

I am, therefore, of the view that the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the appellant are well founded and this appeal must accordingly be allowed. The proceedings are remanded to the trial Court for determination of the quantum of permanent alimony under sub-section (1) of section 25. The parties have been directed to appear before the trial Court on 20th January, 1964.

Surjit Kaur  
v.  
Paragat Singh  
—  
Shamsher  
Bahadur, J.

B.R.T.

APPELLATE CIVIL

Before Shamsher Bahadur, J.

ASA NAND,—Appellant.

*versus*

MADHO SINGH AND ANOTHER,—Respondents

Second Appeal from order No. 35 of 1963

*Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act. (XIII of 1955)—S. 51—Holding of a landlord acquired by allotment from the Custodian of Evacuee Property—Whether exempt from the provisions of the Act.*

1964  
—  
Jan. 3rd.

*Held*, that section 51 of the Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955 excludes only those lands from the applicability of the Act which are either owned or vested in the State or the Central Government. In fact clause (h) of sub-section (1) of section 51 mentions specifically that the exception is made only in respect of land vested in the Central Government and not transferred to an allottee either on permanent or quasi-permanent basis. The suit land has admittedly been allotted to the plaintiff and this indeed is the foundation of his claim. Such land according to the statute itself does not vest

in the Central Government. Rule 58 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation Rules, 1955, also does not apply to such lands as this rule is subject to two exceptions, namely, the provision of any local or special law fixing the ceiling and any law regulating agricultural holdings. The Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955, is manifestly an enactment regulating the agricultural holdings and substantial concessions under it have been granted to the subsisting tenants.

*Second Appeal from the order of Shri Shamshad Ali Khan, Senior Sub-Judge, Bhatinda, dated the 8th April, 1963, affirming that of the Sub-Judge, 1st Class, (B) Bhatinda, dated 30th November, 1962, dismissing the plaintiffs' suit and leaving the parties to bear their own costs.*

D. N. AGGARWAL, ADVOCATE, for the Appellant.

PURAN CHAND, ADVOCATE, for the Respondent.

### JUDGMENT

**Shamsher  
Bahadur, J.**

SHAMSHER BAHADUR, J.—The short question which arises for determination is whether the holding of a landlord acquired by allotment from the Custodian of Evacuee Property is excepted from provisions of the Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955?

The plaintiff-appellant Asa Nand brought a suit for possession of land measuring 9 *kanals* and 9 *marlas* in khasra No. 988/2 in village Bhagu of which he obtained possession on 13th June, 1960. This land had been allotted to him earlier in the year 1957. After the plaintiff had been put in possession of this land the defendant Madho Singh and another got into possession and claimed it as tenants. Apparently the possession of the defendant Madho Singh was forcible and the parties resorted to criminal proceedings as well. It has, however, been found by the Courts below and this finding is not challenged that

Madho Singh was a lessee under the Custodian. The suit of the plaintiff was dismissed by the trial Court on the ground that Madho Singh being a tenant of the land in dispute could not be ejected except under the provisions of section 7 of the Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955. The Court of the Senior Subordinate Judge, Bhatinda, affirmed this decision of the trial Court and directed the plaint to be returned for presentation to the proper Court, it having held that the Civil Court had no jurisdiction under the provisions of the Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955 to entertain the suit.

Assa Nand  
v.  
**Madho Singh  
and another**  

---

**Shamsher  
Bahadur, J.**

In appeal it has been urged by Mr. Aggarwal on behalf of Asa Nand that the provisions of the Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955 are not applicable to the holding of the plaintiff and reliance has been placed for this proposition on section 51 of the Act which says:—

“51. (1) The provision of the this Act shall not apply to —

- (a) lands owned by or vested in the State Government otherwise than under the provisions of this Act,
- (b) lands vested in the Central Government which have not been transferred to an allottee either on permanent or quasi-permanent basis.
- (c) \* \* \* \*
- (d) \* \* \* \*
- (e) \* \* \* \*

Mr. Aggarwal submits that the land before transference to the plaintiff had vested either in the State or the Central Government and consequently the

Assa Nand  
v.  
Madho Singh  
and another  

---

Shamsher  
Bahadur, J.

provisions of the Act are not applicable. I am afraid I do not agree with the contention of the learned counsel. The applicability of the Act is excluded only in respect of lands which are either owned by or vested in the State or the Central Government. After the land had been transferred to an allottee, it ceased to be owned by or vested in the State or the Central Government. In fact clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 51, on which reliance has been placed, mentions specifically that the exception is made only in respect of land vested in the Central Government and not transferred to an allottee either on permanent or quasi-permanent basis. The suit land has admittedly been allotted to the plaintiff and this indeed is the foundation of his claim. Such land according to the statute itself does not vest in the Central Government.

Mr. Aggarwal has also invited my attention to rule 58 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955, which says that "where any person is allotted agricultural land under these rules he shall, subject to the provisions of any local or special law fixing the ceiling of, or otherwise regulating agricultural holdings, be granted vacant possession of such land". It is submitted on basis of this rule that unless dispossession of the tenant is ordered the plaintiff cannot be granted vacant possession as enjoined in rule 58. It has to be borne in mind that this rule is subject to two exceptions, namely, the provision of any local or special law fixing the ceiling and any law regulating agricultural holdings. The Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955, is manifestly an enactment regulating the agricultural holdings and substantial concessions are granted to the subsisting tenants. Section 7 of this Act says that a tenancy cannot be terminated except in accordance with the provisions of the Act

or on grounds specially mentioned. None of the grounds mentioned in section 7 of the Act has been relied upon in support of the suit for possession. Whether the tenancy of Madho Singh respondent is one which is binding on the plaintiff is a matter which is to be determined by appropriate authorities under the Pepsu Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1955. Section 47 of this Act bars the jurisdiction of civil Courts, to entertain disputes which have to be settled by the authorities mentioned in the Act.

Assa Nand  
v.  
Madho Singh  
and another  

---

Shamsher  
Bahadur, J.

In my view the judgments of the Courts below are correct and there is no scope for interference in this appeal which accordingly fails and is dismissed. As there is no direct authority on the point, I leave the parties to bear their own costs.

B. R. T.

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS

Before D. Falshaw, C.J., and Mehar Singh, J.

THE BIRLA COTTON SPINNING AND WEAVING MILLS  
LTD.,—*Petitioner.*

*versus*

HARI CHAND AND OTHERS,—*Respondents.*

Civil Writ No. 342-D of 1961.

*Delhi Rent Control Act. (LIX of 1958)—Ss. 6(1)(B) and 10—Whether ultra vires articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution of India.*

Jan., 7th.  
1964

*Held*, that section 6(1)(B) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, is not *ultra vires* the articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution of India. The division of premises into two classes, viz., premises let before the 2nd of June, 1944, and those let afterwards contained in section 6(1)(B)(1) of the Act is neither arbitrary nor unjustifiable. The reason for