

तारीख हुक्म	हुक्म या कार्यवाही मय इनिशियल्सजज Reference No. 2820/2005/TA/Bikaner State of Rajasthan Vs. Lunaram	नम्बर व तारीख अहकामजो इस हुक्म की तामीलमेंजारीहुए
22.01.2021	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>S.B.</u></b> <b>Mahendra Kumar Parakh, Member</b></p> <p><b><u>Present:</u></b></p> <p>Smt. Poonam Mathur : Additional Govt. Advocate for the State. Shri N.K. Goyal:counsel for the non-petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- - -</p> <p>This reference has been made to the Board of Revenue by Collector-cum-Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation), Bikaner under section 232 of the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955 and section 82 of the Rajasthan Land Revenue Act, 1956 by his decision dated 06.5.2005.</p> <p>2. Brief facts of the case are that non-petitioner filed a suit in the court of Assistant Commissioner (Colonisation), Kolayat claiming that the disputed land situated at Village Phularsar Bada bearing Chak CWB Murabba Nos. 88/18, 88/26, 88/10, 88/12, 88/27, 88/17, 88/23 total area 76 bigha has continuously been cultivated by him, but is not so recorded in the revenue records. Hence, on the basis of long cultivatory possession, it may be declared that he is the khatedar of disputed land. The Assistant Commissioner (Colonisation), Kolayat decreed the suit on 11.02.1999 and ordered to record the above mentioned 76 bighas of disputed land in favour of non-petitioner as gairkhatedar tenant. Considering this judgment &amp; decree in favour of non-petitioner as beyond jurisdiction, illegal and against record, Collector-cum-Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation), Bikaner has made this reference to the Board of Revenue after affording an opportunity of hearing to the non-petitioner.</p> <p>3. I have heard the arguments of learned Addl.Govt.Advocate &amp; learned counsel for the non-petitioner and perused the record.</p>	

तारीख हुक्म	हुक्म याकार्यवाही मय इनिशियल्सजज Reference No. 2820/2005/TA/Bikaner State of Rajasthan Vs. Lunaram	नम्बर व तारीख अहकामजो इस हुक्म की तामीलमेंजारीहुए
	<p>4. Learned counsel for the non-petitioner has submitted that Assistant Commissioner (Colonisation), Kolayat decided the case on 11.02.1999 and the reference has been filed after a lapse of 6 years in the year 2005 just to cover up the delay in making appeal against the order of Assistant Commissioner (Colonisation), Kolayat in competent court. Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) should have appealed against the order of Assistant Commissioner (Colonisation), Kolayat. The counsel for the non-petitioner argued that this inordinate delay in making reference to the Board is not condonable and there are number of citations where it is held that limitation in filing reference is to be adhered to and inexplicable delays should not be condoned. The counsel for the non-petitioner also argued that Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation)-cum-Collector is not competent for the purpose of making reference to the Board. The learned counsel for the non-petitioner cited the case 2017 RBJ page 6 and decision of Rajasthan High Court dated 02.3.2007 in D.B. Special Appeal 789/2003 wherein Rajasthan High Court upheld that the Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) is not authorized to file reference before the Board of Revenue.</p> <p>5. Addl.Govt.Advocate has argued that if decree is illegal, reference can be presented. For this, she presented citation of RRD 1994 page 186. As for the delay in making reference to the Board, argued that decision to make reference was taken on 06.5.2005 after hearing both the parties and within a month it was filed in the Board of Revenue. As regards competence of the Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) for making reference under section 232 of the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, it was argued that notification dated 17.10.1978 conferred the powers to make reference to Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation), Bikaner in Rajasthan Canal Project, Bikaner.</p>	

तारीख हुक्म	हुक्म याकार्यवाही मय इनिशियल्सजज Reference No. 2820/2005/TA/Bikaner State of Rajasthan Vs. Lunaram	नम्बर व तारीख अहकामजो इस हुक्म की तामीलमेंजारीहुए
	<p>6. Considered the arguments of the Addl. Govt. Advocate and learned counsel for non-petitioner. Perused the records carefully.</p> <p>7. As regards delay in filing reference, it is observed that the application moved for making reference was under trial in the court of Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) from 2001 to 2005 and there is no delay after a decision was made on 06.5.2005 by Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation). Hence, delay condoned.</p> <p>8. Prima facie, the decision of the Assistant Commissioner (Colonisation) conferring gair khatedari rights on the basis of consent of the gairkhatedar seems to be inappropriate and mala fide but without going into the merits of the case, this court has considered the issue of jurisdiction in the instant case first relying upon the citations presented by the counsel for non-petitioners.</p> <p>9. The definition of Collector for the purpose of reference under section 232 of the Rajasthan Tenancy Act does not include any office of the Colonisation Department. Though the Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) is included in the definition of Collector in the Colonisation Act,1954, but there are no provisions of making reference in Colonisation Act. Section 6 of the Rajasthan Colonisation Act, 1954 empowers the State Government to notify any officer of the Colonisation Department to exercise powers under Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955 and Rajasthan Land Revenue Act, 1956. Notification was issued on 17.10.1978 which empowered Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) to exercise powers under Rajasthan Tenancy Act and Rajasthan Land Revenue Act in their jurisdiction.</p>	

तारीख हुक्म	हुक्म याकार्यवाही मय इनिशियल्सजज <b>Reference No. 2820/2005/TA/Bikaner State of Rajasthan Vs. Lunaram</b>	नम्बर व तारीख अहकामजो इस हुक्म की तामीलमेंजारीहुए
	<p>Thereafter, the notification dated 15.01.1992 was published conferring powers to make reference under section 232 of the Rajasthan Tenancy Act on the Commissioner Colonisation.</p> <p>10. As regards competence of the Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) for making reference under section 232 of the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, the judgment cited by learned counsel for the non-petitioner in D.B. Special Appeal 789/2003 dated 02.3.2007 has dealt with this issue in detail. In the light of notification dated 15.01.1992 which confers power to make reference to the Board on the Commissioner Colonisation, it was upheld that any other authority other than the Commissioner, Colonisation has ceased to exercise power to make reference to the Board under section 232 of the Rajasthan Tenancy Act, 1955 in the colony area and therefore reference made by the Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation) was held to be incompetent in the cited judgment.</p> <p>11. As such, the reference under consideration is returned and sent back to Dy.Commissioner (Colonisation), Bikaner with the instructions that in the first instance, the impugned order of the Assistant Commissioner (Colonisation), Kolayat may be appealed against in the competent court. Secondly, if it is considered necessary and appropriate, reference can be made through the Commissioner Colonisation. The reference is disposed of accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Pronounced.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Mahendra Kumar Parakh)</b> Member</p>	