

## COMPLAINT CLOSING REPORT

PROJECT NAME	Loan 3619-IND: Karnataka State Highways Improvement III Project (KSHIP) Project Number 42513-014.
ADB DEPARTMENT/DIVISION	SARD/SATC
AM FUNCTION	Problem-Solving
ELIGIBILITY RESULT	Ineligible
ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION DATE	8 March 2019
<b>I. Complaint and issues</b>	The complaint relates to Chintamani – AP Border road sub-project under the above project. The complainant had raised concerns regarding (i) misclassification of the land acquired (treated as semi-urban as against rural); and (ii) missed out mango trees that were present in the said land parcel under acquisition by the Project Authority (KSHIP). The complainant alleged that these lapses resulted in a reduced compensation amount. The complainant also requested for shifting of existing electric poles from his remaining land.
<b>II. Actions taken to address the problems or issues</b>	The complainant, Mr. Subbareddy (son of Mr. Anjaneyareddy, affected titleholder), had simultaneously filed complaints before the ADB's Accountability Mechanism and South Asia Regional Department (SARD) on 6 February 2019. Based on the discussion with the complainant on 22 February 2019, the Office of the Special Project Facilitator on 8 March 2019 declared the complaint ineligible for the problem-solving process, as the complainant informed that KSHIP was in dialogue with him and the concerns were being acted upon to his satisfaction. Before complaining to ADB on 6 February 2019, the complainant had registered his complaint on 1 February 2019 on the KSHIP's grievance redressal web portal. To facilitate resolution of grievances, SARD requested the external monitor for social safeguards engaged for the Project to undertake field-based due diligence to ascertain the facts and advice appropriate corrective actions to KSHIP. During the joint site visit on 21 February 2019, the external monitor and the representatives of KSHIP held a meeting with the complainant. KSHIP officials explained to the complainant the classification of the land recorded as rural, calculation of acquisition cost prepared by the revenue officials as per rules, and the inclusion of all his subject trees in the valuation estimate. The complainant then confirmed that his doubts were clarified, and he had no further concerns. The external monitor submitted its report to SARD on 25 February 2019.
<b>III. Decisions or agreements by parties concerned</b>	KSHIP confirmed to the complainant that his land was classified and valued as rural and not semi-urban, as mentioned in his complaint. The trees on that land were included in the inventory of losses and separately accounted for in the valuation estimate. Accordingly, the land acquisition calculations were discussed with the complainant. It was also clarified that the existing electric poles in his remaining land were neither installed nor under the jurisdiction of KSHIP. Should any of those poles be impacted later due to road alignment, they would be relocated within the Project's right of way. As such, the complainant's doubts on any misclassification of the land, compensation amount, inclusion of affected mango trees, were clarified. The complainant agreed that the compensation was based on the correct application of the methodology. KSHIP confirmed the same to the complainant on 5 March 2019. KSHIP confirmed that the displaced person (Mr. Anjayereddy) received full compensation. The complainant has not raised any further concerns or queries on this matter.
<b>IV. Results and lessons learned</b>	KSHIP clarified the misconception of the complainant regarding incorrect computation of compensation amount with relevant supporting documents. The complainant was paid the full compensation amount as due and agreed. The complaint was closed to the satisfaction of the complainant. The effective and robust use of the consultation process helped to resolve the grievances effectively.