

A HARNAM SINGH (DEAD) THROUGH LRS ETC.
v.
SMT. KHEMA KUNWAR (DEAD) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS

MAY 2, 1994

B [K. RAMASWAMY AND N. VENKATACHALA, JJ.]

Tenancy and Land laws :

C *United Provinces Tenancy Act 1939—Clauses (7), (11), (18), (23), (24) of Section 3 read with Sections 211, 212-222—'Thekanama' in favour of 'Thekedar' in respect of Sir Lands, prior to coming into force of the Act.*

D *U.P. Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950—Definition of 'land-holder'—Sections 3, 4, 20(b), 21(1)(h) and 157—Whether a widow belonging to a class of disabled persons under Section 157 could be regarded as a "land holder" envisaged under Section 21(1)(h) respecting her Sir lands, which a "Thekedar" under a "Thekanama" executed by her had let out for occupation and cultivation prior to or on 9th of April 1947 by receiving yearly rents from the tenants.*

E One 'K' was the owner *inter alia* of plots no. 1, 6 and 1063 in certain village. On 12.12.39 she executed a "thekanama" in favour of one 'G' by which he was put in physical possession of the said Sir lands, enabling him as a "thekedar" not only to cultivate those lands personally for over a period of 20 years subject to payment to her "theka" money but also lease them for cultivation to tenants and receive annual rents from them during the period. 'G' in turn lease plot no. 1 to 6 to 'H' and plot no. 1063 to 'M' on the yearly rents and put them in possession of the plots in 1940 for cultivation. In the year 1960, 'H' and 'M' on finding that they were shown as "Asamis" in respect of their respective plots in the Basic Year Records, filed objections before the jurisdictional Consolidation Officer, claiming that they should be shown in the Basic Year Records as "Adhivasis" in respect of plots in their occupation. 'K' contested their claim and the consolidation Officer by his judgment and order dated 29.9.1961 dismissed the objections, but the said objections were upheld in appeal by the Asstt. Settlement Officer. 'K's appeal before the Deputy Director of Consolidation and her revision before the Jt. Director of Consolidation failed. She
G
H filed a writ petition before the High Court. A single Judge dismissed those

writ petitions by a common judgment and order dated 4.9.67, but her special appeals filed against the common judgment before the same High Court were allowed by common judgment and order dated 8.12.72 of a Division Bench upholding her contention that the appellants herein were "Asamis" under Section 21(l)(h) of U.P. Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act and not Adhivasis under Section 20(1)(b) thereof.

In the SLP filed against the aforesaid judgments and orders of the High Court, the appellants contested that the Respondent under a Thekanama in the year 1939 in favour of 'G' had granted to him as her Thekedar, the right to lease out her Sir-lands in favour of the tenants and receive rents from them who in turn leased out those plots to the appellants on yearly rents and put them in possession and the appellants continued to pay the rent prior to or on 5th of April 1947, the Respondent could not have been 'Land-holder' of such lands under Secs. 21(i)(h) of the U.P. Zamindari Abolition & Land Reforms Act as had been held by the High Court.

Allowing the appeals, this Court

HELD : 1. The United Provinces Tenancy Act, 1939 when came into force on 19th of January 1940, the appellants were in occupation of those plots of lands as tenants and cultivating them by paying rent to "thekedar". Clause (7), (11), (18), (23), (24) of Section 3 read with Section 212-222 of the United Provinces Tenancy Act, makes it clear that Ganga Singh, in whose favour the aforesaid "thekenama" was executed by Smt. Khema Kunwar, in respect of the aforesaid plots, was not only the "thekedar" under the Act but also a "land holder" in respect of those plots in that he was receiving rents from the tenants who were occupying those plots and cultivating them. [819-C-H; 820-A]

2. But after coming into force of the U.P. Zamindari Abolition & Land Reforms Act when a notification referred in Section 4 thereof was published in the Gazette, all rights, titles and interests of all intermediaries in every estate, including the aforesaid plots of lands, ceased and vested in the State of U.P., free from all encumbrances. Section 20(b) states that every person who was recorded as a tenant of any land, shall unless he has become an "Asami" under Clause (h) of Section 21(1) be called "Adhivasis" of the land. [820-A-C]

A *Udai v. Ram Lakhan*, (1990) RD 10 SC, relied on.

B 3. Section 3(26) read with Section 21(1)(h) of U.P. Zamindari Abolition & Land Reforms Act makes it obvious that in respect of the aforesaid agricultural lands (plots) "thekedar" Ganga Singh was the "land holder" who had leased out those lands to the appellants herein and was receiving rents from them, treating them as tenants. The appellants herein who were tenants of those plots being in occupation of them, before, after and at the time of their vesting in the State under the Act, are regarded very rightly by the Consolidation authorities and by the single Judge of the High Court, as occupant of those plots (1, 6, 1063) and has rightly been held to be "Adhivasis" of the lands under Section 20(b) of the Act. [pp.821-D-F; 822-A-D]

C CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal Nos. 142 and 143 of 1976.

D From the Judgment and Order dated 8.12.72 of the Allahabad High Court in S.A. Nos. 948 & 949 of 1967.

Ms. Rachna Gupta and Ms. S. Bagga for the Appellants.

J.P. Goyal, and M.R. Bidsar and K.K. Gupta for the Respondents.

E The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

F **VENKATACHALA, J.** In these appeals by special leave directed against the common judgment and order dated 8th December, 1972 of a Division Bench of the High Court of Allahabad, rendered in Special Appeals Nos. 948-949 of 1967, a question of somewhat importance, which arises for our decision, is as to whether a widow belonging to a class of disabled persons under section 157 of the Uttar Pradesh Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950 - 'The UPZA & LR Act' could be regarded as a land-holder envisaged under section 21(1)(h) respecting her Sir lands, which a 'thekedar' under a 'thekinama' executed by her had let out for occupation and cultivation by tenants prior to 9th April, 1947 and which were allowed by the 'thekedar' to continue in such occupation and cultivation on 9th August, 1947, by receiving yearly rents from the tenants.

H Material facts which have led to the need to decide the said question in the present appeals, could be stated thus :

That on 18th November, 1933, Smt. Khema Kunwar, respondent No.1 A
in these appeals, as the widow of Nathu Singh succeeded to his Sir lands
- plots 1, 6 and 1063 among others, of Village Barai M. Khara, Pargana
Ujhani, District Budaun. That on 12th December, 1939, she executed a
'thekanama' in favour of one Ganga Singh, by which he was put in physical B
possession of the said Sir lands, enabling him as a 'thekedar' not only to
cultivate those lands personally for over a period of twenty years subject
to payment to her theka money of Rs. 355 per annum, but also to lease
them for cultivation to tenants and receive annual rents from them during
that period. No sooner Ganga Singh got possession of the said Sir lands
under the 'thekana' from Smt. Khema Kunwar, he as 'thekedar', leased C
Plot Nos. 1, 6 to Harnam Singh, the appellant in C.A. No. 142 of 1976 and
Plot No. 1063 to Mohar Singh, the appellant in C.A. No. 143 of 1976, on
yearly rents and put them in possession of those plots in the year 1940 for
their cultivation. Eversince the 'thekedar' received yearly rents from Har-
nam Singh and Mohar Singh, as they were his tenants or lessees. In the year D
1960, when Harnam Singh, who was in occupation of Plot Nos. 1 and 6 and
Mohar Singh, who was in occupation of Plot No. 1063, from the year 1940
paying annual rents as tenants to 'thekedar', Ganga Singh, found that they
were shown as 'Asamis' in respect of the said plots in the Basic Years
Records, they filed objections under section 9 of the Uttar Pradesh Con- E
solidation Holdings Act, 1953 - 'the U.P. Act' before the jurisdictional
Consolidation Officer, claiming that they should be shown in Basic Years
Records as 'Adhivasis' respecting plots in their occupation. Smt. Khema
Kunwar, who did not dispute the fact that Harnam Singh and Mohar Singh
were occupants of the plots 1, 6 and 1063 contested their claim for
recording them as 'Adhivasis' of those lands in Basic Years Records. The F
Consolidation Officer by his judgment and order dated 26th September,
1961 dismissed the objection raised by Harnam Singh and Mohar Singh.
That order, when was carried in appeals by Harnam Singh and Mohar
Singh before the Assistant Settlement Officer, their claim for recording
their names in the Basic Years Records as 'Adhivasis' was upheld by his
judgment and order dated 13th June, 1963. Smt. Khema Kunwar, although G
impugned the order of the Asstt. Settlement Officer in her appeal filed
before the Deputy Director of Consolidation, and in her revision filed
before the Joint Director of Consolidation, she did not succeed. So also
she did not succeed in her Writ Petitions filed in the matter before the H
High Court of Allahabad, in that a learned Single Judge of that Court

A dismissed those Writ Petitions by his comon judgment and orders dated 4th September, 1967. But her Special Appeals filed against the said common judgment and orders of the learned Single Judge before the same High Court were allowed by a comon judgment and order dated 8th December, 1972 of a Division Bench of that Court, upholding her contention that the appellants herein were 'Asamis' under section 21(1)(h) of the UPZA&LR Act and not 'Adhivasis' under section 20(1)(b) thereof. It is that common Judgment and order of the Division Bench of the High Court which has been impugned by Harnam Singh and Mohar Singh by filing the present appeals by special leave.

C The contention raised before us by Mrs. Rachna Gupta, the learned counsel appearing for the appellants was that even if Smt. Khema Kunwar, widow of Nathu Singh belonged to a class of disabled persons under section 157 of the UPZA&LR Act, the judgment and order of the Division Bench of the High Court cannot be sustained since it was based on its wrong view that Smt. Khema Kunwar was land-holder envisaged under section 21(1)(h) of that Act. Her contention, in other words, was that Smt. Khema Kunwar, when had under a 'thekinama' executed by her in the year 1933 in favour of Ganga Singh had granted to him as her 'thekedar' the right to lease out her Sir lands in favour of the tenants and receive rents from them and when accordingly her Sir lands, the said plots had been leased out by that 'thekedar' in favour of the appellants and given for their occupation and cultivation long prior to 9th April, 1947 and the appellants were allowed to continue in occupation of such lands by the 'thekedar' on receiving rents from them even on 9th April, 1947, she (Smt. Khema Kunwar) could not have been the land-holder of such lands, envisaged under section 21(1)(h) of the UPZA&LR Act, as has been held by the Division Bench. Whether the said contention of the learned counsel for the appellants in the present appeals, calls to be upheld, is indeed the question which now needs our consideration and decision.

G On 12th December, 1939 Smt. Khema Kunwar, who was the Sirdar of the aforesaid Sir lands (plots), it is not disputed, executed a 'thekinama' of even date in favour of Ganga Singh, Making him 'thekedar' in respect of them. Under that 'thekinama', it is also not disputed, the 'thekedar' was given the right to cultivate the said plots for a period of 20 years, on payment 'theka' money of Rs. 355 per annum. Under that very 'thekinama', H it is again not disputed, that the 'thekedar' was given the further right to

lease the said plots for cultivation to tenants of his choice and to receive rents from such tenants. It transpires that on the execution of that 'thekinama' the 'thekedar' who got possession of the said plots from Smt. Khema Kunwar, leased them to the appellants herein for cultivation as his tenants and received annual rents from them ever since. The right of leasing the said plots in favour of tenants and the right of receiving rents from them were the rights conferred by Smt. Khema Kunwar in favour of the 'thekedar' Ganga Singh under 'thekinama' executed and registered by her, stood unrebutted before the Consolidation authorities who have concluded accordingly. The English officially translated copy of 'thekinama' produced for our perusal fully supports such conclusion.

The United Provinces Tenancy Act, 1939 - 'the UPT Act' when came into force on January 19, 1940 the appellants were in occupation of those plots of lands as tenants and cultivating them by paying rents to the 'thekedar'. The said tenancies created by 'thekedar' in favour of the appellants being agricultural tenancies, came to be regulated by the UPT Act. While under clause (7) of section 3 of the UPT Act 'holding' is defined to include the 'theka area' held by a 'thekedar', under clause (24) thereof the 'thekedar' is defined to mean a farmer or other lessee of the rights in land of a proprietor, who has also, in particular the right to receive rents or profits. Section 209 of the UPT Act declares that the farm or lease of a thekedar is a 'theka', the person who grants it is the 'lessor', and the area to which it relates is the 'theka area'. Section 211 of that Act declares that the thekedar may exercise, during the period of his 'theka' all rights of the lessor under the Act even if such rights were not conferred upon him under the terms of the 'thekinama'. So also sections 212 to 222 thereof refer to regulation of the relationship of 'thekedar' with his lessor and his lessee. Further, under clause (11) thereof a 'land-holder' is defined to mean a person to whom rent is payable while under clause (23) thereof 'tenant' is defined to mean a person by whom rent is payable. Furthermore, under clause (18) thereof 'rent' is defined to mean whatever is, in cash or kind, payable on account of the use or occupation of land.

From the said definition clauses and provisions of the UPT Act, it becomes clear that Ganga Singh, in whose favour the aforesaid 'thekinama' was executed by Smt. Khema Kunwar, respecting the aforesaid plots, was not only the 'thekedar' under that Act but also a 'land-holder' in respect of those plots in that he was receiving rents from the tenants who were

day of April, 1946, on the date of letting or occupation, A

to any one or more of the classes mentioned in sub-section
(1) of section 157;

shall be deemed to be an *asami* thereof."

The Division Bench of the High Court in its judgment under appeal B
has taken the view that the respondent herein Smt. Khema Kunwar is the
land-holder referred to in clause (h) of sub-section (1) of section 21, falling
within one of the classes of disabled persons mentioned in section 157(1)
of the Act and hence the appellants herein, who are in occupation of her C
aforesaid plots, are to be regarded as 'Asamis' envisaged under the clause,
although they have become tenants under the thekedar - Ganga Singh, who
was receiving rents from them.

We find it difficult to agree with the said view taken by the Division D
Bench of the High Court which has led to the rendering of its judgment
under appeals. Section 3 of the UPZA&LR Act which contains definition
clauses, in its clause (26) states that the words and expressions 'land-
holder' 'thekedar' .. 'rent' .. 'tenant'..... 'holding'.. not defined in the
Act and used in the United Provinces Tenancy Act, 1939 shall have the
meaning assigned to them in the UPT Act. From what is contained in the E
said clause (26), it becomes obvious that the word 'land- holder' used in
any of the provisions of the UPZA&LR Act including the provision in
sub-section (1) of section 21 shall carry the meaning given to it under the
UPT Act. When we have referred earlier, to the definition clauses and the
provisions of the UPT Act we have clearly found that the 'thekedar' under F
that Act would be a 'land-holder' in respect of Sir lands (plots) of a
proprietor, if he has leased them to tenants on the basis of 'thekinama'
executed by the proprietor or Sirdar in his favour, for he receives rents
from such tenants. Therefore, the land- holder referred to in clause (h) of
section 21(1) of the UPZA&LR Act can only be 'thekedar' even where he
had leased Sir lands of his proprietor, because of his entitlement to receive G
rents from the tenants of such lands. Such being the legal position of a
'thekedar' question of regarding a widow who had given away her Sir lands
to a 'thekedar' under 'thekinama' executed by her conferring full authority
on the 'thekedar' to lease to tenants such lands and to receive rents payable
for them from the tenants, as a land-holder of such lands can never arise.
Moreover, when 'thekedar' becomes a land-holder in respect of such Sir H

A lands leased out to tenants as 'thekeedar' question of a proprietor continuing as their land-holder also cannot arise. Therefore, in the present case, when in respect of the aforesaid agricultural lands (plots) 'thekeedar' Ganga Singh was the land-holder who has leased out those lands to the appellants herein and was receiving rents from them treating them as tenants, it ought not to have been held that Smt. Khema Kunwar, a person belonging to a class of disabled persons under section 157(1) of the Act, was the 'land-holder' in respect of those plots as would make the appellants herein the "Asamis" under section 21(1)(h) of the UPZA&LR Act. On the other hand, the appellants herein, who were the tenants of those plots (lands), being occupants of them before, after and at the time of their vesting in the State under the Act, are regarded very rightly by the Consolidation authorities and by the learned Single Judge of the High Court as persons recorded in the Records of Rights, as occupants of those plots (1, 6 and 1063) and have rightly held to be 'Adhivasis' of those lands under section 20(b) of the UPZA&LR act.

D In the result, we allow these appeals, set aside the judgment and order of the Division Bench of the High Court under appeals and restore the Orders of the Consolidation authorities and the learned Single Judge of the High Court which were set aside by the judgment and order under appeal.

E However, in the facts and circumstances of the case, we make no order as to costs.

S.S.H.R.

Appeal allowed.