

PETITIONER:
BAPU MAHADU MALI & ORS.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
VITHALRAO BHAUSAHEB DESHMUKH & ANR.

DATE OF JUDGMENT 02/11/1995

BENCH:
RAMASWAMY, K.
BENCH:
RAMASWAMY, K.
HANSARIA B.L. (J)

CITATION:
1995 SCC Supl. (4) 632 JT 1995 (8) 446
1995 SCALE (6) 466

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R

Leave granted.

We do not find any justification warranting interference in this appeal.

The only point before the Revenue Tribunal and the High Court was of the title. For valid reasons the contention was rejected.

Admittedly, there was a suit for possession by the rival reversioners. The appellants-landlords were the defendants in the suit. The suit ended against the landlords-appellants and thereby the title remained with the other side of the reversioners. Since the respondents remained in possession for more than 12 years they have prescribed title by adverse possession. That apart, the appellants' having entered into a tenancy agreement with the respondents they are estopped under Section 116 of the Evidence Act to deny the title of the landlords. Having these insurmountable difficulties in the way, Shri G.N. Ganpule, learned senior counsel for the appellants, contended that when a notice was issued to the appellants to pay Nazrana after the abolition of wattan, the appellants had paid the same and thereby became entitled to remain in possession and Section 31 of the Bombay Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1948 has no application. This contention was rejected by the appellate authorities recording the finding that the respondents paid the Nazrana but this finding was not canvassed either before the Revenue Tribunal or the High Court. No clinching evidence has been produced before us to show that the appellants had paid Nazrana. The contention, therefore, has no substance.

The civil appeal is accordingly dismissed without costs.