

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S. RAMACHANDRA
RAO**

C.R.P.No.196 of 2004

%31-12-2013

#State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by the Authorized Officer,
Land Reforms, Kakinada.

Petitioner.

Versus

\$Nalamati Dorayya and others.
Respondents.

< **GIST:**

> **HEAD NOTE:**

!Counsel for the petitioner : Government Pleader for
Ceiling

^ Counsel for the respondents : Sri G.Krishna Murthy

? Cases referred

[1] 2007 (5) ALT 447

² 2013 (4) ALD 725 (D.B.)

³ AIR 2000 S.C. 3191

⁴ 1978 (1) A.L.T. 43 (NRC)

⁵ 1980 (1) A.P.L.J. 324

⁶ 1998 (1) ALD 716 (DB)

⁷ 1999 (4) ALT 353

⁸ 2003 (4) ALT 9 (SC)

⁹ 1987 (2) APLJ 92 (AP)

¹⁰ 1999 (4) ALT 353

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.RAMACHANDRA RAO

C.R.P.No.196 of 2004

ORDER:

This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Section 21 of the AP Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 (for brevity, 'the Act') challenging the order dt.29-07-2003 in L.R.A.No.13 of 2001 on the file of the Land Reforms Appellate Tribunal-cum-IV Additional District Judge, East Godavari District at Kakinada.

2. The 1st respondent herein Rimmelapudi Lakshmidevi is the daughter of the declarant Nalamati Dorayya. The proceedings were initiated under the Act to compute the holdings of the declarant and it was held that he was holding 0.0630 SH in excess. This determination had become final vide order dt.11-02-1993 in C.R.P.Nos.228 and 1549 of 1990 of this Court.

3. Subsequently orders under Section 10 (4) of the Act were passed on 22-11-1993 which were challenged by the declarant in L.R.A.No.26 of 1994 and by the 1st respondent i.e his daughter in L.R.A.No.131 of 1993.

4. In both the appeals, they contended that 1st respondent, the daughter of the declarant was a major as on 01-01-1975, the notified date, that she remained unmarried till 1987 and therefore by virtue of Section 29-A of the Act 13 of 1986 amending the Hindu Succession

Act, 1956, she is entitled for a share. They contended that her share is to be deleted from the holding of the declarant. The appellate Tribunal accepted this contention but held that at the stage of proceedings for surrender under Section 10 of the Act, such a plea cannot be entertained and therefore rejected the appeals.

5. Aggrieved by the order of the appellate Tribunal, the declarant and his daughter filed C.R.P.Nos.1408 and 1409 of 1994 before this Court. This Court found that the daughter was a major as on 01-01-1975 and marriage took place on 06-06-1987 and she is entitled for the benefit of Section 29-A of the Act and remitted the matter back to the lower Tribunal.

6. The lower Tribunal after receipt of the orders of the High Court dismissed the claim of the declarant and his daughter on the ground that they did not appear before it and did not place any material. It was also held that the daughter can only be considered as an individual and as an unmarried daughter, she cannot be considered as a sharer in view of Section 3 (f) of the Act.

7. This was challenged in L.R.A.No.13 of 2001 by the declarant. Pending L.R.A., the daughter of the declarant died, and her son and daughter were impleaded as parties.

8. By order dt.29-07-2003, the Land Reforms

Appellate Tribunal-cum-IV Additional District Judge, East Godavari District at Kakinada allowed the appeal. He held that the daughter of the declarant would be entitled to the benefit of Section 29-A of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 as she was unmarried as on 05-09-1985, the date on which the A.P. Amendment Act No.13 of 1986 to the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 came into effect as her marriage was performed on 06-06-1987. It therefore held that the daughter of the declarant became a coparcener and is entitled to a share like a major son. It also held that the daughter of the declarant was aged about 19 years as on 01-01-1975, that this is clear from the declaration filed by the declarant and even if the parties did not appear, the lower Tribunal cannot escape from applying the law on that ground and reject the claim of the declarant and his daughter. It therefore allowed the appeal and remitted the matter back to the lower Tribunal to consider the share of the daughter of the declarant and to exclude the said share from the holding of the declarant and thereafter compute the holding of the declarant afresh.

9. Aggrieved thereby this Revision petition is filed by the State.

10. Heard the learned Government Pleader for Ceiling, appearing for the State and Sri G.Krishna Murthy, learned counsel for the respondents.

11. It is pertinent to note that the Hindu

Succession Act, 1956 has been further amended by the Central Act 39 of 2005 with effect from 09-09-2005 and Section 6 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 has been amended giving equal rights to daughters in coparcenary property.

12. This Court in **Damalanka Gangaraju and Others Vs. Nandipati Vijaya Lakshmi and Others** ^[1], has held that by virtue of the amendment made by the Central Act 39 of 2005 to the Hindu Succession Act, 1956, Section 29-A (inserted by the AP State Amendment Act No.13 of 1986) is deemed to have been repealed. This legal position is not disputed by either side.

13. But the question for consideration is - when the computation of holding of the declarant had attained finality even by 11-02-1993 (vide orders in C.R.P.No.228 and 1549 of 1990 passed by this Court) and his holding was found to excess by 0.0630 S.H., is it permissible to reopen the computation proceedings at the instance of the declarant or his daughter.

14. It is not disputed that neither the declarant nor his daughter raised this issue in proceedings under Section 9 of the Act relating to the computation of holding of the declarant, even though Section 29-A of the Act inserted by AP State Amendment Act No.13 of 1986 with effect from 05-09-1985 and was on statute book.

15. A Division Bench of this Court in **Gadda Balaiah and Others Vs. Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District and Others**^[2] (to which I am a party), has considered the legal position as to whether it is permissible in proceedings for surrender under Section 10 of the Act to reopen the computation of the holding of a declarant on any ground and had held that it is not permissible. It held :

“ 37. From the catena of unvarying binding authority referred to, it is clear that when once final determination of the holding has been completed and surplus land held by the family of a declarant finally determined, at the stage of surrender proceedings, which are in the nature of execution proceedings, neither the declarant nor any other person can be permitted to reverse the clock by raising fresh points. Of course, these decisions were rendered before Section 9-A was introduced in 2012. We are of the view that (except to the extent and in the manner provided in Section 9-A, discussed above), no express power is conferred by the Ceiling Act to review and reopen proceedings that have become final and no such power inheres in the LRT nor could be inferred by implication. In the absence of a power to reopen proceedings (which have attained finality after dismissal of CRP Sr.24698 of 1976 by the High Court), de hors Section 9-A of the Ceiling Act, they cannot be reopened under any circumstances including on the ground that claims of alleged protected tenants under Section 38-E of the Tenancy Act were not considered by the LRT (before it declared Kastopa to be a surplus holder, by its order dated 9.12.1975).”

16. Therefore, I am of the opinion that even if the daughter of the declarant was a major on the notified date i.e. 01-01-1975, on that ground, her share cannot be

excluded from the holding of the declarant.

17. The learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, while not disputing this proposition, relied upon the decision in **Makineni Venkata Sujatha Vs. Land Reforms Tribunal and Another**^[3]. In that case, the petitioner before the Supreme Court claimed that she was a minor daughter on 01-01-1975, that the excess of her father's unit had been computed under the Act; that Section 29-A of the Hindu Succession Act 1956 (as amended) conferred a right on the unmarried daughter as on 05-09-1985 in Hindu Joint Family property for a share by birth therein, her share was liable to be excluded. The Supreme Court rejected the contention and held that the excess land of the father as on 01-01-1975 would remain the same and would not suffer any diminution on account of subsequent event, i.e. the right acquired by the daughter under Section 29-A and that Section 29-A did not alter the factual position as the petitioner was a minor as on 01-01-1975. The Supreme Court also held that Section 4-A of the Act, (as introduced in 1977) applies only to major sons as on 01-01-1975 and not to major daughters and the petitioner, being minor daughter on 01-01-1975, her father's unit did not get enlarged. It declined to decide whether the principle that "male" includes a "female" under the General Clauses Act would apply to Section 4-A which mentions only major sons and not

major daughters, as it was unnecessary to do so on the facts of the case.

18. In my opinion, this decision does not help the respondents for the reason that the Supreme Court held that only term “major son” was mentioned in Section 4-A, therefore Section 4-A would not apply to major daughters, and the fact that there was major daughter as on 01-01-1975, would not benefit her father.

19. In fact, a learned Single Judge of this Court in **K.Ram Reddy Vs. The State of A.P. rep. by the Special Tahsildar (Land Reforms), Sangareddy**^[4], held that in the light of the definition of the term “son” under Section 3 (3) of the AP General Clauses Act, it would not be permissible to interpret the words “major son” in Section 4-A of the Act as meaning a “major daughter” also.

20. It is also pertinent to note that the AP Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Amendment Act, 1977 (for short, “Act 10 of 1977”) (which also introduced Section 4-A) received the assent of the President on 29-04-1977 and the said assent was published on 13-04-1977 in the AP Gazette. Section 7 (1) of Act 10 of 1977, provides that notwithstanding anything in the principal Act, if in any case to which provisions of the Principal Act as amended by the Amendment Act

were applicable, and the Tribunal had determined under Section 9 of the Principal Act, the extent of the land in excess of the ceiling area before the date on which the assent of the President to the Amendment Act was first published in the AP Gazette, but a proceeding in respect thereof under Section 10 of the Principal Act was pending before the Tribunal on the said date, the tribunal may *suo motu* or shall, on application of declarant, re-determine holding of the declarant.

21. In the present case, the computation of holding of the Tribunal under Section 9 of the Act attained finality only in the year 1993 and not by 30-04-1977, the date on which the assent of the President was published in the AP Gazette to the Amendment Act 6 of 1977. Therefore, the respondents are not entitled to seek reopening of the issue of computation of the holding of the declarant under sub Section (1) of Section 7 of the Amendment Act 10 of 1977.

22. In **Nagubandi Pullamma and Others Vs. The State of A.P. through Authorised Officer, L.R.T.No.1 Khammam**^[5], cited by the respondents, the Court considered what issues could be raised in a proceeding under Section 7 (1) of the Amendment Act 10 of 1977 and held that all contentions that could be raised under Sections 8 and 9 of the Principal Act could be raised and they ought to be determined afresh. This

judgment has no application to the present case since the respondents are not entitled to invoke sub Section (1) of Section 7 of the Amendment Act 10 of 1977 at all.

23. Learned counsel for the respondents also relied upon the decisions in **Utukuri Sarat Kumar and Others Vs. Authorized Officer, Land Reforms, Ongole**^[6], **Nimmagadda Sambasiva Rao Vs. State of A.P.**^[7] and **B.Chandrasekhar Reddy (D) by Legal Representatives Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh**^[8].

24. The Supreme Court in **B.Chandrasekhar Reddy (D) by Legal Representatives** (8 supra) held that benefit of Section 29-A could be invoked by major daughters if they were not married prior to the commencement of Section 29-A. But in this case, the Supreme Court did not say that at the stage of surrender i.e a proceeding under Section 10 of the Act, the holding of a declarant which had attained finality, could be altered by giving benefit of the provisions of Section 29-A. This decision therefore would apply only if benefit of S.29-A was sought in proceedings under Section 9 of the act and not at stage of Section 10 proceedings. In my opinion, the same holds good even after amendment by Central Act No.39 of 2005 to the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 amending Section 6 thereof giving rights to daughters in coparcenary property. The following decision fortifies my

view.

25. A Division Bench of this Court in **Utukuri Sarat Kumar and Others** (6 supra) held that as on 01-01-1975, the notified date, a major daughter was not a coparcener in a Hindu Joint Family and she was made so only by virtue of AP Amendment Act No. 13 of 1996 with effect from 05-09-1985 and that by 05-09-1985, the ceiling law had already operated. Consequently, an unmarried major daughter cannot claim a separate standard holding under the Act notwithstanding the provisions of Section 29-A. It overruled the judgment in **A. Alivelamma Vs. The Special Tahsildar, Ongole and Another**^[9].

26. But without noticing this Division Bench Judgment, a learned Single Judge of this Court in **Nimmagadda Sambasiva Rao Vs. State of A.P., Land Reforms, Guntur**^[10] followed the decision in **A. Alivelamma** (9 supra) and took a view contrary to the judgment of the Division Bench in **Utukuri Sarat Kumar and Others** (6 supra).

27. No case has been cited by the respondents showing that the holding of the declarant could be reopened on any ground after its computation had attained finality and proceedings at surrender stage were pending.

28. Therefore, following the judgment in **Gadda**

Balaiah

(2 supra), I allow the Revision Petition. The Order dt.29-07-2003 in L.R.A.No.13 of 2001 of the Land Reforms Appellate Tribunal-cum-IV Additional District Judge, East Godavari, Kakinada is set aside. It is declared that the computation of holding of the declarant, which had already become final, cannot be altered on account of Section 29-A of A.P. Act 13 of 1986 or after it's repeal, by Section 6 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 (as amended by Central Act No.39 of 2005), conferring equal rights to daughters in coparcenary property. No costs.

29. As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE M.S.RAMACHANDRA RAO

Date: 31-12-2013

Note:

L.R.copy to be marked

B/o.

kvr /*

[\[1\]](#) 2007 (5) ALT 447

[\[2\]](#) 2013 (4) ALD 725 (D.B.)

[\[3\]](#) AIR 2000 S.C. 3191

[\[4\]](#) 1978 (1) A.L.T. 43 (NRC)

[\[5\]](#) 1980 (1) A.P.L.J. 324

[\[6\]](#) 1998 (1) ALD 716 (DB)

[\[7\]](#) 1999 (4) ALT 353

[\[8\]](#) 2003 (4) ALT 9 (SC)

[\[9\]](#) 1987 (2) APLJ 92 (AP)

[\[10\]](#) 1999 (4) ALT 353