

A

STATE OF A.P. & ORS.

v.

D. RAGHUKUL PERSHAD (D) BY LRS & ORS.
(Civil Appeal No. 5822 of 2012)

B

AUGUST 8, 2012

**[A.K. PATNAIK AND SUDHANSU JYOTI
MUKHOPADHAYA, JJ.]**

C

Rent Control and Eviction – Suit for ejection and resumption of possession of land filed by respondents on the ground that appellant-tenant failed to pay rent from 1986 – Plea of appellant in written statement that suit land actually belonged to him and the lease deed was executed and rent was paid to respondents by mistake of fact – Trial court

D

decreed suit for eviction after recording finding that the appellants had failed to prove the title to the land – First appellate court and High Court upheld the decision of trial court – On appeal, held: Although plea was raised by appellants that the execution of lease deed as well as

E

payment of rent pursuant to the lease deed were under mistake of fact, no issue as such was framed by trial Court on whether the lease deed was executed by mistake of fact – This issue was an issue of fact but as the issue was not framed, parties could not adduce evidence and no finding as

F

such was recorded by trial Court on the said issue – Hence, this Court is not in a position to consider the argument of the appellants that the lease deed was executed and the rent was paid by mistake of fact – It is well settled that the tenant who has been let into possession by the landlord cannot deny the

G

landlord's title however defective it may be, so long as he has not openly surrendered possession by surrender to his landlord – Although, there are some exceptions to this general rule, none of the exceptions were established by the appellants in this case – Therefore, appellants who were the

H

STATE OF A.P. & ORS. v. D. RAGHUKUL PERSHAD 1177
(D) BY LRS & ORS.

tenants of the respondents would have to surrender possession to the respondents before they can challenge the title of the respondents – In the plaint as framed by respondents in the instant case, the relief of eviction against the appellants was not based on the title of the respondents – Although an averment was made in the plaint that respondents were owners of the suit land, no relief for declaration of title as such was claimed by the respondents – Only the relief of eviction was sought in the plaint on the ground that the lease had not been renewed after 1986 and the rent had not been paid since 1986– Therefore, this being not a suit of declaration of title and recovery of possession but only a suit for eviction, trial Court, first appellate court and High Court were not called upon to decide the question of title – The findings of courts below on title is, therefore, set aside, but the decree for eviction is maintained – The appellants are directed to vacate the suit land within six months – Suit, if any, filed by the appellants for declaration of title and consequential relief cannot be entertained by the court unless the appellants first vacate and handover possession to the respondents.

D. Satyanarayana v. P. Jagdish 1987(4) SCC 424: 1988 (1) SCR 145 – relied on.

Venkata Chetty v. Aiyanna Gounden AIR 1917 Madras 789 – referred to.

Case Law Reference:

AIR 1917 Madras 789 referred to Para 4

1988 (1) SCR 145 relied on Para 6

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 5822 of 2012.

From the Judgment & Order dated 06.11.2009 of the High

A Court of Judicature, Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad in S.A. No. 270 of 2009.

P.S. Narasimha, C.K. Sucharita, P. Parmeshwar, K., Sriram P., Vishnu Shankar Jain for the Appellants.

B M.L. Verma, Venkateshwar Rao Anumolu, Satya Mirta, Prabhakar Parnam, T. Kanaka Durga for the Respondents.

The Order of the Court was delivered

ORDER

C

1. Leave granted.

2. The facts briefly are that the respondents herein filed OS No. 2379 of 1990 in the Court of 5th Assistant Civil Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad against the appellants no. 1 to 4 for ejection and resumption of possession of the suit land. The case of the respondents in the plaint was that the appellants had taken lease of the suit land from their common ancestor late Shri Dwaraka Pershad who had purchased the suit land from Nawab Raisyar Bahadur. The further case of the respondents in the plaint was that as the appellants failed to pay any rent from 1986 and renewed the lease after 1986, the respondents gave a notice to the appellants on 30.11.1989 to vacate the suit land. The appellants filed written statement pleading, inter alia, that the suit land actually belonged to the appellants and the lease deed had been executed and the rent had been paid to the respondents by mistake of fact. The learned Civil Judge decreed the suit for eviction after recording a finding, inter alia, that the appellants have not been able to prove the title to the land. The appellants filed First Appeal before the 3rd Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad which was numbered as AS No. 294 of 2005. The First Appellate Court held that the appellants were estopped from setting up title in them so long as they have not surrendered possession of the land to the lessees, namely, the

H

STATE OF A.P. & ORS. v. D. RAGHUKUL PERSHAD1179
(D) BY LRS & ORS.

respondents and further held that the appellants have not been able to establish their title to the suit land. A

3. Aggrieved, the appellants filed Second Appeal SA No. 270 of 2009 before the High Court and by the impugned order, the High Court has dismissed the Second Appeal after holding that the appellants cannot be permitted to deny the title of the respondents under the provisions of 116 of the Indian Evidence Act and also holding that the appellants have not been able to adduce any evidence to prove that the suit land belonged to the appellants. The High Court also held in the impugned order that in a writ petition WP No. 9717 of 1993 filed before the High Court one Mohammed Khasim and Ameena Begum had challenged the entries with regard to Survey No. 58(Old) of Bahlookhanguda Survey No. 127(new) and the High Court had observed that Rayees Yar Jung was the owner and sales made by Rayees Yar Jung were therefore, valid. The High Court further observed that the order passed by the High Court in writ petition no. 9717 of 1993 was challenged before this Court by the Government but this Court had dismissed the appeal and therefore, the appellants were estopped from taking a different stand with regard to the ownership of the land. With the aforesaid findings, the High Court dismissed the Second Appeal of the appellants. B
C
D
E

4. Mr. P.S. Narasimha, learned senior counsel appearing for the appellants cited a full Bench Judgment of the Madras High Court in *Venkata Chetty Vs. Aiyanna Gounden* AIR 1917 Madras 789 and particularly the observations of Abdul Rahim, officiating C.J., to the effect that a tenant who was not let into possession by the person seeking to eject him is not estopped from denying the plaintiff's title and he may also show that the title is in some third person or himself. He also relied on the observations of Sheshagiri Aiyar, J. in the aforesaid case that under the Indian Contract Act, it can be shown that any contract into which a party has entered into is vitiated by mistake and the principle of estoppel should not be held to override these F
G
H

A provisions of law of contract. He argued relying on the aforesaid
 observations in the judgment of the Madras High Court that the
 appellants, therefore, were entitled to plead in the written
 statement that the execution of the lease acknowledging title
 of the respondents was a mistake of fact and that the appellants
 B were actually the owners of the suit land.

5. We have considered the submissions of Mr. P.S.
 Narasimha and we find that although plea was raised by the
 appellants in their written statement that the execution of the
 lease deed in the present case, as well as payment of rent
 C pursuant to the lease deed were under mistake of fact, no issue
 as such was framed by the trial Court on whether the lease
 deed was executed by mistake of fact. This issue is an issue
 of fact and it is at the stage of trial that this issue will have to
 be raised and framed by the trial Court so that parties could
 D lead evidence on the issue. In this case, as this issue has not
 been framed, parties have not adduced evidence and no
 finding as such has been recorded by the trial Court on this
 issue. Hence, we are not in a position to consider the argument
 of Mr. P.S. Narasimha that the lease deed was executed and
 E the rent was paid by mistake of fact.

6. The law is settled by this Court in *D. Satyanarayana vs.*
P. Jagdish 1987(4) SCC 424 that the tenant who has been let
 into possession by the landlord cannot deny the landlord's title
 F however defective it may be, so long as he has not openly
 surrendered possession by surrender to his landlord. Although,
 there are some exceptions to this general rule, none of the
 exceptions have been established by the appellants in this
 case. Hence, the appellants who were the tenants of the
 respondents will have to surrender possession to the
 G respondents before they can challenge the title of the
 respondents.

7. In the plaint as framed by the respondents in the present
 case, the relief of eviction against the appellants was not based
 H on the title of the respondents. Mr. M.L. Varma, learned senior

STATE OF A.P. & ORS. v. D. RAGHUKUL PERSHAD1181
(D) BY LRS & ORS.

counsel appearing for the respondents vehemently submitted that on a reading of the plaint, it will appear that the respondents had claimed to be owners of the land. We find that although an averment has been made in the plaint that the respondents were the owners of the suit land, no relief for declaration of title as such has been claimed by the respondents. Only the relief of eviction was sought in the plaint on the ground that the lease had not been renewed after 1986 and the rent had not been paid since 1986. In our considered opinion, therefore, this being not a suit of declaration of title and recovery of possession but only a suit for eviction, the trial Court, the First Appellate Court and the High Court were not called upon to decide the question of title.

8. For the aforesaid reasons, we set aside the findings of the trial Court, the First Appellate Court and the High Court on title, but we maintain the decree for eviction. We, however, order that the appellants will vacate the suit land within six months from today and further make it clear that the suit, if any, filed by the appellants for declaration of title and consequential relief cannot be entertained by the Court unless the appellants first vacate and handover possession to the respondents.

9. The judgment of the Courts below are modified accordingly. The appeal is allowed to the extent indicated above. No costs.

B.B.B.

Appeal Partly allowed.