

Mani alias Raman Vs Damodara Worrier and Another

Court: High Court Of Kerala

Date of Decision: Dec. 22, 1960

Acts Referred: Constitution of India, 1950 Article 227

Citation: (1961) KLJ 344

Hon'ble Judges: T.K. Joseph, J; M.S. Menon, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: C.K. Viswanatha Iyer, T.L. Viswanatha Iyer and K.P.S. Menon in C.R.P. 133 of 1957, for the Appellant; T.R. Achutha Warriar in C.R.P. 133 of 1957, V.P. Gopalan Nambiar in C.R.P. 168 of 1957, N. Sundara Iyer and K. Narayanan in C.R.P. 168 of 1957, for the Respondent

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

T.K. Joseph, J.

These civil revision petitions which have been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution should have been numbered as original petitions. The two revision petitions arise from proceedings for fixing the fair rent of the properties involved in two cases, under the

Malabar Tenancy Act. Section 4 of the Malabar Tenancy Act was amended by Act XXII of 1956 (Madras) by which an explanation was added

to the section. The explanation reads as follows:-

in ascertaining the normal produce, the yield of the second crop shall be deemed to be half of that of the principal crop which shall be deemed to

be the 6rst crop.

The learned Subordinate Judge of Palghat from whose decision C. R. P. No. 133 was filed did not apply the principle of this explanation in fixing

the fair rent while the Subordinate Judge of Ottapalam fixed the fair rent taking into consideration this explanation also.

2. Section 4 was amended while appeals were pending before the lower courts. Section 7(2) of Act XXII of 1956 (Madras) states that the

principal Act as amended by this Act shall also apply to petitions, appeals and other proceedings pending at the commencement of this Act. It is

therefore clear that fair rent should have been fixed by the lower courts on the basis of the amended section.

3. C.R.P. No. 133 of 1957 may now be considered. The explanation to section 4 requires that in ascertaining the normal produce the yield of the

second crop should be deemed to be half of that of the principal crop. This was not followed on the ground that the tenant had admitted that the

yield of the second crop would be three-fourth of the first crop. The figures stated by the tenant were not accepted by the court below so that

there was no admission as such which could be made the basis of the decision. Even apart from this the yield from the second crop has to be

ascertained as provided by explanation to section 4. The word "deemed" in section 103 of the Madras Hindu Religious and Charitable

Endowments Act, 1951, came up for construction in Krishna Moosad & another v Hindu Religious Endowments Board & others (1959 K.L.J.

560). The dictum of Lord Asquith in (1951) 2 All E. R. 587 and the decisions of the Supreme Court reported in The State of Bombay Vs.

Pandurang Vinayak Chaphalkar and Others, : 1958 S.C. 875 : 1959 S.C. 352 were followed in that case and the following passage from the last

of the cases referred to above was extracted:

It is a rule of interpretation well-settled that in construing the scope of a legal fiction it would be proper and even necessary to assume all those

facts on which alone the fiction can operate.

This applies to this case also, and there is no scope for taking evidence regarding the yield of the second crop or for deciding the case on the basis

of evidence if any adduced. The court has only to follow the provision in the Explanation to section 4.

4. It follows that C.R.P. No. 133 of 1957 has to be allowed and the order of the court below set aside. We do so and remand C.M.A. Nos. 24

and 36 of 1956 of the Subordinate Judge's Court, Palghat, to that court for fresh decision according to law and in the light of the observations

made above. C.R.P. No. 168 of 1957 is dismissed.

In the circumstances of the case we direct both sides to bear their costs in this Court.