examined through the interconnected dimensions of economic growth, social inclusion and resilience. From the economic perspective, the proposed township has the potential to promote planned urbanisation, strengthen infrastructure, attract investment, generate employment, support technology-oriented activities and contribute to regional economic growth. These potential benefits are consistent with the broader need to expand productive capacity and manage the spatial pressures created by Bengaluru’s growth.

However, economic growth alone is insufficient to establish sustainability. The project must also be assessed in terms of who bears its costs and who receives its benefits. Farmers, agricultural workers and local communities may bear concentrated costs through loss of land, employment, community networks and agricultural production, while wider urban populations and investors may receive dispersed benefits. This distributional dimension makes inclusion central to the evaluation of the project.

Resilience provides a further analytical dimension. A resilient development strategy should enable affected households to withstand the economic transition created by acquisition and to build sustainable alternative livelihoods. Compensation without livelihood restoration may provide short-term liquidity but may not create long-term resilience. Skill development, employment opportunities,

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

business support, transitional assistance and access to social infrastructure are therefore important complements to financial compensation.

Environmental sustainability must also be considered. Conversion of agricultural land and rapid urban expansion can increase pressure on water, vegetation, drainage, transport systems and other ecological resources. Sustainable development therefore requires an integrated assessment of economic benefits alongside social and environmental costs. The fundamental test should be whether the project generates a net sustainable public benefit while avoiding disproportionate burdens on affected communities.

Is Monetary Compensation Sufficient?

The Bidadi case raises a fundamental question about the meaning and adequacy of compensation in compulsory land acquisition. Although a substantial monetary payment may provide an immediate financial benefit to a landowner, it may not fully compensate for the long-term economic and social value associated with productive agricultural land. A farmer who receives compensation may simultaneously lose agricultural income, future appreciation of productive land, family employment opportunities, agricultural knowledge, social identity and the capacity to produce food.

The economic problem is therefore one of livelihood replacement rather than simple asset valuation. Compensation should be combined with measures that enable affected households to replace lost income and adapt to the emerging economic structure. Sustainable rehabilitation may require employment opportunities, skill development, support for entrepreneurship, transitional assistance, housing and access to social infrastructure. The objective should be to ensure that affected households do not experience a sustained decline in their standard of living.

The issue is also relevant to agricultural labourers, tenants and other persons who depend on farming without necessarily holding formal ownership rights. A compensation-centred model can overlook these groups. An inclusive approach should identify livelihood-dependent persons and provide appropriate rehabilitation and livelihood-restoration measures.

The RFCTLARR Act itself reflects this broader policy orientation by linking acquisition with rehabilitation and resettlement and by stating that affected persons should become partners in development with an improvement in their post-acquisition social and economic status (Government of India, 2013). The Bidadi case therefore illustrates why compensation should be understood as one component of a broader livelihood-restoration framework rather than as a complete substitute for the economic and social benefits previously derived from land.

Bidadi as a Stakeholder-Management Challenge

The Bidadi land-acquisition controversy represents a significant stakeholder-management and governance challenge because the proposed township involves stakeholders with different and sometimes conflicting interests. The Karnataka Government and development authorities seek planned urbanisation, infrastructure development, investment and economic growth, while farmers and landowners are primarily concerned with agricultural land, livelihood security, compensation and long-term economic interests. Agricultural workers and local communities may face loss of employment, disruption of social networks and changes in their local environment. Industries and investors have an interest in infrastructure and economic opportunities, while Bengaluru residents may expect improved connectivity, employment and urban facilities. Civil-society organisations may focus on social justice, environmental protection and the interests of affected communities.

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

A sustainable stakeholder-management framework for Bidadi should integrate stakeholder identification, Social Impact Assessment, meaningful consultation, examination of feasible alternatives, fair compensation and R&R, implementation, long-term monitoring and grievance redressal. The process should assess impacts on agricultural livelihoods, employment, food security, land use, vulnerable households and the environment while providing affected communities with meaningful opportunities to participate in project planning and decision-making.

Stakeholder management should also include transparent communication about the project's land requirements, master planning, development phases, compensation choices, rehabilitation arrangements and expected economic benefits. Where acquisition is necessary, affected households should be able to understand not only what they will receive but also how the project will address the loss of livelihood and social assets. Independent monitoring and accessible grievance-redressal mechanisms can strengthen accountability and reduce the risk that unresolved grievances will escalate into prolonged conflict.

Such a stakeholder-oriented approach can help balance urban development with farmers' rights, livelihood security, environmental protection and social justice, thereby strengthening the social legitimacy and long-term sustainability of the Bidadi township project.

Findings of the Study

The analysis confirms that land has both economic and social value. For farming communities, land functions not only as a productive asset but also as a source of livelihood, social security, family heritage and identity. Assessment of acquisition should therefore extend beyond immediate market value.

The analysis indicates that development-induced displacement has multidimensional socioeconomic consequences, including livelihood loss, economic insecurity, disruption of social networks and reduced intergenerational opportunities.

The study finds that monetary compensation alone cannot adequately address the long-term consequences of displacement. Sustainable rehabilitation requires livelihood restoration, employment opportunities, skill development, transition support and measures that strengthen long-term economic resilience.

The analysis establishes that Social Impact Assessment is an important instrument of sustainable land acquisition because it can identify socioeconomic consequences, livelihood dependence and vulnerable groups and can support consideration of alternatives before acquisition decisions become irreversible.

The analysis indicates that conversion of productive agricultural land creates concerns extending beyond individual landowners because it can affect agricultural production, rural employment, food systems and local economic linkages.

The Bidadi case demonstrates that inadequate or contested stakeholder engagement can contribute to resistance and prolonged conflict. The reported protests and continuing controversy highlight the importance of early consultation, transparent communication, participatory decision-making and effective grievance management.

The study establishes that legal authority alone does not ensure social legitimacy. Sustainable development also requires fairness, participation, livelihood protection, transparency, environmental responsibility and credible mechanisms for addressing grievances.

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

Overall, sustainable land acquisition requires an integrated approach combining minimum displacement, meaningful participation, fair compensation, livelihood restoration, environmental and food-security protection, long-term socioeconomic monitoring and stakeholder accountability.

Recommendations

Adopt the principle of minimum displacement.: The government should acquire only the minimum land necessary for the stated public purpose and examine feasible alternative locations, designs and development models wherever possible.

Strengthen Social Impact Assessment and public participation.: SIA should be evidence-based, transparent and completed before irreversible acquisition decisions. Affected farmers, agricultural workers and local communities should have meaningful opportunities to participate in consultation and decision-making.

Protect productive agricultural livelihoods.: Productive agricultural land should be acquired only where alternatives are demonstrably inadequate. Assessment should include the livelihood dependence of farmers, agricultural labourers and allied activities such as sericulture and dairy.

Move beyond compensation to livelihood restoration.: R&R should provide long-term livelihood security through employment, skill development, entrepreneurship support, transitional assistance, housing and necessary social facilities rather than relying only on one-time monetary compensation.

Adopt phased and sustainable development.: Large projects should be implemented in phases, with social, economic and environmental impacts reviewed before subsequent phases proceed. Phasing can also reduce the scale of immediate disruption and allow corrective measures.

Ensure independent monitoring and stakeholder accountability.: An independent mechanism should monitor compensation, R&R, livelihood outcomes, environmental safeguards and socioeconomic conditions of affected families while providing accessible grievance redressal and transparent reporting.

Link development benefits with affected-community participation.: Where feasible, affected households should have opportunities to participate in employment, enterprise, skill development and other economic activities created by the project. This can help convert affected communities from passive recipients of compensation into partners in development.

Conclusion

Compulsory land acquisition is an important instrument through which governments facilitate infrastructure, urbanisation and economic development. However, its legitimacy cannot be assessed solely through economic growth or legal authority. Land is simultaneously an economic resource, a livelihood asset and a social resource and, for many communities, an important component of cultural identity. Consequently, compulsory acquisition can generate consequences that cannot be adequately addressed through monetary compensation alone.

The Bidadi township case illustrates this tension clearly. The Greater Bengaluru Integrated Township is intended to contribute to planned metropolitan growth and new economic opportunities, while farmers and sections of civil society have raised concerns regarding agricultural land, livelihoods, displacement and the acquisition process. The first-phase acquisition of approximately 518 acres across three villages in June 2026, together with continuing controversy over the larger approved

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

acquisition area, demonstrates the complexity of balancing metropolitan development with rural livelihood security.

The legal developments in 2026 also demonstrate the need to distinguish judicial proceedings from broader questions of social legitimacy. The High Court's dismissal of a PIL was an important legal development, but it should not be characterised as a judicial endorsement of every substantive aspect of the acquisition. Subsequent proceedings and continuing public contestation show that legal authority and social acceptance are related but distinct dimensions of sustainable development.

The analysis therefore concludes that sustainable land acquisition requires minimum displacement, meaningful participation, fair compensation, livelihood restoration, environmental and food-security protection and long-term stakeholder accountability. These principles are closely aligned with the economic-conference theme of inclusion and resilience: development should expand economic opportunity while ensuring that the communities bearing concentrated development costs are protected and enabled to adapt.

The ultimate objective should not simply be to complete a project but to ensure that development generates net social welfare without imposing disproportionate costs on the people whose land and livelihoods make the project possible. The Bidadi case should consequently be understood not merely as a land-acquisition dispute but as a contemporary test of India's ability to pursue metropolitan economic growth while protecting farmers, livelihoods, food security, environmental sustainability and social justice.

References

Asif, M. (1999). Land acquisition act: Need for an alternative paradigm. *Economic and Political Weekly, 34*(24), 1564–1566.

Fernandes, W. (1993). Tribals, land, natural resources and displacement. *The Administrator, 38*, 19–38.

Government of India. (2007). *National rehabilitation and resettlement policy, 2007*. Ministry of Rural Development.

Government of India. (2013). *The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013*.

Indian Express. (2026, July 13). Villagers chase away Bidadi township survey officials with stones and brooms. *The Indian Express*. Article

Indian Express. (2026, July 20). Karnataka High Court dismisses PIL against land acquisition for Bidadi township. *The Indian Express*. Article

Indian Express. (2026, August 24). Court stays probe against Karnataka farmers who protested 7,400-acre township survey. *The Indian Express*. Article

Iyer, R. R. (2007). Towards a just displacement and rehabilitation policy. *Economic and Political Weekly, 42*(30), 3103–3107.

Jeyaraj, X. (2008). An SEZ with a defiance. *Social Action, 58*, 281–290.

Ramanathan, U. (1996). Land acquisition and compensation in involuntary resettlement. *Economic and Political Weekly, 31*(24), 1486–1491.

Sabar, B. (2010). Development-induced displacement and human rights. *Social Action, 60*.

ISBN code 978-81-999803-3-4

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

The News Minute. (2026, June 29). Ground report: Why Bidadi farmers are resisting Bengaluru AI city land acquisition. *The News Minute*. Article

The New Indian Express. (2026, April 14). Bidadi farmers dig their heels in, not ready to give up land for proposed Greater Bengaluru Township. *The New Indian Express*. Article

The Times of India. (2026, August 8). Report faults Bidadi Township land acquisition, farmers demand rollback. *The Times of India*. Article

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.

World Bank. (1994). *Resettlement and development: The Bankwide review of projects involving involuntary resettlement*. World Bank.