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TOTAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

This chapter deals with the total protectors of their land, who by dint of one strategy or more did not yield even a single acre of their land. Although some of them have no legal stake in part(s) of their land but still they retain the possession. Some of these 16 cases have litigations going on at one level or another. The chapter also includes the cases who have gone down fighting for their land to which they attach social, political and economic importance. Some of these cases are examples of downward mobility, the causes varying from case to case. The cases taken are described as follows:

CASE-27

The present owner Rahim Khan, aged 83, comes from the Meo community (subcaste of Islam) enjoying majority status in a village located 16 kms. west of Ballabgarh in Faridabad district. It is a key village located on the state highway running from Ballabgarh to Sohna. Rahim Khan's father died at an age of 97, two years after the implementation of the Second Ceiling Act of 1972. Rahim Khan is married twice and has a big joint family. He is educated upto primary school but his father was illiterate. At the time of the First Act only one person (ownself) was educated in a family of 5 persons. Around the Second Act, the number of persons in the family increased to 20 (Rahim Khan, his father, 9 sons, 7 daughters and his 2 wives), out of which 8 males were literate and none of the females was literate. Today, the number of family members (excluding married daughters) has risen upto 62, out of which 30 are females. Although all of the
male members of the family are more or less literate but only 3 out of 30 female members are literate in some sense. There is a taboo of the religion of not sending females to schools. The number of coparceners of the property was 2 in 1953, 13 in 1972 and is 32 up to now. Only females are practically working on the farm, the males share only the leadership responsibilities and are involved in village politics. The family hired 7 labourers (full-time) for the farm work in 1953, whereas now the number of farm labourers has increased to 11. Except the two sons, one of whom is in United States and is working there as a Lawyer and the other who is Clerk in Chandigarh, others depend wholly on agriculture. The above mentioned two members have changed their place of residence only 5 to 6 years back.

The family owned about 140 acres of land distributed in two farms of 100 and 40 acres each. The bigger piece of the land is in native village and 40 acres of land is in a neighbouring village. The land was totally rainfed around 1953, whereas in 1972, 65 acres of land got irrigated and today, whole of the farm is irrigated either by canals or by tubewells. The entire land is ancestral except a piece of 4 acres which was purchased at a low rate in 1992. Today, the land is subdivided into 12 households and the number of other coparceners excluding daughters amounts to 20. The family has never leased-in any land and has also never formally leased-out any land to tenants, if ever, it was very less and was given to poor friends. The land yielded 1 to 2 crops depending upon the irrigation facilities. Now, the entire land yields two crops a year.

The family was a victim of both the Ceiling Acts (1953 and 1972) but the actual land loss is nil. The land declared surplus due to the First Act was 36 acres but the possession has never been given to anybody. The litigation goes on even today, in Session Court. To retain this land help was
sought from advocates. Further, according to Rahim Khan, the implementation was poor making it easy for the landlords to retain their lands. Again in 1972, due to the Second Act, 4 acres of family's land was declared and acquired as surplus. Same amount of land, i.e. 4 acres, was purchased in 1972 with the amount received as compensation but it was not as expensive as his own land. The the net effect on the total land due to the legislation remained zero. But, Rahim Khan terms the effect as a considerable social and economic setback as he had to pay a lot to the advocates, policemen, etc. The family has attempted to diversify the occupation and has recently opened a hatchery-cum-poultry farm but, it has not started giving income. The family is politically and socially sound, but only if it remains united. Three of the close relatives of the family were ministers in various governments. The family owned a pucca house covering 2000 sq.yds. in 1953, which has been multiplied thrice since then. The family as its other assets had 16 cattle and a few goats in 1953. A tractor was also purchased before 1972 and now, although the cattle remain in same numbers, the family owns 5 tractors, 4 two wheelers and a hatchery-cum-poultry farm.

The family is said to have a sound social, political and economic standing in the past but now it has gone down a little. Rahim Khan remarks that politicians are crushing them and are jealous of their position as he was Sarpanch of the village for 25 years and since then his son is Sarpanch for two terms. One of the sons of Rahim Khan was murdered three years back but was shown as a mere accident by the authorities.

DISCUSSION: The case falls in the category of 'very big' farmers. The family seems to have a strong backing and by dint of that, the family has more or less maintained its prestige. Also, they did not lose much due to the Ceiling legislation. But, if the land is devolved to all the eligible coparceners, the situation could be undesirable.
CASE 28

The present head of the family Karan Singh, aged 50 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died at an age of 75 years in 1977. Karan Singh stays in a remote village located 17 kms. south west of Narnaul in Mahendragarh district. He is illiterate and except two children going to primary schools, all others in the family are also illiterate. The family comes from 'Ahir' (Hindu) caste which enjoys a majority status in the village. In 1953, the number of members in family totalled 12. In 1972, the number increased to 15 and now it is 25. The number of coparceners increased from 5 in 1953 to 8 in 1972 and to 16 at present. Almost whole of the family is working on the farm now, as in the past. The family has never felt a need of domestic or farm servant in the remembered past. The family depends solely on agriculture for its survival. The family stays in the village with no exceptions.

The family owned 90 acres of unirrigated land in 1953 which it has maintained upto now. The family has never leased-out any land but had shown Karan Singh's father as a tenant in 1953 to grab some land but failed to get any. The family has also never leased-out its land to anybody. The land yields normally one crop a year as the agriculture is rainfed. Sometimes it yields 2 crops, if the weather permits. 5 Acres of this land was declared as surplus but the possession remains with the family. According to Karan Singh 5 more acres were acquired for digging-up a canal but that too is still with them as the work has not yet started.

Even today not even a single acre of land is irrigated. Agriculture here depends solely on rain (rainfall in the region is an uncertain 25 cms.). The total of 90 acres of land is scattered in 10 pieces of land in sizes varying
from 2 acres to 15 acres (no consolidation is done in this area). The entire land is ancestral.

Karan Singh informs that there was no claimant for their land but other residents and the Sarpanch told that a poor claimant came for possession but was scolded-off.

The family has an inadequate life style and is illiterate and ignorant. The life style of the family approaches the tribal style of life.

The family lives in bankruptcy, so there is no question of improvement in the status. The family has had no political or bureaucratic influence in the last 40 years or even more. There is almost no surplus generated by the land as it is a semi-desert strip. The family occupies the same 'Kuchha' house covering 200 sq. yds. which was built by its forefathers a long time back (about 60 years).

The family has one tractor purchased on loan from the bank in 1984 and rest of the assets are almost the same as they were in 1953, i.e. a few buffaloes and a camel.

Karan Singh informs that his father was a 'Jaildar' (Revenue officer of 25 villages in British India) and, therefore, they had a better social standing in the past.

DISCUSSION: Although Karan Singh’s family falls in the ‘big’ category of farmers but the living standard does not comply with their counterparts in other parts of Haryana. The family did not lose any land due to Ceiling legislations. But even then there seems to be no change in the social, economic or political standing of the family overtime.
CASE 29

The present head Neelam Singh, aged 62 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died at an age of 78 in 1983. Neelam Singh is functionally literate while his father was illiterate. The family comes from ‘Rajput’ (Hindu) caste that enjoys a majority status in the village located just 2 kms from Gharaunda in Karnal district. The number of members in the family were 7 in 1953, out of which only one male was literate. The number increased to 18 in 1972, out of which 5 males and 2 females were literate. The total number of members are 21 at present, out of which 14 males and 5 females are literate. The literacy proportion of the family is high, may be, because of urban proximity. The number of coparceners in the family was 3 in 1953, 6 in 1972 and is 15 till now. The number of members of family working on the farm was even less, i.e. 2 of the members worked on farm in 1953, 4 worked in 1972 and now only 3 are practically working on the farm. One of the sons of Neelam Singh is practising as an Advocate in Karnal. The family hired 4 full-time farm workers in 1953 and maintained the number till 1972. Now the number of hired workers is 6.

The family owned 100 acres of land in 1953. 50 acres of this land was irrigated. The land is one consolidated farm. The entire land is ancestral. The land got totally irrigated only in early sixties. The family has never leased-in any land but has been leasing-out part of its land due to scarce labour. The family leased-out 30 irrigated and 35 unirrigated acres of land in 1953, 20 acres of irrigated land in 1972 and is still leasing-out 7 acres of irrigated land to poor friends of the village.

The land was usually yielding 2 crops a year in irrigated portion and one crop a year in unirrigated portion. Now some vegetables are also grown, thereby, increasing the number of crops to 3. 15 acres of the family's land was
declared as surplus out of which 8 acres was exempted following a litigation in 1956. The remaining 7 acres of land was acquired and distributed to ‘Mali’ tenants who were also the original tenants of the family.

The Rajput family took the acquisition as socially disgracing. Neelam Singh’s father purchased 4 acres of land for the allottees in their own village, thereby, saving family’s prestige and land in the village. Finally, the family is left with the same 100 acres of irrigated (class-I) land. More land might have been declared as surplus if the family did not own a orchard.

The family gives illiteracy and ignorance as the main cause of the landloss, therefore, now the young ones are persuaded for higher education. The family has not diversified its occupation much and is concentrating on efficient farming. The family is also active in politics. Neelam Singh is an ‘ex-sarpanch’, his brother is present ‘Sarpanch’, also a member ‘Block Samiti’ and has also contested for M.L.A. The family has an adequate political and bureaucratic influence at present. But, still the members feel that they were better-off in the past and that now they are just normal.

The family had been generating only 20 quintals of food-grains as surplus in 1953, 70 quintals in 1972 and now when they are serious about agriculture, the generated surplus is 700 quintals of food-grains in addition to some cash crops. The family owned a ‘kuchcha’ house covering 200 sq. yds. in 1953. It was made ‘pucca’ in 1972 and 200 sq. yds. of covered area was added to the original one. In 1953, the other assets of the family were 4 bulls and 5 buffaloes. In 1972, the assets increased to 1 tractor, 7 buffaloes and 4 bulls. Now, the family has 2 tractors, 2 cars, 3 motorcycles, 15 buffaloes and 5 cows.

DISCUSSION: The family could be accounted as a ‘very big’ farming unit living in considerable comforts. As the land loss was nil and the family was politically, economically and socially sound, it made easier
for it to cope-up and stand in a higher stead. The family is quite enterprising as compared to other Rajput families taken in the study. The family is seeking higher education for its offsprings and is cultivating its land efficiently

CASE 30

The present head Pushkar Singh, aged 45 years, is son of the former head who died at an age of 68 in 1975. Pushkar Singh is functionally literate, while his father was illiterate. The family belongs to Rajput (Hindu), a dominant majority caste in a remote village located 18 kms. north of Mahendragarh. The total number of members in the family in 1953 was 6 including Pushkar Singh, his father, his mother, his grandmother and his two brothers. The number of members increased to 23 in 1972 and to 24 till date. While none of the members was formally educated in past, two young children are going to the village school now. The number of coparceners was 4 in 1953, 7 in 1972 and now the number is 12. Only one member worked on farm in 1953, 5 of the 23 members worked in 1972 and now 10 members are working on the farm at present. In 1953, the family hired 6 full-time agricultural labourers, which reduced to 2 in 1972 and none is needed now. Females do not work outside the four walls of their house in this caste. Even fetching of water from the well is a male’s job. All of the members of the family reside in the village except one of Pushkar Singh’s brother who has settled at his in-laws' place (Loharu) with his family.

The family owned 180 acres of unirrigated sandy land until the implementation of the Second Act in 1972. This land was divided into 10 farms of 5 to 20 acres in size. The entire land that the family has possessed is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 45 acres of its land to known people before 1972. The land leased-out was located at more distance from the village and was low on production. In the Second Act of 1972, 46 acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus.
The family fought all ends out to save its land that was allotted to poor tenants (not the original tenants) of nearby villages. The family fought physically with the allottees and never yielded possession to them. For that, male members of the family were frequently arrested and were harassed by the police. Most interesting thing about this case is that they had to sell 120 acres of their land in their attempt to save 46 acres. They fought the case upto High Court and have won back their land about year and a half back. Finally, the family is left with only 60 acres of land, and that too divided equally in 5 households. If the land is further divided into the eligible coparceners, some of them will get less than two acres. The final 60 acres of land comprises 6 farms of sizes varying from 5 to 20 acres out of which 40 acres of land is unirrigated.

The owners were not in a position to purchase any more land as they were in a state of actual bankruptcy due to the court cases. When asked -why did you fight when you were losing more? Pushkar Singh replied with his brother supporting him that;"when Rajputs fight, they fight till the end".

There was no scope for the diversification of occupation as all of the male members were deeply involved in the matter. There is a negligible improvement in the land productivity as water used for irrigation is saline and is spoiling the land further.

The family owned a ‘kuchcha’ house (Mud house) upto 1970's which was renovated later but the covered area remained the same (200 sq.yds.). There is no addition in assets except a tractor taken on loan and shared by 4 households. There is no access of the family in bureaucracy or politics.

The family was involved in 6 civil and criminal cases which ended about year and a half back.

The head of the family is now satisfied even when he has lost 120 acres in an attempt to save 46 acres.
DISCUSSION: The family was in 'very big' category but the divided families are all in 'small' category of farmers. The family beared a big loss in this process. Pushkar Singh accepts that they are ruined in the last 20 years. This is a case of clear downward mobility in all its aspects but not due to the landloss with respect to Ceiling legislation but due to a landloss in an attempt to save the declared surplus land.

CASE 31

The present head Gulab Singh, aged 54 years, is the eldest son of the former owner who died at an age of 82 in 1979. Gulab Singh lives with his family in his ancestral village, which is remote but a very big village (population - 15,000 approx.) located 19 kms. north west of Mahendragarh town. Gulab Singh is a matriculate but his father was illiterate. The family comes from a dominant Rajput (Hindu) caste constituting 25% of the village population. The present family is the part of a very big family. Gulab Singh had 18 brothers and 5 sisters from the same parents, out of whom only 6 brothers and 5 sisters are alive. The number of members in the family was 16 in 1953, 26 in 1972 and is reduced to 23 now. The number of literate members was only one (male) in 1953, 2 (males) in 1972 and is 11 (10 males and 1 female) at present. The number of coparceners was 9 in 1953, 17 in 1972 and is reduced to 11 at present. The family was not working on farms in 1953 as the work was done by hired labourers, 10 members (all males) worked in 1972 and 9 members (all males) are working at present. The Rajputs do not allow females to work on farm. The family has never hired a full-time agricultural labour since 1955. All of the members of the family solely depend on agriculture, have no other occupation and reside in the same village.
The family owned 120 acres of land before the first Act. All 120 acres are unirrigated. A well is owned but the water is not useful. If the well water is used it spoils the land. The land is divided into 9 plots of 6 to 26 acres in size. 120 out of 122 acres of the land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land in their name. The land produces only one crop a year. 26 acres of land was declared as surplus due to the First Act. Gulab Singh and his father managed to retain the better land and offer the Class-IV land (not producing anything - rocky land in hills) to the allottees. The allottees refused to take possession of that land. Gulab Singh’s father filed a case in the court seeking guidance from an advocate and won back his land about 20 years back. Now, the family possesses 122 acres (2 acres of land that fell in between the farms of the family was purchased in 1974).

Gulab Singh complains that the land declared surplus was not based on correct calculations. He beholds that it would have been a severe loss in social prestige if the land was taken away from him. Furthermore, the family did not diversify its occupation on a more rational front but is involved in village politics (Gulab Singh is Sarpanch). Now, he claims to have a considerable bureaucratic and political influence.

The land is not yielding any surplus because of lack of water. The family could not add much to its assets except one tractor and the renovation of its ‘kuchcha’ house that covered the same 600 sq.yds. in 1953.

The family finds a downward mobility in social and economic terms. Gulab Singh’s father was well respected as he was kind and big hearted, but now they are not in a position to offer anything to the village poors.

**DISCUSSION:** The family has maintained its status as a ‘very big’ farming household. In this case too {as in Pushkar Singh’s case (Case-31)}, we find that land is seriously taken as a status symbol and especially so in case of ‘Rajput’ caste. They never want to part with any piece of land whatever it may be producing. Although the
family has maintained its social and political position but much is spent in the attempt to save its land.

**CASE 32**

The present head Ramphal, aged 69 years, is the eldest son of the former head of the family. He is educated up to middle standard while his father was illiterate. The family comes from dominant Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in a remote village located 20 kms. from Meham (tahsil headquarters) in Rohtak district. The number of members in the family increased slowly (relatively) from 21 in 1953 to 27 in 1972 and to 35 till date. While none of the members was literate in 1953, 5 males and 2 females got literate in 1972 and the numbers increased to 12 and 6 respectively by 1993. The corresponding increase in coparceners is from 11 in 1953 to 14 in 1972 and 28 till now. All of the members were dependent on agriculture until recently when 5 of the young males joined small private jobs (3 in Delhi, 1 in Faridabad and 1 in Hansi). The family has never hired a full-time labour as enough labour was available within the family.

The family owned 21 acres of land in 1953. 30 more acres of land was purchased in 1965 as the land was going cheap. In 1953, only 7 acres out of 21 were irrigated but afterwards all of it was irrigated by tubewells or canal. Before the purchase was made, the land was divided into two farms of 4.5 and 16.5 acres. The purchased land was also divided into two farms of 11 and 19 acres of size, making the number of total farms 4.

The family has been leasing-in some land since long. 10 acres were leased-in around the First Act, 15 acres were taken on oral lease in 1972 and even now family cultivates 8 acres taken on oral terms from friends of the same village. But, the family has not been leasing-out any land. As usual, two crops
are harvested from the irrigated land, but the unirrigated land used to produce one crop when it was so in the past. In the Second Act of 1972, 8.5 acres of land was declared as surplus. The possession is retained by the family and the litigation goes on till now.

Ramphal informs that it was mainly due to the ignorance of the family that a part of its land was declared as surplus, otherwise it did not have any land as surplus, as per the rules. The family had to seek some guidance from the Advocates to file a suit in the revenue court. 30 acres of land was purchased to improve the status but the court cases on surplus land have spoilt the image of the family.

The family does not have a notable bureaucratic and political influence. There is no surplus generated as anything earned is spent on court case. The house that the family owns was ‘kuchcha’ upto early 70’s but then it was renovated and the covered area was doubled to 1000 sq.yds. The number of cattle which was 5 in 1953 has also doubled to 10 and besides that one tractor is also added.

Ramphal remarks that they are still respected in the village because of their behaviour but the litigation on land has definitely let them down.

**DISCUSSION:** Ramphal’s family falls in the ‘big’ category of farmers and in an attempt to increase the landholding, was trapped into the Ceiling Legislation. As it is evident in some other cases too, the landowner is not ready to give its major means of livelihood. The family is fighting the case since 1973 but has not given up. In this case, as there is no landloss, only social factor of ‘honour’ is guiding its behaviour.

**CASE 33**

The present head Tejveer, aged 38 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1988 at an age of 66 years. Tejveer possesses
a post-graduate degree in History while the former head was barely literate. The family comes from Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in a village located west of Bahadurgarh in Rohtak district. The village is on midway between Bahadurgarh and Jhajhar. The educational level of the members is high in the family. The family comprised of 3 members out of which one male and a female were literate in 1953. In 1972, the number of members in the family rose upto 8 out of which all 6 males and 2 females were literate. Now again, out of the total of 15 members, all 8 males and 7 females are educated upto graduation or more. The family had only one coparcener (former head) in 1953, 6 in 1972 and 8 till date. All of the members were working on farm till 1978. Now, only 10 members out of 15 are working on the farm. Four of the males are seeking education at urban centres and one is working as a vocational guidance counsellor in Delhi. The family hired 4 full-time workers for farm in 1953 and retained 2 of them in 1972. Now, the family is employing 2 workers, one each for farm and domestic work.

The family owned 125 acres of land before the First Act in 1953. The land was divided into 6 farms of sizes varying from 5 to 50 acres. The entire land was unirrigated. The land was consolidated in 1956 and reduced to 4 farms of 10 to 50 acres in size. 50 acres of which got irrigated in 1970 and now 105 acres of the total land is irrigated. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land whatsoever. The cropping pattern is as usual, 2 crops in irrigated and 1 in unirrigated land. 90 acres of the total land was declared as surplus in 1953 due to the First Act. The family retains the possession.

The family sought guidance from Advocates and by dint of that it did not lose the land outrightly as the case is still going on and it is in High Court. The family is very serious about the matter and acknowledges the
possible landloss as a severe setback. The family lived on subsistence till 1974 when canal irrigation was available. Now, about 12 tonnes of surplus food grain is produced. The original ‘pucca’ house is also doubled to 2000 sq.yds. The family reared 2 or 3 cattle in 1953; added a tractor by 1972; one more tractor, a car and a tyre shop too was added to their assets by 1993.

Tejveer finds a little betterment in the status but the land has been naturally devolved into smaller holdings and if the declared surplus land is lost, the situation may become miserable.

DISCUSSION: Tejveer’s family belonged to the ‘very big’ category of farmers but after devolution the new families belong to the ‘big’ category of farmers. In this case, we see an upward mobility as there is no net loss in the land possessed. Also, there is an upward trend because family is pursuing higher education since long.

CASE 34

The present head Randhir, aged 65 years, is the only son of the former head who died in 1974 at an age of 62 years. The illiterate head Randhir lives with his family in a remote village located 18 kms. north of district headquarters of Jind. The family comes from Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in the village. The family comprised all illiterate 12 members in 1953, reduced to 10 illiterate members in 1972 and now the total number has mounted to 30 of which only 3 males are literate. The corresponding increase in the number of coparceners is from 5 in 1953 to 6 in 1972 and to 22 till now. Almost all of the family members are working on farm except a few young children and a son who is working as a ‘Clerk’ in Chandigarh. The family hired 5 full-time labourers for farm work in 1953 and 4 since then.
The family owned 60 acres of land before the First Act, all of which was irrigated. The land was divided into two farms of 22 and 38 acres each. One of these farms (bigger one) is in a village located just 2 kms. from the native village. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out 2 to 4 acres at the time of the First Act. The leased-out land was irrigated, yielding 2 crops per year like rest of the land. 25 acres of the total of 60 acres was declared as surplus due to the First Act. The former head filed a case and won that about one year back. The possession of this land was never given to anybody. In a nearby village, 2 allottees were murdered (see Kanwar Pal of Case-40), therefore, nobody dared to take possession of the surplus land. Some help was sought from ‘Patwaris’ and ‘Advocates’ too.

The yield of land has gone up to 4 times, i.e. from 20 tonnes to 80 tonnes for the total land. Randhir is an Ex-Sarpanch but still the political and bureaucratic influence is less. The family owned a pucca house covering 500 sq.yds. in 1953 to which another 200 sq.yds. of covered area is added. The family purchased 1 tractor in early 70's and now has two tractors. Besides that, the family reared about 250 cattle in 1953 reduced to 200 in 1972 and further to only 100 cattle at present.

Randhir finds illiteracy as the main cause of their land being declared surplus. Although possession was not given at any time but the declaration alone has let the family down on the social ladder (according to him).

DISCUSSION: The family belongs to the ‘big’ category of farmers and has maintained that status except that the other assets have decreased. The family did not let any land go from its possession as it is the prime mode of production and an important element of social prestige.
CASE 35

The present head Harsha, is just 22 years in age and the eldest son of his blind and illiterate father who died at a relatively young age of 44 in 1976. Harsha is married but yet without a child. He is a matriculate coming from Jat (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the remote village located 21 kms. north east of Jind. At the time of the First Act, the number of members in the family was just 2. The former head who was blind and just 20 years of age, lived with his widowed mother. The number of family members rose to 6 in 1972 all of whom were illiterate. The number has remained the same but 2 young males and 1 female except Harsha have sought some elementary school education. The corresponding increase in the coparceners is from 1 in 1953 to 3 in 1972 and to 4 till date. All of the family members solely depend on agriculture for their livelihood. The family has hired 3 full-time farm workers since long before the First Act.

The family owned 60 acres of land at the time of the First Act. The land is divided into 3 farms of size 20 acres each. Out of the total, only 20 acres is irrigated and the rest is rainfed. The entire land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. The cropping pattern of the land is as usual, 2 crops in irrigated and 1 crop in unirrigated land.

In the Second Act, 18 acres of the total land that the family held was declared as surplus. For this, taking help from 'Advocates' a suit was filed in District Court, which is still pending there. Harsha says that nobody came to take possession because they were a very weak family.

The family finds the 'court-case' as a big loss in its meagre social prestige and economic status. The family has never tried to diversify its occupation or purchase some more land. The reason for this being the bad
The family has absolutely no political or bureaucratic influence. It owns the same 'semi-pucca' house covering 300 sq.yds. which it had in 1953 and the same number of cattle (i.e. 4). There is no asset except that.

DISCUSSION: The case strengthens the fact that 'Lilliputians' were easy prey to the Ceiling legislations. The family is weak but belongs to the 'big' category of farmers. The family was helpless as the former head was blind. This made the circumstances more difficult as the land given to Harsha's father by his brothers was of very low quality. The family has gone down on the social and economic ladders but as is evident Land Ceiling is not the sufficient cause for that.

CASE 36

The present head Kewal Singh, aged 60 years, is the eldest son of the former owner who was son-in-law of the original owner at the time of the First Act. Kewal Singh and the former heads were illiterate. Since when Kewal Singh's father got married (1949), the family is staying at his in-laws' place which is a big remote village located 13 kms. north of Jind. The family belongs to Jat (Hindu), a majority caste in that village. The number of members in the family is 17 in 1953 out of which none was literate. The number rose to 32 in 1972, of which only 2 males were literate. At present, the total number of members in the family are 40, out of which 18 males are literate but none of the females is so. The number of coparceners rose from 11 in 1953 to 20 in 1972 and to 31 till date. All the members of family depend on agriculture for their livelihood and all except young school going children work on farm. The present family has never hired any full-time labour for domestic or farm work but the original owners did hire 3 or 4 full-time farm workers.
The original family owned about 120 acres of land out of which 80 acres was irrigated and 40 acres unirrigated. This land was divided into 8 sub-farms of 2 to 24 acres in size but after consolidation the farms were re-united to one big farm. The entire land is inherited from Kewal Singh’s father, who in turn inherited this land from his father-in-law. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any piece of land. The cropping pattern is as usual, 2 crops in irrigated land and one crop in unirrigated land.

The family has never given possession of its 9 acres of land which was declared as surplus in 1954. The family did not need to do much for the retention of its land as no claimant seriously came for the possession. The reason was that inferior quality of land was offered to allottees.

The family was not in a position to purchase any more land because surplus generated has been too less. There is no bearing of the Ceiling Act on the social prestige of the family as nobody else knows about it in the village.

The family owns the same ‘pucca’ house covering 800 sq.yds. as it owned in 1953. The number of cattle has increased from 6 in 1953 to 11 in 1972 and to 15 at present owing to the increase in domestic demand of milk. The family has purchased 3 second hand tractors in last 10 years.

As the family is not basically from that village, it does not have much political standing. The living standard of the family is also not adequate.

**DISCUSSION:** The family fell in the ‘very big’ category of farmers but now the land has been devolved and the new independent families are in the ‘big’ category.

Now, the families live in actual bankruptcy not because of land acquisition but because of natural devolution and low yield of land.
CASE 37

The present head of the family Dayanand, aged 54 years, is the eldest son of his father who died in 1982 at an age of 70 years. Dayanand is a law graduate practising at High Court, Chandigarh and is staying with his family in Chandigarh. His brothers stay with their families in their native village located 16 kms. south-east of Hansi (Tahsil) in Hisar district. The family comes from dominant Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in the village. The number of members in the family increased from 10 in 1953 to 20 in 1972 and to 30 till date. Dayanand’s parents were illiterate, all others in the family are literate. The number of coparceners increased from 3 in 1953 to 7 in 1972 and to 21 till date. The family hired one or two full-time agricultural labourers in 1972 but afterwards the family increased in size and contained enough manual labour within. Dayanand is an Advocate and his wife is a school teacher in a local village near Chandigarh, all others depend on agriculture.

The family owned 74 acres of irrigated land in 1953, adding 6 acres more to it in 1968, it now holds 80 acres of well irrigated land. The land was consolidated to two farms of 46 and 34 acres in size. Except the 6 acres mentioned above, rest of the land is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out all its land in 1953 and 32 acres of the total land in 1972, afterwards the entire land was self-cultivated. The tenancy on the land was because of scarce family labour. The tenants were usually low caste people. The land has been yielding 2 crops consistently. One crop of cotton and the other of wheat are the usual crops.

In the First Act, 30 acres of the land that the family held was declared as surplus. This land was soon recovered by the help of Court and known Officers. 4 more acres of land was declared as surplus in the Second Act of 1972 for which the litigation went on till recently when the family lost
the case. The land is not utilised and the possession is retained by the family. The family is quite influencing which made it easier to retain the land. There is no loss in social prestige as none in the village knows about it. The family has tried to diversify its occupation; besides Dayanand practising as an Advocate, family owns a 1 acre plot and a cotton mill in Hansi town. Dayanand's younger brother is Sarpanch of the village. The productivity of the land has increased but is neutralized by the increased investments and cost of living. Dayanand quotes in the context that until recently no soap was used to wash clothes, and instead buffalo's urene was used for the purpose, or the clothes were kept under ash and then rinsed in water.

In 1953, the family owned a 'pucca' house covering 800 sq.yds. and 10-12 cattle. The covered area of the house is doubled, the cattle remaining almost the same. A cotton mill was established in 1980 and 2 tractors were added in 1978 and 1985. The family also owns a 1 acre plot in Hansi worth Rs. 10 lakh.

Dayanand does not find any apparent change in their social, economic or political status.

DISCUSSION: The family protected its land and falls in the upper half of the 'big' category. This is an example of upward mobility. The living standard of the family in Chandigarh and also in the village is very high and is comparable to the urban middle class.

CASE 38

The eldest male Khem Chand aged 36 years, is the eldest son of the former head who died in 1974 at an age of 75 years. Khem Chand who lives with his small family alongwith his brothers' families in a small village within the periphery of Hisar town. He is educated upto
primary level while his father was illiterate. The family belongs to Jat (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in the village. The number of family members in 1953 was 5 including the parents and his three sisters (Khem Chand was not born at that time). The literate member at that time was only the eldest sister. The total number went up to 7 in 1972, out of whom 3 males and 2 females were literate. At present, there are 10 members in the family, among whom 6 males and 3 females are literate. The number of coparceners increased from 1 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and to 6 in 1993. Except the young and school going children all others work on farm. The family hired 2 full-time labourers for farm work in 1953 and 1 of them in 1972. Now, the family labour is sufficient for the farm work. None of the family members have any other occupation than agriculture.

The family owned 38 acres of land in 1953, of which 10 acres was irrigated. The family maintained the land up to 1976 when it sold 5 acres of land which was at some distance from their bigger farm. Rest of the land, i.e. 33 acres, is consolidated into one farm, half of which is irrigated. The entire land that the family owns is ancestral. The family has never leased-in any land but was leasing-out around 10 acres of irrigated or unirrigated land to some known people before 1976. The land which was leased-out was located at some more distance from the village.

In the Second Act, 6 acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus. This land was never given possession of and till today the litigation goes on. Khem Chand informs that the allottees to whom the land was allotted have died and now there is no claimant. He adds that it was mischief of the ‘Patwari’ who asked for bribe which the former owner could not give at the right time. Finally, he took Rs.10,000/- and got himself transferred without doing the task. He further adds that now the ‘Tahsildar’ asks for a bribe of Rs.1,00,000/- but the family is not in a position to give.
The family seeking the guidance from ‘Munshi’ and ‘Patwaris’ filed a suit in 1974 which is yet not decided. Khem Chand acknowledges a loss in social prestige and a recurring loss of money. The family has no access to politics or bureaucracy which adds to the problem. As the land did not produce much, it was difficult to diversify the occupation.

The family owned a ‘kuchcha’ house covering 400 sq.yds. in 1953 which was soon made ‘pucca’. Now, the covered area of the house is doubled. Besides that, the family reared 20 cattle in 1953 which are now reduced to 4. The family purchased a tractor on a bank loan in 1970, which was sold in 1985 and a new one was purchased but again on a bank loan.

Khem Chand concludes that although the productivity of land has doubled (or even more) but it is not indicative of anything prestigious.

DISCUSSION: The family falls in the lower half of the ‘big’ category of farmers. The family has gone down struggling to retain its land. The sale of 5 acres shows that it was difficult for the family to cope with the new demands. This is an example of downward mobility, not due to the Ceiling Act alone but also due to other miscellaneous factors.

CASE 39

The owner Joginder, aged 70 years, was head of the family even at the time of the First Act in 1953. Joginder is illiterate and comes from Rajput (Hindu) caste enjoying a majority status in a village located 16 kms. east of Ambala. The number of members in this family did not increase drastically. The number was 9 in 1953, of which only 1 male was literate, again 9 in 1972 of which 2 males and 2 females got literate. The number is 13 at present of which 5 males and 3 females are literate. The number of
coparceners increased from 1 in 1953 to 4 in 1972 and 8 till date. As is well known, traditionally the 'Rajput' females do not work outside their house. In this context, Joginder remarks, "Ladoes (loved ones) do not work outside". While only one male was working on farm in 1953, 3 of the males worked in 1972 and now 5 adult males are working on farm excluding young and school going children who too share some work. The family had hired 8 full-time farm workers in 1953, reduced to 6 in 1972 and to only 2 workers at present.

One of the sons of Joginder is an Advocate at Ambala who owns a small house there and keeps his family with him. All other members are depending on agriculture for their livelihood. The family owned 70 acres of unirrigated land in 1953, all of which got irrigated by 1970. The land was divided into three farms of sizes 16, 24 and 30 acres. The smallest farm is located in a neighbouring village. The entire land was ancestral. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. In the First Act, 12 acres of the land that the family owned was declared as surplus following which 12 acres of land was sold and Joginder went to the court to prove that he does not have any surplus land. He lost this case but very smartly got the sold land allotted to the allottees. When the new owner, who purchased that land, asked for his money back, he was denied. Therefore, the family did not lose actually any land.

The cropping pattern on the land has been as usual, 2 crops in irrigated and 1 crop in unirrigated portion. The production from the land was only 10 tonnes in 1953 which increased to 30 tonnes by 1972 and is 65 tonnes of food-grains at present.

The family owned a 'kuchcha' house covering 500 sq.yds. in 1953 which was soon transformed to 'pucca' adding 200 sq.yds. more to the covered area. The family had 15-20 cattle at the time of the First Act which
are now reduced to 5. The other assets of the family are: a house (worth Rs.2 Lakh) at Ambala and a new tractor.

Joginder remarks that social life has decreased and thus, so there is no question of social prestige.

**DISCUSSION:** The family falls in upper half of the 'big' category and is in the same category even after the sale of 12 acres. As is evident, the family has not lost any land due to the Ceiling Acts. Practically, the family has only sold 12 acres of its land. This case can be treated as a circumventor who has comparatively improved its status overtime.

**CASE 40**

The present head, Kanwar Pal aged 80 years, is the only son of the previous head who died in 1973 attaining an age of 102 years. Kanwar Pal is illiterate and so was his father. He lives with his family in a remote village located 28 kms. north east of Jind (district headquarters). The family belongs to 'Rajput' (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the village. The number of members in the family was 15 in 1953, 24 in 1972 and is 34 till now. The literate members counted 6 (all males) in 1953, 15 in 1972 and 30 in the family at present. Only 4 members (Kanwar Pal and 3 of his daughter-in-laws) are illiterate. The number of coparceners was 4 in 1953, 12 in 1972 and is 17 till now. All of the males, except the young and school going offsprings, are engaged in farm work. The family hired 15 full-time agricultural labourers in 1953, 10 of them in 1972 and now only 5 workers are considered enough owing to the increasing mechanization and family labour within. All the members reside in the village solely depending upon agriculture for their livelihood.

The family owned 275 acres of land, only 20 acres of which was irrigated in 1953. This land was divided into 3 farms of 100 acres, 90 acres and
85 acres in size. The entire land is ancestral. Twenty percent of the total land was brought under irrigation by 1972 and at present about 60 percent of the land is adequately irrigated. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land. The land was very less productive around 1950 but now half of it is giving 2 or 3 crops and the other half yields 1 or sometimes 2 crops. 195 acres of land with the family was declared as surplus due to the First Act, the possession for which was never given to anybody. The authorities allotted the land to the ‘Chamar’ tenants of the same village. Kanwar Pal narrates the story as follows: "The land was declared as surplus in 1954 due to the First Act. The amount of land declared as surplus was massive (i.e. 195 out of 275 acres; i.e. 71%). This loss was unbearable, thus, my father and I never got ready to surrender the land. On the other hand, our cousins (Ram Singh & family of Case-41) did not keep desired relations with us. With the help of an Advocate (their relative) they managed to get our land allotted to the local village tenants and furthermore, my land declared as surplus was 40 acres more than their’s even when we had almost the same number of units. As the land was allotted to the local tenants, it increased the intensity of the struggle. For the first time, when the authorities came to take possession, one of the allottees was killed in the clashes. We were baffled at that, but we never gave up and launched an all out struggle. The second time when the possession was sought, another allottee was killed. This time my son and two more members of the family were arrested and imprisoned. The debacle was thus initiated. By this time, we were prepared to do anything. The government even tried to take possession by itself. Trees were planted on the declared surplus land, but I put them off. It took almost 40 years to finish this matter. Anything earned was spent on the six different litigations (Criminal and Civil). We have incurred a massive loss of carefully calculated 18 lakh rupees".

Kanwar Pal further adds in retrospect. "In 1953, a Tahsildar offered to save my land, if in exchange I gave him 11 acres. I was prepared to give that, but when the papers were made and I was required to put my thumb
impression, suddenly, I got afraid and I denied to do that as I was illiterate. It would have been a lot better if I had done that”.

As is evident the generated surplus was all consumed in litigations till recently. Now, it is about 4200 quintals of foodgrains per year. Nevertheless, the family seems to have regained its standing overtime. The eldest son of Kanwar Pal is ‘Sarpanch’ of the village since 1991. But, there was little chance of any more purchase of land and increasing the assets. The family owned a ‘pucca’ house covering 1000 sq.yds. in 1953 and still except some repairs it is the same. Besides that, the family has purchased 2 tractors (one of them, 10 years back and the other 2 years back) and a car. The number of cattle remained 8 to 9 throughout.

DISCUSSION: Now, the family is relieved and back to its original status. Kanwar Pal’s family falls in the ‘very big’ category of farmers and is still there.

In this village, none has surrendered his land, although 12 households possessed land above the permissible limit. 9 of the households were Pakistani refugees who were educated and smart enough to circumvent the legislation before-hand. Most of them have sold their lands (a few small farms are leased by two households) and have migrated out to urban centres. The where-abouts of these families were difficult to trace and thus these families are not included in the study. Moreover, as confirmed by other residents they are no more dependent on agriculture. Rest of the 3 households were ‘Rajputs’ and are taken as Cases-40 to 42.

CASE 41

The present head Jagat Singh, aged 72 years, is the eldest son of the previous head. Jagat Singh is illiterate and so was his father. He stays with his big joint family in a remote village located 28 kms. north east
of Jind (district headquarters). The village is same as that of Kanwar Pal of Case-40. The family belongs to ‘Rajput’ (Hindu) caste, which is in minority in the village. The number of members in the family was 10 in 1953, 22 in 1972 and is 69 at present. While none of the members was literate in 1953, 3 sought elementary education in 1972 and 51 are literate at present. Out of the 18 illiterates, 13 are females. The number of coparceners was 5 in 1953, 20 in 1972 and is 43 at present. In 1953, 5 males were working on the farm the number increased to 19 males in 1972 and to 38 at present. The females as usual in Rajputs are not allowed to work outside their house. The family hired 3 full-time farm workers in 1953 and since then the farm work is shared by the males in the family. One male is employed as a ‘constable’ in Navy and another is an Advocate in Jind since 1971. Rest of the members are engaged in agriculture.

The family owned 275 acres of land in 1953, 250 acres of which was unirrigated. By 1972, half of the land got irrigated and now, the entire land is irrigated. This land was ancestral and was divided into two farms of 100 acres and 175 acres of size. The family has never leased-in or leased-out any land in the remembered past. The land yielded 1 to 2 crops depending upon the availability of water uptill 1975. Since then, 2 or 3 crops are harvested from the land. Taking guidance from the Advocates (one of whom was relative), a case was filed in 1954. This case was decided after 35 years in 1989. The family won the case and retained the possession of its land. Jagat Singh terms the legislation as a big trauma for the landowners. He adds that everything that was produced from the land was spent on the litigation. He cites lack of muscle power as the main cause of their ruin. Further, there was no scope of diversification or purchase of more land.

The family had very less political and bureaucratic influence. None of the members has resorted to active politics.
Jagat Singh tells that surplus generated was less in the past. It is lesser at present because of increase in the number of members.

The family owned a ‘kuchcha’ house covering 500 sq.yds. in 1953, which is increased to 2000, sq.yds. owing primarily to the increase in the members. Besides that, the family reared 40-50 cattle in 1953, reduced to 30-35 by 1972 and 2 tractors are added to the same number of cattle till now.

DISCUSSION: Jagat Singh’s family has maintained its status of ‘very big’ farming unit as the family is still united. This case is from the same village as in Case-40 and shares a common descent with it. This household had some more influence than Kanwar Pal of Case-40 by dint of which it managed to get allottees from other villages. This family now maintains no relation with Kanwar Pal’s family. There is no doubt that the family has gone down in all dimensions but it is mainly due to the phenomenal increase in the family size.

CASE 42

Gopal Singh, aged 71 years, is the eldest son of the previous head who died in 1976 at an age of 70 years. Gopal Singh is illiterate like his father. He stays with his family along with his brothers’ families in a remote village (same as Case-40 & 41) located 28 kms. north-east of Jind (district headquarters). The family belongs to a socially dominant ‘Rajput’ (Hindu) caste which is in minority in the village. The number of members in the family was 6 in 1953, 16 in 1972 and is 34 at present. None of the members was literate in 1953, 4 of the males sought elementary school education by 1972 and 28 are literate in the family at present. Among the 6 illiterates, 4 are females and 2 are elderly males. The number of coparceners was 2 in 1953, 8 in 1972 and is 22 at present. Only the males work on the farm. 2 of them worked on the farm
in 1953 with the help of 6 full-time agricultural labourers. 5 of the males worked on the farm in 1972 seeking help of 3 full-time paid workers. Now, 19 males are taking-up the farmwork without any full-time worker. Except one male member who is working as a school master in a neighbouring village rest of the members depend on agriculture. All the members of the family reside in the village (including the school master).

The family owned 185 acres of land in 1953. Except 6 acres, rest of the land was unirrigated at that time. One half of the family's land was brought under irrigation by 1972 and now almost whole of the land is irrigated by canal and tubewells. The land is divided into 3 farms of 30, 60 and 95 acres in size. The entire land has been self-cultivated. 130 acres of the total land was declared as surplus in 1953. The possession for this land was never given to the allottees. Instead, the allottees were afraid to claim the land as this village was notorious in this context (referring to Kanwar Pal of Case-40). The allottees were from other neighbouring villages. Taking note of other landlords in the village, a suit was filed in 1954. This case remained pending in High Court till 1982, when the family won it. Gopal Singh adds that the litigation has dragged them down economically. Much of their surplus produce upto 1982 was spent on the litigation and after that land was devolved into 6 households (the family got disintegrated).

The family has had negligible political and bureaucratic influence. The members of the family are not interested in politics but are keeping desirable relations with fellow villagers. The family is perceived as simple and honest.

The family owned a 'pucca' house covering 400 sq.yds. in 1953 which was doubled in 1987. Besides that, the family reared 20-30 cattle in 1953, which is more or less the same till now. A tractor was purchased in 1986 and a two-wheeler was added two years back. The family has dug 6 tubewells for irrigation which is more than any family has dug in the village.
DISCUSSION: The family was in the 'very big' category of farmers till 1980. Now the independent families fall in 'big' category. The family has certainly gone down in all dimensions partly due to the cost of litigation and partly due to the population pressure on land and natural devolution.

Next chapter concludes the study taking up the analysis of the sample in all aspects. Policy implications will also be discussed.