

pl

C.A.No. 7588 OF 1999

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

CIVIL APPEAL NO.7588 OF 1999@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

Abdul Sattar

...Appellant

versus

Khutejabi & Ors.

...Respondents

O R D E R@@
CCCCCCCC

L.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.
.SP2

A petition for eviction of the tenants on the ground available under clause (p) of sub-Section (1) of Section 21 of the Karnataka Rent Control Act, 1961 (hereinafter, 'the Act' for short) was allowed by the trial court and the order of eviction was confirmed by the revisional court under Section 50 of the Act. However, in the revision under Section 115 of the C.P.C. preferred by the tenants, the High Court has reversed the findings of the two courts below and held the petition liable to be dismissed. The aggrieved landlord has filed this appeal by special leave.

The admitted facts are that the appellant is the owner-cum-landlord of the suit premises. In the year 1955, the landlord inducted late Mohammed Gouse as tenant in the suit premises, which are residential. The tenant's family consisted of his wife and four sons, who have all been residing in the suit premises jointly with the tenant as ...2/-

.PA

-2-

members of his family. In the year 1984, a house came to be allotted by the Housing Board to one of the sons of the tenant, namely, Mohammed Ismail. Mohammed Gouse, the tenant, died in the year 1988 and the tenancy rights devolved upon the widow and the four sons including the son in whose name the house from the Housing Board had stood allotted in the year 1984. In the year 1990, the landlord initiated proceedings for eviction of the tenants (the five heirs of late Mohammed Gouse) on the ground that one of the tenants has been allotted a building suitable for their residence.

Section 21(1)(p) of the Act reads as under:

.SP1

21. Protection of tenants against@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
eviction.__(1) Notwithstanding anything to the@@
AAAAAAAAAAAA
contrary contained in any other law or contract,
no order or decree for the recovery of possession
of any premises shall be made by any Court or

other authority in favour of the landlord against the tenant:

Provided that the Court may on an application made to it, make an order for the recovery of possession of a premises on one or more of the following grounds only, namely:-

xx xx xx

(p) that the tenant whether before or after the coming into operation of this part has built, or acquired vacant possession of, or been allotted, a suitable building.

xx xx xx"

.SP2

...3/-

.PA

-3-

In the opinion of the High Court, the allotment of house in the name of Mohammed Ismail, respondent No.4, was prior to their having inherited tenancy rights, that is, prior to a date when they became tenants and, therefore, the case was not covered by clause (p) above-said.

We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and we are satisfied that no fault can be found with the view of the law taken by the High Court. On a plain reading of the provision it is clear that building of a house or acquisition of vacant possession or allotment of a suitable building must be to the tenant in his capacity as a tenant though such event may be referable to a point of time, whether before or after the coming into operation of this provision. In the year 1984, when the house was allotted to Mohammed Ismail, the son, the tenant was Mohammed Gouse, that is the father. We have asked the learned counsel for the landlord-appellant whether Mohammed Gouse, the then tenant, would have incurred liability for eviction under clause (p) above-said in the year 1984 because his son or a member of his family was allotted a house? The learned counsel, with all fairness, conceded that it could not have been so because in the year 1984, the allotment of house was not to the tenant.

However, the learned counsel for the appellant ...4/-

.PA

-4-

invited our attention to the definition of 'tenant', as contained in clause (r) of Section 3 of the Act, which reads as under:

.SP1

"Tenant" means any person by whom or on whose@@
AAAAAAA

account rent is payable for a premises and includes the surviving spouse or any son or daughter or father or mother of a deceased tenant who had been living with the tenant in the premises as a member of the tenant's family up to the death of the tenant and a person continuing in possession after the termination of the tenancy in his favour, but does not include a person placed in occupation of a premises by its tenant or a person to whom the collection of rents or fees in a public market, cart-stand or slaughter house or of rents for shops has been framed out or leased by a local authority."

Abdul Sattar

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

Khutejabi & Ors.
(With office report)

Respondent (s)

Date : 01/05/2003 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.C. LAHOTI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. AGRAWAL

For Appellant (s) Mr. S.K. Kulkarni, Adv.
Mr. M. Gireesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ankur S.Kulkarni, Adv.
Ms. Sangeeta Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Mr. R.S. Hegde, Adv.
Mr. Chander Prakash, Adv.
Mr. A. Nagabhushanam, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

Heard the learned counsel for the parties for about
forty five minutes.

The appeal is dismissed, in terms of the signed
order, without any order as to costs.

.SP1
(N. Annapurna) (Radha R. Bhatia)
Court Master Court Master

Signed order is placed on the file.

REPOETABLE.@@
CCCCCCCCC