



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Reserved on	:	27.03.2024
Pronounced on	:	12.07.2024

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

C.R.P.(MD).No.1818 of 2015
and
W.P(MD).No.17331 of 2017
and
W.M.P(MD).No.13873 & 13874 of 2017
and M.P(MD).No.1 of 2015

C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015:

Veeraputhiran (Died)

... Plaintiff

1. V.Malaiammal

2. V.Chellammal

3. V.Muthupandian

4. V.Ravindraperumal

5. V.Balasubramanian

6. V.Rameshram

7. V.Kannan

... Petitioners/Petitioners/Proposed Plaintiffs/
LR's of deceased Plaintiff

Vs.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

1. Southern Roadways Limited,
No.8, Trivandrum Road,
Vannarpettai, Palayamkottai Taluk,
Tirunelveli District,
Through its Managing Director

2. M.Muthukrishnan
S/o.Marimuthu Konar,
Accountant,
Southern Roadways Limited,
Trivandrum Road,
Vannarpettai, Palayamkottai Taluk,
Tirunelveli District. ... Respondents/Respondents/Defendants

Prayer : Civil Revision Petition filed under Section 115 of Civil Procedure Code, praying to set aside the Fair and Decreetal Order dated 20.02.2015 passed in I.A.No.489 of 2014 in O.S.No.330 of 2002 on the file of the 1st Additional District Munsif Court, Tirunelveli and allow the present Civil Revision Petition.

For Petitioners : Mr.D.Srinivasaragavan
For Respondents : Mr.M.P.Senthil for R1
: R2 - Died



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017:

Southern Roadways Ltd.,
No.8, Trivandrum Road,
Vannarpettai, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District,
through its Authorized Officer on Special Duty. ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Tirunelveli.
2. The Special Deputy Collector
cum Revenue Court,
Tirunelveli.
3. The Tahsildar cum Record Officer,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
4. V.Raveendraperumal
5. V.Kannan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ or order or direction in the nature of writ to call for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st respondent dated 01.06.2017 in Revision Petition No.1/2015 confirming the order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 03.11.2014 in I.A.No.1/2013 in A.P.02/2010 (Madurai A.P.15/2010) and quash the same.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

For Petitioner : Mr.M.P.Senthil
For Respondents : Mr.A.K.Manikkam,
Special Government Pleader for R1 to R3
: Mr.D.Srinivasaragavan,
for Mr.M.Murugaprabhu, for R4 & R5

COMMON ORDER

The writ petitioner/Southern Roadways Limited is the owner of the property situated in the survey No. 126/1 to the extent of 1.83 acre situated in Palayamkottai Village.

2.In the said company, the civil revision petitioner's father Veerabhuthiran was working as a watchman. After his service period, he retired in the year 1993. Thereafter, the said Veerabhuthiran filed the petition before the Tashildar, cultivating tenancy records to register his name as Cultivating Tenant under Tamil Nadu Agricultural Lands Records of Rights Act, 1969, (herein after called TNRT Act, 1969). He also filed the suit in O.S.No.330 of 2002, on the file of the Additional District Municip Court, seeking the permanent injunction restraining the writ petitioner from dispossessing him in the said property without due process of law and also



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

had obtained interim injunction. In the said suit, he claimed himself as cultivating tenant. Challenging the same, the petitioner company filed the Civil Miscellaneous Appeal before the appellate Court and same was confirmed. Thereafter, the Civil Revision Petition in C.R.P.(MD).No.1818 of 2015 had been filed.

3. Pending the said Civil Revision Petition, the said Veerabhutaran died. Hence, the Civil Revision petitioners have filed petition before this Court. This Court remitted back to the Civil Court to determine whether the legal heirs of the Veerabhuthiran satisfied the requirement of the Tamil Nadu Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955(herein after referred as TNCTP Act, 1955). In the meantime, the petition filed before the Tashildar was allowed and hence, the company, preferred appeal before the District Revenue Officer and the same was confirmed. Challenging the same, the company filed the writ petition in W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017. In the meantime, the learned I Additional District Munsif, Tirunelveli dismissed the application filed by the legal heirs of Veerabhuthiran to implead the legal heirs in the suit as cultivating tenant stating that they have not



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

satisfied the requirement stated under the TNCTP Act, 1955, to claim themselves as cultivating tenant. Challenging the same, the revision has been filed by them, apart from challenging the dismissal of their petition to implead themselves as the legal heirs of the Veerabhuthiran as “Cultivating Tenant”.

4. Both the petitions were heard together and the learned counsel for the company made the following submission:

(i) At no point of time, Veerabhuthiran was the cultivating tenant of the property. The property is the prime property located in the industrial areas and all are surrounded with buildings and there was no agricultural activities. Veerabhuthiran was working as a watchman of the property. Now, he had made a false claim as if he registered his name Cultivating Tenant under the TNRT Act, 1969. According to the pleadings, he was doing cultivation from 1990 onwards. As per the Act, only after entering with an agreement, either oral or written and on the basis of same, he can entered into an agreement and thereafter only, he had right to claim as cultivating tenant under the TNCTP Act, 1955.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

5. In this case, there was reverse direction. He filed suit in O.S.No. 330 of 2022 for injunction restraining the company from evicting them and thereafter, he had filed the petition before the Tahsildar to record his name as the Cultivating Tenant under the TNRT Act, 1969, and hence, there was no *bona fides* in the action of the Veerabhuthiran and hence, original authority who passed order is not done it in consonance with the TNRT Act, 1969. Hence, pending appeal before the District Revenue Officer, Veerabhuthiran died and in the impleading petition, he filed the memo recording the death of the Veerabhuthiran and the legal heirs have not satisfied the requirement of the Act and in spite of that the order impugned was passed. There was no finding on evidence that the legal heirs are to implead themselves as they were doing personal cultivation during the life period of Veerabhuthiran. He also reiterated the said submission at the cost of the repetition that without registering themselves as the cultivating tenants, they had no right to claim as cultivating tenants under the TNCTP, Act, 1955. Hence, he seeks to set aside the impugned order of the second respondent confirmed by the first respondent.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

6. On contrary the learned counsel appearing for the Veerabhuthiran's legal heirs in Civil Revision Petition made the following submission:

(i)The issue whether the petitioners are cultivating tenants or not is pending and the same would be adjudicated before the competent authority namely, Tahsildar. The Civil Court has no jurisdiction to decide the issues and the Civil Court decided the issues as if on the basis of direction of this Court, the order was passed is not legally valid. In spite of availability of sufficient evidence, the learned trial Judge erred in holding that they are not cultivating tenants. In the said circumstances, he seeks to set aside the same. When the appeal is pending against the order of the Tahsildar, to contest the appeal filed by the company before the District Revenue Officer, the direction of the Civil Court was not binding on the District Revenue Officer. Hence, the competent authority has to decide the issue of the entitlement of the benefit. Hence, he seeks for dismissal of the writ petition and seeks for allowing the revision petition.

7. This Court considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

7.1. Whether the revision petitioner is entitled to claim the benefit of Tamil Nadu Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955?

7.2. Whether the authorities under the Tamil Nadu Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955, passed the order against the writ petitioner/land owner is correct?

7.3. Whether the Court below is correct in dismissing the application filed by the revision petitioner to proceed the suit initiated by his father claiming as cultivating the tenants of the writ petitioner?

Discussion on Question Nos.1 to 3:

8. Before adverting to the submission of the learned counsel on either side, it is the duty of this Court to delineate the scheme available to record the “tenancy” and claiming benefit as “cultivating tenant”, as per the two following acts.

(i) Tamil Nadu Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955 (24 of 1955) .

(ii) Tamil Nadu Agricultural lands Record of Tenancy Rights Act, 1969 (10 of 1969).

8.1. The relevant provisions are as follows:



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

WEB COPY

Tamil Nadu Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955 (24 of 1955)	Tamil Nadu Agricultural lands Record of Tenancy Rights Act, 1969 (10 of 1969)
2aa.Cultivating Tenant: <i>(i)Means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of any member of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied: and</i> <i>(ii)Includes-</i> <i>(a)any such person who continues in possession of the land after the determination of the tenancy agreement;</i> <i>(b)the heir of such person, if the heir contributes his own physical labour or that of any member of his family in the cultivation of such land;</i> <i>(c)a sub tenant if he contributes his own physical labour or that of any member of his family in the cultivation of such land; or</i> <i>(d)any such sub tenant who continues in possession of the land notwithstanding that the person who sublet the land to such sub-tenant ceases to have the right to possession of such land; but</i> <i>(iii)does not include a mere intermediary or his heir;</i> Explanation:<i>A sub tenant shall be deemed to be cultivating tenant of the holding under the landlord if the lessor of such sub tenant has ceased to be the tenant of such land lord.</i>	4.Inclusion of lands in the approved record of tenancy rights: <i>1(a)where subsequent to the publication of the approved record of tenancy rights any land has been let for cultivation, the landowner, intermediary or the tenant having interest in such land shall make an application to the record officer for inclusion of particulars relating to such land in the approved record of tenancy rights.</i> <i>(b)Where any land has been let for cultivation before the publication in the approved record of tenancy rights for any reason, the landowner, the intermediary or the tenant shall make an application to the Record Officer for inclusion of particulars relating to such land in the approved record of tenancy rights.</i> <i>(2)An application under sub Section (1) shall contain such particulars as may be prescribed and shall be accompanied by the documents, if any. Relied on by the applicant as evidence in support of his claim.</i> <i>(3)(a)before passing an order on an application under Sub Section (2) the Record Officer shall follows such procedures as may be prescribed and shall also give a reasonable opportunity to the parties concerned to make their representations either orally or in writing. If the Record Officer decides that the particulars of the land specified in the application should be included in the approved record of tenancy rights he shall pass an order accordingly and shall make the necessary entries in the approved record of tenancy rights.</i> <i>(b)if the record decides that there is no case for inclusion of particulars of the land in the approved record of tenancy rights, he shall reject the application.</i> <i>(c)An order under clause (a)or clause (b)shall contain the reasons for such order and shall be communicated to the parties concerned in such manner as may be prescribed.</i>



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

WEB COPY

9.As per the above provisions of the Acts, the person, who is claiming as the cultivating tenant should have established the following facts:

9.1.There is an agreement either oral or written entered between the landlord and the cultivating tenant.

9.2.On the basis of that, the tenant should have recorded his name before the proper authority constituted under the “TNRTA Act, 1969”.

9.3.After that, they should have been continuously cultivating the land by contributing their “Own physical labour”.

9.4.Without the above, they are not entitled to get benefit of the “TNCTP Act, 1955”.

10.In this case, the civil revision petitioners are legal heirs of one Veerabhuthiran. The said Veerabhuthiran filed a suit in O.S.No.330 of 2002, against the writ petitioner namely, Southern Roadways limited (herein after called company), stating that the company is the owner of the property situated in the S.No.126/1 to the extent of 1.83 acres land. He had oral agreement to cultivate the land with condition to pay Rs.425/- per crop. He



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

handed over the said amount to the second defendant who was the agent of the company. The property is situated 100 feet close to the main bypass road. Now, the company is taking advantage of the escalation on of price, and has taken steps to sell the properties without evicting the petitioner as per due process of law. Therefore, he filed a suit in O.S.NO.330 of 2002 on the file of the First Additional District Munsif Court, Tirunelveli, restraining the company and other officials from interfering with the peaceful enjoyment of the property. Thereafter, he had filed the application before the third respondent in W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017 namely, Tashildar cum Record Officer, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli District (herein after called Original Authority) under the Act, to record his name as a tenant. The said application was allowed on 03.07.2010. Aggrieved over the same, the company filed the appeal before the second respondent in W.P.(MD).No. 17331 of 2017, namely, Special Deputy Collector cum Revenue Court, Tirunelveli (herein after called Appellate Authority) and the said authority passed the interim order vide order dated 15.02.2011, staying the operation of the original authority order dated 03.07.2010, which reads as follows:



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

Pending disposal of the Appeal petition filed by the Appellant Southern Roadways Limited, Trivandrum Road, Tirunelveli District in the refernece second cited, an interim stay is granted against the order of the Record Officer-Cum-Tahsildar, Palayamkottai passed in T.R.No.12 of 2002, dated 30.07.2010.

11.Parallely, the civil Court granted ad-interim injunction in favour of the tenant in the suit filed by him in I.A.No.343 of 2002 under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 C.P.C. The same was challenged by the company before the First Additional District Judge, Tirunelveli, in C.M.A.No.8 of 2003 and the same was also confirmed. Challenging the same, C.R.P.(MD).No.218 of 2004 has been filed before this Court.

12.Pending the revision before this Court and the pending the appeal before the Revenue Court, the said Veerabhuthiran died. The legal heirs of Veerabhuthiran filed application before the revenue Court to implead them as legal heirs of the said Veerabhuthiran. The same was allowed and



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

further, an appeal filed by the first respondent in W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017 and the same was dismissed with the following order:

மேல்மறையீட்டு மனுவில் பிரஸ்தாப
நிலத்திற்கான குத்தகைதாரர் உறுதி
செய்யப்படாத நிலையில் மேல்முறையீட்டு
மனுவின் மீது தொடர்ந்து நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கும்
பொருட்டு இறந்து போன குத்தகைதாரர்
திரு.மு.வீரபுத்திரன் என்பவரின் வாரிசுகளை கட்சி
சேர்க்க உத்தரவிடப்பட்ட திருநெல்வேலி வருவாய்
நீதிமன்ற தனித்துணை ஆட்சியரின் தீர்ப்பினை
உறுதி செய்தும் சீராய்வு மனுதாரர் சதர்ன்
ரோடவேஸ் லிட் என்பவரின் சீராய்வு மனுவினை
தள்ளுபடி செய்தும் இதன் மூலம்
உத்தரவிடப்படுகிறது.

The said order was challenged in W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017 by the company.

13.In the Civil Revision Petition pending before this Court, this Court passed the following order:

9. Section 2 of the Tamil Nadu Cultivating
Tenants Protection Act, 1955 reads as follows:-
“ 2.Definitions .- In this Act , unless the context
otherwise requires-
(a a) “Cultivating tenant”-



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

(i)Means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of any member of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied: and

(ii)Includes-

(a)any such person who continues in possession of the land after the determination of the tenancy agreement;

(b)the heir of such person, if the heir contributes his own physical labour or that of any member of his family in the cultivation of such land;

10. As per the definition, not all the heirs of the plaintiff can claim right, but only the heirs, who contributes their physical labour or that of any members of their family in cultivation of the land in dispute. The learned I District Additional Munsif, Tirunelveli shall decide the impleadment petition, as per the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955 as referred above.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

WEB COPY

14.After the remand by this Court, it has held that the legal heirs of the Veerabhuthiran are not cultivating tenants. The same was challenged in C.R.P.(MD).No.1818 of 2015.

15.From the above records and the findings and upon the perusal of the pleadings, the said Veerabhuthiran had not recorded his name as a tenant under the Act, till the filing of the suit in O.S.No.330 of 2002. He had filed the application before the competent authority under the Act only in the year 2010. The authority has passed the order vide order dated 30.07.2010 to register his name and the same was stayed by the Revenue Court by order dated 15.02.2011. The same is still in operation. In the said circumstances, his case of oral tenancy has not been proved and he had not satisfied the requirement to record his name in the record maintained by the third respondent in the writ petition in W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017. Therefore, the legal heirs are not entitled to claim the benefit under the TNCTP Act, 1955.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

WEB COPY

16.The company specifically pleaded that Veerabhuthiran was a labourer under the company and he retired from company in the year 1993 and he had never been treated as cultivating tenant of the said premises. The said Veerabhuthiran during his life time, collusively impleaded the second defendant as an agent of the company and made the plea that the second defendant received the lease amount and subsequently, he dropped him from the said suit. Therefore, there was no evidence that he had collected the rent on behalf of the company. From the records, there is evidence before the authority that the Veerabhuthiran family members were doing business and they were not doing personal cultivation by contributing their physical labour. The said fact also was properly appreciated by the learned trial Court and dismissed the application filed by the legal heirs of the said Veerabhuthiran to prosecute the suit stating that there was no evidence to show that they were personally cultivating the land by contributing their physical labour. This Court also perused the entire records. In the absence of the evidence to show that the said Veerabhuthiran was the cultivating tenant and he had continued as tenant and his legal heirs were also



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

contributing their physical labour, they cannot contend that they are the cultivating tenants. From the affirmative statement made by the company staff that the sons of the Veerabhuthiran are doing business and without any evidence to show that they continued the cultivation, merely on the basis of the observation made by the original authority in its order dated 30.07.2010, that the sons also assisted in the cultivation, which has been stayed by the appellate authority on 15.02.2011 and the same continued as on date, there is no evidence to hold they are entitled to the benefit of the Act. Therefore, the learned trial Judge correctly dismissed the application holding that no evidence was adduced to prove that they are the cultivating tenants and seek injunction to continue the suit filed by their father to seek the relief of permanent injunction restraining the company from dispossessing him except due process of law.

17.Even in the impugned order challenged in the writ Petition, the authority never stated that they are contributing their labour. They only stated that to proceed the appeal filed by the company, they should be allowed to contest the case. More particularly, the following statement



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

recorded by the first respondent in W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017 clearly proved that there was no material as on date to hold that they are entitled to the benefit of the Act.

“மேல்மறையீட்டு மனுவில் பிரஸ்தாப நிலத்திற்கான குத்தகைதாரர் உறுதி செய்யப்படாத நிலையில் மேல்முறையீட்டு மனுவின் மீது தொடர்ந்து நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கும் பொருட்டு” Apart from that, the precedent relating to the entitlement of the benefit under the cultivating tenants are as follows:

17.1.The Hon'le Thiru.Justice F.M.Ibrahim Kalifulla, (as he then was) in the case of P.Shanmugasundaram Vs. The District Revenue Officer, reported in 2005 1 MLJ 91, has held as follows:

6.Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, I am convinced that the stand of the petitioner merits acceptance in every respect. In fact Mr.S.Parthasarathy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner relied upon the Division Bench judgment of this Court in Ramalingam v. District Revenue Officer A.I.R. 1992 Mad. 97 in support of his submission. In the said decision, the legal position as regards the jurisdiction of the authorities functioning under Act XXV of 1995, vis-a-vis, the Civil Court decree



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

has been succinctly set out which requires extraction for our present purpose. The same has been set out in paragraph 8 which reads as under:

8.As far as the relevance of the findings of the Civil Court in respect of the proceedings under the Act is concerned, the matter is not res integra. A Full Bench of Periathambi Gounder v. District Revenue Officer (1980)2 MLJ. 89: A.I.R. 1980 Mad. 180 (F.B.), has taken the view that in all matters which may arise incidental to the determination of the matters mentioned in Sec. 3(2) of the Act, the Record Officer or the appellate or revisional authority cannot be said to have exclusive jurisdiction and with reference to such matters, the jurisdiction of the Civil Court cannot be said to have been barred or ousted under Sec.16-A of the Act. In Balasubramaniam v. Shamsu Thaireez (1985)98 Mad L. W. 536, a Division Bench of this Court had occasion to consider the question once again and held that the Civil Court can go into the jurisdictional issues, which are not within the exclusive jurisdiction of the authority. The Division Bench



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

also came to the conclusion that it would be a different matter if the matter had gone to the Civil Court and a decision had been rendered by the Civil Court and on the questions raised anterior to the decision of the authority under the act, and that in such an event the findings of the Civil Court cannot be ignored. In Palanisami Gounder v. Bhallammal (1987)10 Mad L.W. 367, Nainar Sundaram, J. who was a party to the Division Bench judgment reported in Balasubramaniam v. Shamsu Thaireez (1985)98 Mad L.W.536, had occasion to consider the question in the form in which it has been raised before us on behalf of the appellant. The learned Judge declared the position that the authorities functioning under the Act cannot eschew from consideration the decisions of the Civil Court and that they are as much relevant and vital as any other material in adjudicating the rights of parties under the provisions of the Act. In Karuppanna Gounder v. Ammal Appan (1983)101 Mad L.W. 194, Nainar Sundaram, J. in a second appeal arising out of a suit for injunction had occasion to consider the issue in the light of the earlier judgments and



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

declared the position that unless the primary relief asked for is one of declaration of the status of a party as a cultivating tenant, a suit for injunction cannot be said to be not maintainable in a Civil Court in which incidentally there could be a consideration and finding with reference to the nature and character of possession and status and possession of the parties.”

7. Going by the Division Bench judgment, it is clear that while a party may not be able to seek for a declaration of the status of a party as a cultivating tenant in the Civil Court, a suit for declaration cannot be said to be not maintainable in the Civil Court, a suit for declaration cannot be said to be not maintainable in the Civil Court in which, incidentally there can be a consideration and finding with reference to the nature and character of possession and a status of the party. In fact, it is also made clear in the above decision that Civil Court decree either filed during the pendency of the applications before the Revenue Authorities or subsequent to that should be given due weight by the authorities concerned who deal with the applications under



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

Act XXV of 1955.

17.2.This Court, in the case of ***Jayachandran.R.***
Vs. Mohamed Sirajudeen and others reported in
2021 (2) TLNJ 523 (civil), has held as follows:

A reading of the above provision makes it clear that not all heirs of tenants could be termed as cultivating tenants. In order to claim as cultivating tenant, such heir must prove that he or she contributes his or her own physical labour or that of any member of his family in cultivation of the land in question.

9.Both the Courts below have adverted to the definition and have held that there is total lack of evidence on the side of the plaintiff to show that he has been contributing his own physical labour or that of any member of his family in cultivation of the land in question. Despite his best efforts, the learned counsel for the appellant is unable to project any material to enable me to conclude that such factual finding recorded by the Courts below is perverse. Once such factual finding is reached, that finding could not be disturbed for want of perversity or ignorance of some material



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

available on record.

WEB COPY

17.3.This Court, in the case of ***Venkataswami Reddiar v.***

Sundaramoorthy, reported in ***AIR 1972 Mad 171***, has held as follows:

Madras cultivating Tenants Protection Act tenant must establish that some one in his family is contributing his physical labour in the cultivation of land-The test of personal cultivation applies to the heirs of the original tenant.

17.4.This Court reported in ***1978 TNLJ 531***, has held as follows:

But such an heir acquires an interest in the subject matter of the tenancy itself. Such a statutory status is subject only to contributions of the heirs' own physical labour in the matter of cultivation of the lands.

Applying the above said principle and also discussion made earlier, the revision petitioners have not established their entitlement for the benefit under the TNCTP Act, 1955. Therefore, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the well considered order passed in I.A.No.418 of 2014 in O.S.No.330 of 2002, dated 04.08.2014. As a sequel, the W.P.(MD).No. 17331 of 2017 is liable to be allowed.



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

18.Hence, the questions 1 to 3 are answered against the civil revision petitioner/Tenant and in favour of the writ petitioner/Landlord.

19.Accordingly, the Civil revision petition is dismissed confirming the fair and decreetal order dated 20.02.2015 passed in I.A.No.489 of 2014 in O.S.No.330 of 2002 by the I Additional District Munsif Court, Tirunelveli.

20.Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed by setting aside the impugned order passed in Revision petition No.1 of 2015 dated 01.06.2017 by the first respondent confirming the order passed by the second respondent dated 03.11.2014 in I.A.No.1 of 2013 in A.P.No.02 of 2010 (Madurai A.P.No.15/2010). No costs. Consequently, the connected writ miscellaneous petitions are closed and miscellaneous petition is closed.

12.07.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : *Yes / No*
sbn

25/27



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

WEB COPY

To

1. The 1st Additional District Munsif Court,
Tirunelveli.
2. The District Revenue Officer, Tirunelveli.
3. The Special Deputy Collector cum Revenue Court,
Tirunelveli.
4. The Tahsildar cum Record Officer,
Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli District.
5. The Special Government Pleader,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.
6. The Section Officer,
VR Section(Records)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD).No.1818 of 2015 and
W.P.(MD).No.17331 of 2017

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, J.
sbn

C.R.P.(MD).No.1818 of 2015
and
W.P(MD).No.17331 of 2017
and
W.M.P(MD).No.13873 & 13874 of 2017
and M.P(MD).No.1 of 2015

12.07.2024