

Commission did not expect that this measure would yield any significant acreage for redistribution. The Panel on Land Reforms set up by the Planning Commission in 1955, reaffirmed the ceiling principle and asserted that for the purpose of ceiling fixation, the aggregate area of all the members of a family should be the determining factor.

The Second Five-Year Plan also endorsed the same approach stated in the First Plan. It said, "For building up a progressive rural economy, it is essential that disparities in the ownership of land should be greatly reduced. In view of the existing pattern of distribution and size of agricultural holdings, redistribution of land in excess of a ceiling may yield relatively limited results. Nevertheless, it is important that some effective steps should be taken in this direction during the Second Five-Year Plan so as to afford opportunities to landless sections of the rural population to gain a social status and to feel a sense of opportunity equally with other sections of the community."<sup>3</sup> The Second Plan also went on record that a reasonable ceiling should equal "about three family holdings" and it was left entirely to the State Governments, to decide whether the ceilings should apply on an individual or family basis.

The Standing Committee of the National Development Council decided in 1957 that the States which had not yet enacted necessary legislation should do so by the end of March 1959 and the laws should be implemented within a period of about three years. The Indian National Congress passed a resolution in 1959 urging the State Governments to enact ceiling legislation expeditiously. As a result of these policy directions most of the State Governments,

---

<sup>3</sup> Planning Commission; Second Five Year Plan, Government of India, 1956, p. 178.

including that of Maharashtra, enacted ceiling laws by 1961.

In the case of the Maharashtra State, the draft Bill of Ceiling on Land Holdings was first published on 4th August 1959, but due to the impending reorganisation of the then State of Bombay, its consideration was postponed. Prior to this draft Bill, the provisions relating to ceiling on land holdings were incorporated in the respective Tenancy Acts for Western Maharashtra, Vidarbha and Marathwada. These provisions, however, were never put into operation and were repealed in 1961. After the formation of the present State of Maharashtra, the issue of ceiling on land holdings was again taken up. The former Bill on Ceiling on land holdings was subsequently revised and was passed by both the Houses of Legislature in April 1961. The new Act, called the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961, was brought into force with effect from 26th January 1962.

#### 1.1 The Maharashtra Ceiling Act

The Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act 1961, henceforth referred to as the 'Principal Act', came into force on 26th January 1962 and the first phase of surplus land distribution began with the enforcement date (i.e. 26th January 1962) and continued upto 2nd October 1975, when some of the important provisions in respect of the ceiling area and also the distribution of the surplus land were amended. Thus, the 'Principal Act' was amended by Maharashtra 21 of 1975, the so amended Act, henceforth referred to as the 'Revised Act', came into force from 2nd October 1975.

The ceiling area prescribed under the Principal Act varied between 66 and 140 acres of dry crop land, the lowest category of crop land, falling under sub-clause (d) of Clause 5 of Section 2 or its equivalent area in the other categories i.e. lands falling under sub-clauses (a) or (b) or (c) of Clause 5 of Section 2, for various 'local areas' as given in the First Schedule to the said Act. The Act amended by 'Maharashtra 21 of 1975' not only lowered the ceiling area but further prescribed a uniform ceiling area all over the State by introducing sub-clause (e) in Clause 5 of Section 2 and thereby did away with the earlier mentioned variations in ceiling area of crop land for various 'local areas', the 'local area' becoming redundant with the introduction of sub-clause (3). In fact sub-clause (d) of Clause 5 of Section 2 of the Principal Act was split into two as sub-clause (d) relating to lands under paddy cultivation in major paddy growing areas of the State for a continuous period of three years immediately preceding the commencement date and sub-clause (e) relating to dry crop land other than that falling under sub-clause (d). The First Schedule of the Principal Act was substituted in the light of the amendments under "Maharashtra 21 of 1975". This substitution of the First Schedule of the Principal Act in the Revised Act itself would have adversely affected the extent of maximum area allocable to individual grantees under Section 27 of the Principal Act. However, Section 27 of the Principal Act was also substituted by 'Maharashtra 21 of 1975'. This substitution of section 27 of the Principal Act in the Revised Act was with a view to giving effect to the policy of the State towards securing principles specified in clause (b) and clause (c) of Article 39 of the Constitution.

Section 27 of the Revised Act drastically reduced the maximum area allocable to individual grantees as against that allocable under the Principal Act and thus brought about a significant difference in the area allotted to grantees under the Principal Act and the Revised Act.

Thus, distribution of the surplus land, surplus over the ceiling area prescribed under the Principal and the Revised Act occurred in two distinct phases. The two phases of distribution are based on the date of enforcement of the Principal and the Revised Act. The necessity to distinguish between the Principal Act and the Revised Act arises in view of the difference in the maximum area allocable to individual grantees as per provisions of the respective Acts. Distribution of the surplus land, however, was done according to the list of priorities laid down in the Principal Act and which continued to remain the same under the Revised Act as well. The list of priorities was as under :

The Act provides that :

(1) If the surplus land belonged to a person who, by resuming land from his tenant before 2nd October 1975 had rendered the tenant landless such surplus land was first to be offered to the tenant;

(2) If any surplus land formed part of one or more compact blocks, then such surplus land was first to be offered to the landlord who had leased it but had not exercised his right of resumption under the Tenancy Act.

(3) Of the remaining surplus land (excluding lands referred above) 50 per cent was reserved for distribution to landless persons from the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and landless persons belonging to Nomadic Tribes

notified by the State Government.

(4) The rest of the total surplus land was offered in the following order :

(a) Landless tenant residing either in the village where the surplus is situated or within its radius of eight kilometers;

(b) A person who had leased his land to an undertaking referred to in Section 28, who is a resident of the taluka in which the surplus land is situated and whose net annual income does not exceed Rs.4000/-;

(c) Serving members of the armed forces and ex-servicemen;

(d) Other landless persons.

The Act further provides that while making distribution of the declared surplus land, it should be seen that as far as possible the total holding of the allottee after grant of the surplus land does not exceed one hectare of land falling under class (a), of one and half hectares of land falling under class (b), or two hectares of land falling under class (c) or (d) or three hectares of land falling under class (e). The occupancy price payable in respect of surplus land granted, is to be the same as the compensation calculated for that land, and is to be paid at the most in 15 annual instalments. The surplus land granted cannot be sold or otherwise transferred or partitioned without the permission of the Collector, except for purpose of mortgage with the Government or a Cooperative Land Development Bank for securing a loan.

## 1.2 Objectives of the Enquiry

The Estimates Committee of the Maharashtra Legislature in its Report for the year 1977-78, recommended that an

evaluation of the programme of the implementation of the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961 be made with the following objectives in view :

"(1) to assess the quality of lands allotted i.e. whether they are cultivable or otherwise; where the lands are not cultivable whether they can be brought under cultivation by undertaking some developmental operations;

(2) to recommend the steps that could be taken to assist the allottees in the selection of seeds etc. and to provide them with facilities for borrowing and ploughing of land with a view to increase the agricultural production from the land;

(3) to ascertain and recommend the facilities (such as irrigation facility) which could be provided to the allottees for developing the land and what step could be taken for the purpose; and

(4) to assess the overall success of the scheme, particularly with reference to whether there is any marked improvement in the economic conditions of the allottees."

The present study was undertaken by the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune, at the instance of the Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra, as per their Resolution No. EVA-1077-14-Div II dated 4th July 1978, in pursuance of the above noted points of reference. The following excerpts may be quoted from the write-up for the present study of evaluation of the implementation of the Act prepared by the Revenue and Forest Department, Government of Maharashtra, and appended with the resolution to elaborate the objectives of the study.

"The revised Land Ceiling Act was brought into force with effect from 2nd October 1975. Under this Act, till

the end of August 1977, 1,40,767 hectares of land has been declared surplus; out of which 1,08,302 hectares has been distributed to 72,375 allottees. Nearly 60 per cent of the land has been distributed to landless persons belonging to backward class."

The progress reports indicate that about 3,500 hectares of the land cannot be distributed as it is uncultivable. Again, all the lands that have been declared surplus and distributed are not of the same quality. While some of these lands are cultivable and of quite a good quality, the others may require developmental operations for bringing them under cultivation. The allottees of the land also, by and large, belong to the economically weaker sections of the Society and do not possess necessary implements etc. for bringing the lands allotted to them under cultivation. Care has already been taken to make the allottees members of the village cooperative societies, so as to enable them to obtain loans from cooperative financing agencies. A programme of borrowing and ploughing the lands granted to the allottees with the assistance of village Sakhar Karkhanas, tractor owners, etc. was also taken up in 1976 Kharif Season.

"The success or otherwise of the implementation of the Land Ceiling Act will depend upon :

(1) Whether the allottees have been able to bring the lands allotted to them under cultivation.

(2) Whether the measure has ultimately resulted in increasing the food production.

(3) Whether the measure has resulted in improving the economic condition of the allottee."

The write-up has further stressed that the study would have to be undertaken with reference to the four objectives recommended by the Estimates Committee. The present study, therefore, attempts to examine the implementation of the Act with reference to the four objectives stated earlier in the four sample districts of the Maharashtra State.

### 1.3 Selection of the Sample Districts

By the end of October 1976, the total area declared as surplus in the whole of Maharashtra State was around 2,23,404 hectares under both the Principal and the Revised Act. Of this, about 1,56,522 hectares were finally distributed to 88,173 allottees in the State. The remaining area of 66,882 hectares was not taken possession of and hence was not available for distribution. This area was involved in the appeals and writ petitions made by the surplus land holders to the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, High Court and the Supreme Court. The Divisionwise and districtwise distribution of the total declared surplus land, distributed land and the number of allottees under the Principal and the Revised Act are given in Tables 1.1 to 1.3. It may be noted from the tables that the average distributed surplus land per allottee varied between 1.31 and 2.00 hectares in the four divisions of the State. The interdistrict variations in the average surplus land distributed per allottee was also, more or less, of the same order.

It was decided to select one district each from the four Divisions of the State to undertake a detailed enquiry into the distribution of the surplus land. Accordingly we selected Thane district, from the Bombay division;



**Table 1.1 : Surplus area declared and distributed under the Principal Act**

District	Area declared surplus	Surplus area distributed	No. of allottees	Area per allottee
<b>Bombay S. D.</b>	-	-	-	-
Thana	4,236	2,765	2,821	0.98
Kulaba	4,217	2,229	2,248	0.99
Ratnagiri	646	228	117	1.95
Nasik	1,583	711	270	2.63
Dhule	1,002	632	329	1.92
Jalgaon	1,668	1,230	450	2.73
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,352</b>	<b>7,795</b>	<b>6,235</b>	<b>1.25</b>
<b>Ahmednagar</b>	<b>4,315</b>	<b>2,753</b>	<b>1,189</b>	<b>2.32</b>
Pune	6,121	3,967	1,816	2.18
Satara	4,691	2,942	927	3.17
Sangli	2,205	1,994	1,215	1.64
Solapur	3,704	2,196	881	2.49
Kolhapur	4,099	1,946	1,307	1.49
<b>Total</b>	<b>25,135</b>	<b>15,798</b>	<b>7,335</b>	<b>2.15</b>
<b>Aurangabad</b>	<b>3,688</b>	<b>2,655</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>2.04</b>
Parbhani	6,440	1,245	429	2.90
Beed	1,632	1,590	620	2.56
Nanded	1,256	528	255	2.07
Osmanabad	3,745	2,114	538	3.93
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,761</b>	<b>8,132</b>	<b>3,142</b>	<b>2.59</b>
<b>Buldhana</b>	<b>2,359</b>	<b>2,018</b>	<b>872</b>	<b>2.31</b>
Akola	9,878	6,421	2,245	2.86
Amravati	7,528	5,135	2,564	2.00
Yestmal	10,783	9,034	2,873	3.14
Wardha	6,037	3,907	1,648	2.37
Nagpur	3,223	2,076	722	2.88
Bhandara	928	643	484	1.33
Chandrapur	2,871	1,810	862	2.10
<b>Total</b>	<b>43,607</b>	<b>31,044</b>	<b>12,270</b>	<b>2.53</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>98,855</b>	<b>62,769</b>	<b>28,982</b>	<b>2.17</b>

**Table 1.2 : Surplus area declared and distributed under the Revised Act**

District	Area declared surplus	Surplus area distributed	No. of allottees	Area per allottee
Bombay S.D.	29	-	-	-
Thana	4,665	3,909	3,346	1.17
Kulaba	4,439	2,928	2,693	1.09
Ratnagiri	6,880	5,604	3,727	1.50
Nasik	2,721	2,105	1,339	1.57
Dhule	1,649	1,380	805	1.71
Jalgaon	1,537	1,163	841	1.38
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,920</b>	<b>17,089</b>	<b>12,751</b>	<b>1.34</b>
Ahmednagar	5,080	4,387	2,565	1.71
Pune	5,191	4,183	2,668	1.57
Satara	1,892	1,351	654	2.07
Sangli	2,351	2,284	1,829	1.43
Solapur	7,182	6,956	3,737	1.87
Kolhapur	1,402	1,070	935	1.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,098</b>	<b>20,231</b>	<b>12,388</b>	<b>1.63</b>
Aurangabad	7,462	6,232	3,285	1.90
Parbhani	7,891	6,764	4,456	1.52
Beed	7,881	5,986	3,565	1.68
Nanded	4,363	2,992	1,769	1.69
Osmanabad	7,731	6,835	3,932	1.74
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,328</b>	<b>28,809</b>	<b>17,007</b>	<b>1.69</b>
Buldhana	4,672	3,439	856	4.02
Akola	6,638	4,255	2,450	1.74
Amravati	6,378	3,355	2,306	1.45
Yestmal	13,440	8,681	6,060	1.43
Wardha	3,580	1,860	1,752	1.06
Nagpur	3,187	2,171	1,435	1.51
Bhandara	3,032	1,578	1,470	1.07
Chandrapur	3,281	2,285	716	3.19
<b>Total</b>	<b>44,208</b>	<b>27,624</b>	<b>17,045</b>	<b>1.62</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,24,554</b>	<b>93,753</b>	<b>59,191</b>	<b>1.58</b>

**Table 1.3 : Surplus area declared and distributed under the Principal and the Revised Act**

District	Area declared surplus	Surplus area distributed	No. of allottees	Area per allottee
Bombay S.D.	29	-	-	-
Thana	8,901	6,674	6,167	1.08
Kulaba	8,656	5,157	4,941	1.04
Ratnagiri	7,526	5,832	3,844	1.52
Nasik	4,304	2,816	1,609	1.75
Dhule	2,651	2,012	1,134	1.77
Jalgaon	3,205	2,393	1,291	1.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,272</b>	<b>24,884</b>	<b>18,986</b>	<b>1.31</b>
Ahmednagar	9,395	7,140	3,754	1.90
Pune	11,312	8,150	4,484	1.81
Satara	6,583	4,293	1,581	2.71
Sangli	4,556	4,278	3,044	1.41
Solapur	10,886	9,152	4,618	1.98
Kolhapur	5,501	3,016	2,242	1.34
<b>Total</b>	<b>48,233</b>	<b>36,029</b>	<b>19,723</b>	<b>1.83</b>
Aurangabad	11,150	8,887	4,585	1.94
Parbhani	14,331	8,009	4,885	1.64
Beed	9,513	7,576	4,185	1.81
Nanded	5,619	3,520	2,024	1.74
Osmanabad	11,476	8,949	4,470	2.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>52,089</b>	<b>36,941</b>	<b>20,149</b>	<b>1.83</b>
Buldhana	7,031	5,457	1,728	3.16
Akola	16,511	10,676	4,695	2.36
Amravati	13,906	8,490	4,870	1.74
Yeshwantnagar	24,223	17,715	8,933	1.32
Wardha	9,617	5,767	3,400	1.70
Nagpur	6,410	4,247	2,157	1.97
Bhandara	3,960	2,221	1,954	1.14
Chandrapur	6,152	4,095	1,578	2.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>87,810</b>	<b>58,668</b>	<b>29,315</b>	<b>2.00</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,23,404</b>	<b>1,56,522</b>	<b>88,173</b>	<b>1.77</b>

Solapur district, from the Pune division; Aurangabad district, from the Aurangabad division; and Yavatmal district, from the Nagpur division. It was further thought that we should restrict the study only to those talukas which together contained at least 50 per cent of the total allottees in each of the selected districts. In Table 1.4, we give the details of the sample talukas, villages and the number of allottees chosen from the four districts selected for the present study. It was observed that in all the sample talukas of the four districts, the number of allottees securing surplus land under the Revised Land Ceiling Act was much larger than those who received surplus land under the Principal Land Ceiling Act. This was obvious because of the lower ceiling enforced under the Revised Land Ceiling Act. As the ceiling on land was brought much lower under the Revised Act, more surplus land was made available for distribution to a larger number of landless families in the district. In the sample talukas therefore, the number of allottees securing surplus land under the Revised Act was nearly three-fourths of the total allottees. Only about one-fourth of the total allottees were reported to have secured surplus land under the Principal Act.

In order to select a sample of villages for the present study, we collected figures for the number of allottees for each village in all the sample talukas, from their respective Taluka Records. These villages were then arranged in a descending order, according to the number of allottees and further stratified them into three groups, viz. those containing (1) 1 to 5 allottees; (2) 6 to 15 allottees; and (3) above 15 allottees. It was desirable to select villages from each of the above groups as there was a possibility that the extension agencies

**Table 1.4 : Sample talukas, villages and the number of allottees selected from the four districts**

District	Sample Talukas	Sample villages	Sample allottees	
Solapur	North Solapur	7	92	
	South Solapur	5	114	
	Barshi	8	109	
	Akkalkot	6	53	
	Madha	6	35	
	Malsiras	6	62	
	Karmala	6	58	
	Sangola	6	48	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>571</b>	
Thane	Talasari	5	130	
	Dahanu	5	118	
	Palghar	6	110	
	Jawhar	2	30	
	Shahapur	6	81	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>469</b>	
Yavatmal	Yavatmal	9	134	
	Darvha	5	124	
	Pusad	3	81	
	Wani	3	103	
	Kelapur	3	187	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>629</b>	
Aurangabad	Ambad	13	132	
	Jalna Bhokardan Jafrabad	18	98	
	Silled Soegaon	8	48	
	Paithan	6	40	
	Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	8	70	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>388</b>

might have paid more attention to the villages containing larger number of allottees and much less attention to the others. We decided to select villages from each group in such a manner that the selected villages in a group would contain at least 10 per cent of the allottees in that group. The number of villages to be selected from each group, was determined on the basis of the total number of allottees in each group of villages and the average number of allottees per village in the same group. The selection of the required number of villages from a group was made at random. The number of allottees in the villages, selected in the above manner made up around 10 per cent of the total allottees in each group of villages and consequently 10 per cent of the total allottees in the selected talukas. We decided to study all allottees in the selected villages.

The above mentioned procedure for drawing the sample allottees was followed in the three districts, viz. Aurangabad, Solapur and Thane. In the case of Yavatmal district, however, the selection of the sample villages was purposive, so as to cover 10 per cent of allottees in each taluka of the district. The minimum number of villages to be selected was set at two villages at least in each taluka. The purposive selection of villages was with a view to facilitate collection of the data and comparatively easier accessibility of the villages. It was further decided to cover all the allottees from the sample villages, whether he was allotted surplus land under the Principal or the Revised Act. Wherever the allottees under the Principal Act were not reported in the selected villages another village reporting such allottees should be covered in addition to the selected villages in respect of the Revised Act. This procedure was inevitable for want of the necessary detailed information

and the selected allottees may not strictly fit into the concept of a sample. In this manner data was collected in respect of the allottees under the Principal Act in all the five talukas of the Yavatmal district. The sample allottees under the Principal and the Revised Act came to about 8 per cent of the total allottees who received surplus lands by the end of April 1978.

While conducting the field investigations, however, we found that the actual number of the sample allottees in some of the villages particularly from the Solapur and Thane districts, fell much short of their total number recorded in the Taluka Records supplied to us. So also some of the allottees from the selected villages in these two districts, could not be contacted as they had temporarily left their villages in search of employment to the neighbouring districts. Because of these two facts, the total number of allottees from the sample villages who could be contacted for the study, fell short of the total number of allottees chosen as sample from the Taluka Records. In Thane district, therefore, additional villages had to be selected in Talasari, Dahanu, Palghar and Shahapur talukas to cover at least 10 per cent of the allottees from each group of villages. Thus, we have taken care that the total number of allottees who could be contacted and studied during our field investigations in all the four sample districts came to round about 10 per cent of the total number of the allottees in each district. The talukawise number of the allottees studied for the present enquiry is given in Table 1.4. The field investigation was carried out during 1978 for the Yavatmal district and during 1979 for the remaining three districts.

#### 1.4 The Surplus Estimate

In this section we try to estimate the surplus agricultural land in each of the four sample districts in order to arrive at the probable composition of such an estimate in terms of cultivated and uncultivated area. The figures of the declared surplus land do not give such a break-up. To the extent the surplus estimate can lead us to some probable composition of the surplus land into cultivated and uncultivated area the exercise could be worthwhile. Not that such probable composition will, necessarily, be observable in respect of the surplus area declared and distributed but that probable composition may indicate to what extent cultivated and uncultivated areas were likely to be surrendered as surplus over the prescribed ceiling. The composition of exempted and unexempted land cannot be taken note of since no information on these lines is available, nor can any further exemptions under relevant provisions of the Act be visualised. An element of speculation is quite likely while indulging in such an exercise of surplus estimates but as will be seen subsequently there is nothing speculative about such an exercise. At the same time it may be remembered that estimate of surplus is not with a view to judge the surplus declared being right or otherwise but has the only purpose of arriving at a probable composition of surplus into cultivated and uncultivated area.

The composition of surplus land into cultivated and uncultivated area assumes importance since under the relevant provisions of the Act the choice to retain whichever lands upto the ceiling area has been given to the landholder and it will be quite natural for the surplus holder to surrender



uncultivated area as surplus to the extent it is feasible to meet the situation without violating any provisions of the Act. Section 16 of the Act makes it sufficiently clear that the right to priority of lands to be retained is of the surplus landholder and the right to the extent of land to be surrendered as excess over ceiling is of the State.

The surplus surrendered and distributed and its composition in terms of cultivated and uncultivated area deserves attention on another count also. Depending upon the extent of surplus being previously cultivated or uncultivated the effects of bringing such lands under cultivation would affect the employment in agriculture, agricultural production, and income in quite different directions. How significant or insignificant such effects will be is another matter depending not only upon the composition of the surplus but also upon the extent of the surplus as a proportion to total agricultural land falling within the purview of the ceiling on Holdings Act. If the extent of land distributed out of the surplus surrendered is largely previously uncultivated area and brought under cultivation by the allottees, it would mean that such addition to total agricultural production and also in employment in agriculture and whether this will essentially amount to addition to the allottees' income in the immediate period is difficult to say. On the other hand if the distributed surplus is largely out of the previously cultivated area it is more or less certain that, at least in the immediate period there is no likelihood of increase in agricultural production, employment and income also or at best any changes in this will be quite marginal.

The surplus estimate obviously will have to be based on the landholding data that would near about coincide with the dates fixed by the Principal Act and the Revised Act forbidding any transfer or partitions etc. of land that are likely to defeat the objectives of the Act. Thus the land holding data in respect of the Principal Act will have to be around 4th day of August 1959, the date stipulated by Section 10 of the Act. However, no such data around the day stipulated in the Principal Act is available and so estimates of surplus land in respect of the Principal Act are not possible. The Revised Act had forbidden any transfers etc. after 26th September 1970 and the estimates will have to be based on the land holding near about the day stipulated. Districtwise data on number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of operational holdings is available from the Agricultural Census 1970, and the same may be used for the purpose of the estimate.

Tables 1.5 to 1.6 give the number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of individual and joint holdings for all the four sample districts as per the Agricultural Census 1970. The presence of the joint holdings in the data creates some difficulties in estimating the surplus and this hurdle needs to be cleared before proceeding any further. Section 6 of the Revised Act and the definition of the 'Joint Holding' as per the Agricultural Census 1970 may be of some help in clearing the hurdle. Section 6 of the Revised Act allows lands held in excess of ceiling area deemed to be within ceiling area in certain circumstances as given below.

"Where a family unit consists of members which exceeds five in number, the family unit shall be entitled

**Table 1.5 : Number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of operational holdings (Aurangabad District)**

Sr. No.	Size class of holding	Individual holdings		Joint holdings		Total holdings		(Area in Hectares)		
		No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	Average area		
								Individual	Joint	Total
1.	Below 0.5	7517	2115	1	-	7518	2115	0.28	-	0.28
2.	0.5 - 1.00	12256	9198	3	2	12259	9200	0.75	0.67	0.75
3.	1.00 - 2.00	29422	43763	8	11	29430	43774	1.49	1.38	1.49
4.	2.00 - 3.00	28555	70549	8	18	28563	70567	2.47	2.25	2.47
5.	3.00 - 4.00	24950	86356	5	18	24955	86374	3.46	3.60	3.46
6.	4.00 - 5.00	21119	94488	6	26	21125	94514	4.47	4.33	4.47
7.	5.00 - 10.00	59095	420639	22	173	59117	420812	7.12	7.86	7.12
8.	10.00 - 20.00	33598	453505	13	175	33611	453680	13.50	13.46	13.50
9.	20.00 - 30.00	4827	113868	8	187	4835	114055	23.59	23.38	23.59
10.	30.00 - 40.00	850	28661	5	178	855	28839	33.72	35.60	33.73
11.	40.00 - 50.00	171	7434	1	49	172	7483	43.47	49.00	43.51
12.	50.00 ha. and more	93	7875	1	51	94	7926	84.68	51.00	84.32
<b>Total all size classes</b>		<b>222453</b>	<b>1338451</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>888</b>	<b>222534</b>	<b>1339339</b>	<b>6.02</b>	<b>10.96</b>	<b>6.02</b>

Source : Agricultural Census 1970 - Maharashtra State.

**Table 1.6 : Number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of operational holdings in Solapur district**

Size class of holdings	Individual holdings		Joint holdings		Total holdings		(Area in hectares)		
	Number	Area	Number	Area	Number	Area	Average area		
							Indivi- dual	Joint	Total
Below 0.5	14,070	3,444	627	103	14,697	3,447	0.24	0.16	0.23
0.5 - 1.0	14,295	10,705	347	250	14,642	10,955	0.75	0.72	0.75
1.0 - 2.0	29,800	44,083	750	1,073	30,550	45,156	1.48	1.43	1.48
2.0 - 3.0	26,958	66,555	616	1,506	27,574	68,061	2.47	2.44	2.47
3.0 - 4.0	21,347	73,740	557	1,922	21,904	75,662	3.45	3.45	3.45
4.0 - 5.0	18,529	82,707	422	1,868	18,951	84,575	4.46	4.43	4.46
5.0 - 10.0	50,181	3,56,308	1,179	6,321	51,360	3,64,629	7.10	7.06	7.10
10.0 - 20.0	30,389	4,14,701	748	10,047	31,132	4,24,748	13.65	13.43	13.64
20.0 - 30.0	5,419	1,27,848	194	4,596	5,613	1,32,444	23.59	23.69	23.60
30.0 - 40.0	1,126	38,425	60	2,027	1,186	40,452	34.13	33.78	34.11
40.0 - 50.0	374	16,516	33	1,440	407	17,956	44.16	43.64	44.12
50.0 and more	263	24,657	25	4,247	288	28,904	99.75	169.88	100.36
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,12,746</b>	<b>12,59,589</b>	<b>5,558</b>	<b>37,400</b>	<b>2,18,304</b>	<b>12,96,989</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>6.73</b>	<b>5.94</b>

**Table 1.7 : Number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of operational holdings in Thane district**

Size class of holding	Individual holdings		Joint holdings		Total holdings		(Area in hectares)		
	Number	Area	Number	Area	Number	Area	Average area		
							Indivi- dual	Joint	Total
Below 0.5	41,544	9,618	180	40	41,724	9,658	0.23	0.22	0.23
0.5 - 1.0	23,295	16,972	121	84	23,416	17,056	0.73	0.69	0.73
1.0 - 2.0	25,639	36,795	165	227	25,804	37,022	1.44	1.38	1.43
2.0 - 3.0	14,427	35,180	146	350	14,573	35,530	2.44	2.40	2.44
3.0 - 4.0	8,956	30,881	110	377	9,066	31,258	3.45	3.43	3.45
4.0 - 5.0	6,379	28,418	86	377	6,465	28,795	4.45	4.38	4.45
5.0 - 10.0	13,660	95,761	229	1,620	13,889	97,381	7.01	7.07	7.01
10.0 - 20.0	6,147	82,318	162	2,190	6,309	84,508	13.39	13.52	13.39
20.0 - 30.0	1,185	28,243	50	1,198	1,235	29,441	23.83	23.96	23.84
30.0 - 40.0	349	11,809	8	265	357	12,074	33.84	33.13	33.82
40.0 - 50.0	115	5,013	4	177	119	5,190	43.59	44.25	43.61
50.0 and above	141	15,020	8	660	149	15,680	106.67	82.50	105.37
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,41,837</b>	<b>3,96,028</b>	<b>1,269</b>	<b>7,565</b>	<b>1,43,106</b>	<b>4,03,593</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>5.96</b>	<b>2.82</b>

**Table 1.8: Number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of operational holdings  
(Yavatmal District)**

Sr. No.	Size class of holding hectares	Individual holdings		Joint holdings		Total holdings		(Area in hectares)		
		No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	Average area per holding		
								Indivi- dual	Joint	Total
1.	Below 0.50	959	292	2	1	961	293	0.30	0.50	0.30
2.	0.50 to 1.00	3625	2775	7	5	3632	2780	0.77	0.71	0.77
3.	1.00 to 2.00	15448	23240	36	54	15484	23294	1.50	1.50	1.50
4.	2.00 to 3.00	17008	41590	46	111	17054	41701	2.45	2.41	2.45
5.	3.00 to 4.00	14416	49808	40	137	14456	49945	3.46	3.43	3.45
6.	4.00 to 5.00	14872	66129	28	126	14900	66255	4.45	4.50	4.45
7.	5.00 to 10.00	36319	256193	143	994	36462	257187	7.05	6.95	7.05
8.	10.00 to 20.00	20270	270952	115	1506	20385	272458	13.37	13.10	13.37
9.	20.00 to 30.00	4167	99610	54	1256	4221	100866	23.90	23.26	23.90
10.	30.00 to 40.00	1244	42295	22	736	1266	43031	34.00	33.45	33.99
11.	40.00 to 50.00	505	22422	7	300	512	22722	44.40	42.86	44.38
12.	50.00 and above	502	41673	19	1397	521	43070	83.01	73.53	82.67
Total all size classes		129335	916979	519	6623	129854	923602	7.09	12.76	7.11

Source: Agricultural Census 1970 - Maharashtra State - p.261.

to hold land exceeding the ceiling area to the extent of one-fifth of the ceiling area for each member in excess of five, so however that the total holding shall not exceed twice the ceiling area, and in such case, in relation to the holding of such family unit, such area shall be deemed to be the ceiling area."

In so far as the Agricultural Census 1970 is concerned the Joint Holding may include an outsider, jointly sharing the economic and technical responsibility with another person. In thus defining the "Joint Holding" the Agricultural Census makes a proviso that it is not necessarily the holding of the family unit but at the same time does not explicitly or implicitly deny the existence of the holding of the family unit in the Joint Holding. It is, therefore, assumed that barring an occasional case the Joint Holdings are more likely to be the holdings of the family unit and could hold land upto twice the ceiling area as stipulated by Section 6 of the Act. If the Joint Holding, by and large is not to be accepted as a holding of the family unit then it is impossible to arrive at an estimate of surplus that is likely to accrue from the joint holdings.

Another matter that needs to be considered relates to irrigated area of the holdings. In the light of the First Schedule to the Act, the irrigated area is bound to affect the ceiling area available. However, the irrigated area in the sample districts, as shown in Table 1.9, is proportionately so small that it may be not be considered as serious hurdle. It may be seen from the table that only in Solapur district the proportion of the irrigated area to the total land was relatively high, i.e. 6.5 per cent. In Thane and Yavatmal districts it was less than one per cent of the total

**Table 1.9 : Irrigated areas in the four sample districts**

District	Number of holdings	Total area	(Area in hectares)	
			Irrigated area	Per cent
Aurangabad	2,22,534	13,39,339	50,933	3.80
Solapur	2,18,304	12,96,989	1,10,299	8.50
Thane	1,43,106	4,03,593	2,692	0.67
Yavatmal	1,29,854	9,23,602	4,790	0.52

area. Thus, for all practical purposes it is assumed that the area of the holdings in all the four sample districts may be treated as dry land falling under sub-clause (e) of Clause (5) of Section 2 of the Revised Act. Such a bold assumption is certain to affect the surplus composition in terms of cultivated and uncultivated area but considering the extent of irrigation available in each district, the total effect will be just marginal.

The estimate of the surplus area would be arrived at on the basis of the above assumptions with ceiling area for individual holding at 22 hectares (instead of 21 hectares and 85.9 acres), and twice that is 44 hectares for joint holdings. This will facilitate calculations and would not materially affect the surplus.

Tables 1.10 to 1.13 along with the number of operational holdings etc. gives the average area per individual and joint holdings and this along with the assumptions forms the basis of the estimates. As will be seen from the tables individual holdings under Sr.Nos. 9, 10, 11 and 12 alone report a surplus over the ceiling area at 22 hectares. Similarly, Sr. Nos. 11 and 12 under joint holdings in Thane and Aurangabad districts and only



**Table 1.10 : Estimate of surplus areas in individual holdings in Aurangabad district**

**Individual Holdings**

Serial No. of holding	No. of holdings	Average area of holding in hectares	Surplus @ 22 hectares ceiling	Total surplus in hectares
9	4827	23.59	1.59	7675
10	850	33.72	11.72	9962
11	171	43.47	21.47	3671
12	93	64.68	62.68	5829
<b>Total Surplus</b>	-	-	-	<b>27137</b>

**Joint Holdings**

Serial No. of holding	No. of holdings	Average area of holding in hectares	Surplus @ 44 hectares ceiling	Total surplus in hectares
9	8	23.38	-	-
10	5	35.60	-	-
11	1	49.00	5	5
12	1	51.00	7	7
<b>Total Surplus</b>	-	-	-	<b>12</b>

**Total Surplus - Individual + Joint Holdings 27149.00 Hectares**

**Table 1.11 : Estimate of surplus areas in individual holdings in Solapur district**

(Area in hectares)

Sr. No.	No. of holdings	Average area of holdings	Surplus @ 22 hectares ceiling	Total surplus area
9	5,419	23.59	1.59	8,616
10	1,126	34.13	12.13	13,658
11	374	44.16	22.16	8,288
12	263	93.75	71.75	18,870
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	<b>49,432</b>

Joint holdings

Sr. No.	No. of holdings	Average area of holding	Surplus @ 44 hectares ceiling	Total surplus area
9	194	23.69	-	-
10	60	33.78	-	-
11	33	43.64	-	-
12	25	169.88	125.88	3,147
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	<b>52,579</b>

**Table 1.12 : Estimate of surplus area in individual holdings in Thane district**

(Area in hectares)

Sr. No.	No. of holdings	Average area of holding	Surplus @ 22 hectares ceiling	Total surplus area
9	1,185	23.83	1.83	2,169
10	349	33.84	11.84	4,132
11	115	43.59	21.59	2,483
12	141	106.67	84.67	11,938
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	<b>20,722</b>

**Joint holdings**

Sr. No.	No. of holdings	Average area of holdings	Surplus @ 44 hectares ceiling	Total surplus area
9	50	23.96	-	-
10	8	33.13	-	-
11	4	44.25	0.25	1.00
12	8	82.50	38.50	308.00
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	<b>21,031.00</b>

**Table 1.13: Estimates of surplus areas in individual holdings in Yavatmal District**

Individual Holdings

Sr.No. of holding	No. of holdings	Average area of holding hectares	Surplus @ 22 hectares ceiling	Total surplus plus hectares
9	4167	23.90	1.90	7917.30
10	1244	34.00	12.00	14928.00
11	505	44.40	22.40	11312.00
12	502	83.01	61.01	30627.02
<b>Total surplus</b>				<b>64784.32</b>

Joint Holdings

Sr.No. of holding	No. of holdings	Average area of holding hectares	Surplus @ 44 hectares ceiling	Total surplus plus hectares
9	54	23.26		
10	22	33.45		
11	7	42.86		
12	19	73.53	29.53	561.07
<b>Total surplus</b>				<b>561.07</b>
<b>Total surplus = Individual + Joint Holdings</b>				<b>65345.39 hectares</b>

**Table 1.14 : Area under different land uses by size class of operational holdings (Aurangabad District)**

Sr. No.	Size class of holding	Total holdings		Net sown area	Current fallows	Cultivated land	Uncultivated land	(Area in Hectares)		
		No.	Area					Other fallows	Culturable waste	Not available for cultivation
1.	Below 0.5	7518	2115	1980	55	2035	5	7	12	12
2.	0.5 - 1.00	12259	9200	8790	198	8988	13	29	20	58
3.	1.00- 2.00	29430	43774	41970	967	42937	34	130	63	406
4.	2.00- 3.00	28563	70567	67394	61756	69150	78	247	122	742
5.	3.00- 4.00	24955	86374	82187	2362	84549	81	370	108	1017
6.	4.00- 5.00	21125	94514	89445	2980	92425	75	472	189	1096
7.	5.00- 10.00	59117	420812	395219	14381	410300	546	2368	1157	6062
8.	10.00- 20.00	33611	453680	419684	20270	439954	841	3786	1851	6850
9.	20.00- 30.00	4835	114055	103552	6342	109894	176	1408	623	1741
10.	30.00- 40.00	855	28839	25209	2290	27499	43	378	376	466
11.	40.00- 50.00	172	7483	6388	661	7049	11	139	88	175
12.	50.00 ha. and above	94	7926	5761	976	6737	52	349	652	124
<b>Total all size classes</b>		<b>222534</b>	<b>1339339</b>	<b>1247679</b>	<b>53838</b>	<b>1301517</b>	<b>1955</b>	<b>9683</b>	<b>5261</b>	<b>18749</b>

**Source :** Agricultural Census 1970 - Maharashtra State.

**Table 1.15 : Area under different land uses by size class of operational holdings in Solapur district  
(Area in hectares)**

Size class of holdings	Total holdings		Cultivated area			Uncultivated area			
	Number	Area	Net sown	Current fallow	Total cultivated	Uncultivated	Other fallows	Culturable waste	Not available for cultivation
Below 0.5	14,697	3,362	2,840	95	2,935	52	68	89	218
0.5 - 1.0	14,642	10,846	9,828	309	10,137	75	168	159	307
1.0 - 2.0	30,550	44,993	40,538	1,497	42,035	208	834	557	1,359
2.0 - 3.0	27,574	67,886	60,858	2,509	63,367	308	1,465	833	1,913
3.0 - 4.0	21,904	75,487	66,653	3,157	69,810	390	1,876	1,071	2,340
4.0 - 5.0	18,951	84,393	73,668	3,913	77,581	486	2,418	1,206	2,702
5.0 - 10.0	51,360	3,64,389	3,10,042	19,684	3,29,726	2,403	13,224	5,770	13,266
10.0 - 20.0	31,132	4,24,512	3,45,674	27,060	3,72,734	3,535	19,072	10,580	18,591
20.0 - 30.0	5,613	1,32,270	1,00,774	10,691	1,11,465	1,557	7,305	4,568	7,375
30.0 - 40.0	1,186	40,370	27,931	4,136	32,067	612	3,019	1,935	2,737
40.0 - 50.0	407	17,913	11,704	1,813	13,517	354	1,508	1,152	1,382
50.0 and above	288	28,871	16,346	2,678	19,024	359	2,350	4,480	2,658
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,18,304</b>	<b>12,95,292</b>	<b>10,66,856</b>	<b>77,542</b>	<b>11,44,398</b>	<b>10,339</b>	<b>53,307</b>	<b>32,400</b>	<b>54,848</b>

**Table 1.16 : Area under different land uses by size class of operational holdings in Thane district**

(Area in hectares)

Size class of holdings	Total holdings		Cultivated area			Uncultivated area			
	Number	Area	Area Net sown	Current fallow	Total cultivated	Uncultivated	Other fallows	Culturable waste	Not available for cultivation
Below 0.5	41,724	9,459	8,432	8	8,440	516	10	55	438
0.5 - 1.0	23,416	16,818	14,054	61	14,115	1,801	33	82	787
1.0 - 2.0	25,804	36,747	27,457	388	27,845	6,590	117	205	1,990
2.0 - 3.0	14,573	35,254	23,318	849	24,167	8,534	196	236	2,121
3.0 - 4.0	9,066	30,999	18,709	1,092	19,801	8,586	218	290	2,104
4.0 - 5.0	6,465	28,552	15,936	1,386	17,322	8,662	287	222	2,059
5.0 - 10.0	13,889	97,082	47,052	6,775	53,827	32,713	1,089	1,035	8,418
10.0 - 20.0	6,309	84,255	35,605	7,414	43,019	29,420	1,335	1,034	9,447
20.0 - 30.0	1,235	29,330	11,538	2,459	13,997	10,421	486	340	4,086
30.0 - 40.0	357	12,026	4,579	1,030	5,609	4,007	242	231	1,937
40.0 - 50.0	119	5,171	1,884	383	2,267	1,739	83	31	1,051
50.0 and above	149	15,680	6,590	463	7,053	3,741	135	489	4,262
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,43,106</b>	<b>4,01,373</b>	<b>2,15,154</b>	<b>22,308</b>	<b>2,37,462</b>	<b>1,16,770</b>	<b>4,231</b>	<b>4,250</b>	<b>38,700</b>

**Table 1.17: Area under different land uses by size class of operational holdings (Yavatmal District)**

(Area in hectares)

Sr. No.	Size class of holdings Hectares	Total holdings		Cultivated area			Uncultivated area			
		No.	Area	Net sown	Current fallow	Total cultivated	Uncultivated	Other fallows	Culturable waste	Not available for cultivation
1.	Below 0.50	961	293	249	7	256	1	1	2	3
2.	0.50 to 1.00	3632	2780	2511	40	2551	22	8	50	21
3.	1.00 to 2.00	15484	23294	21431	303	21734	295	85	618	280
4.	2.00 to 3.00	17054	41701	38070	658	38728	650	233	1212	541
5.	3.00 to 4.00	14456	49945	44885	895	45780	997	422	1596	772
6.	4.00 to 5.00	14900	66255	58986	1221	60207	1621	613	2183	1216
7.	5.00 to 10.00	36462	257187	226229	4567	230796	7899	2716	8876	6331
8.	10.00 to 20.00	20385	272458	233983	5122	239105	10673	3443	10303	8367
9.	20.00 to 30.00	4221	100866	86465	1696	88161	4062	1263	3862	3135
10.	30.00 to 40.00	1266	43031	36548	768	37316	1856	581	1760	1315
11.	40.00 to 50.00	512	22722	18917	586	19503	1040	326	966	780
12.	50.00 and above	521	43070	33498	1072	34570	2937	1082	2559	1809
Total all size classes		129854	923602	801772	16935	818707	32053	10773	33987	24570

Source : Agricultural Census 1970 - Maharashtra State.



uncultivated areas of the holdings, it is necessary to look into the composition of the two. While the Agricultural Census 1970 defines the various concepts as per the Indian Agricultural Statistics, it has peeled all the uncultivated land into four categories, one of which is "other fallows." The Indian Agricultural Statistics defines "fallows other than current fallows" as given below :

"This implies all lands taken up for cultivation but are temporarily out of cultivation for not less than one year and not more than five years. The reasons for leaving such lands fallow may be, (1) poverty of cultivators, (2) inadequate supply of water, (3) malarial climate, (4) silting of canals and rivers, and (5) unremunerative nature of farming."

The reasons for leaving such lands fallow are of no interest for the present purpose. The point to be remembered is that these "other fallows" were under cultivation in the immediate past varying from one to five years, and if these need be included into uncultivated areas. To err on the safer side it is desirable to keep "other fallows" separate and not include these either under cultivated or uncultivated area. Taking into consideration the earlier stated assumptions etc. it is possible to decide the extent of cultivated, other fallows and uncultivated area for the relevant size group of holdings. Since as stated earlier there is no surplus in size categories 9 and 10 of joint holdings these are excluded and the areas for individual holdings in size categories, 9 to 12 and size categories 11 and 12 of the joint holdings will be given in Tables 1.18 to 1.21.

**Table 1.18 : Estimates of the cultivated and uncultivated areas in Aurangabad district**

(Area in hectares)

Size category	Cultivated area Ha.	Fallow area Ha.	Uncultivated area Ha.	Total area of holding Ha.
9	109714	1618	2536	113868
10	27328	453	880	28661
11	7049	160	274	7483
12	6737	361	828	7926
<b>Total</b>	<b>150828</b>	<b>2592</b>	<b>4598</b>	<b>157938</b>

**Table 1.19 : Estimates of the cultivated and uncultivated areas in the Thane district**

(Area in hectares)

Size Category	Cultivated area	Fallow area	Uncultivated area	Total area of holdings
9	13,477	469	14,297	28,243
10	5,508	237	6,064	11,809
11	2,198	81	2,734	5,013
12	7,053	135	8,492	15,680
<b>Total</b>	<b>28,236</b>	<b>922</b>	<b>31,587</b>	<b>60,745</b>

**Table 1.20 : Estimates of the cultivated and uncultivated areas in the Solapur district**

(Area in hectares)

Size category	Cultivated area	Fallow area	Uncultivated area	Total area holdings
9	1,07,738	7,057	13,053	1,27,848
10	30,521	2,874	5,030	38,425
11	12,463	1,391	2,662	16,516
12	19,024	2,350	7,497	28,871
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,69,476</b>	<b>13,672</b>	<b>28,242</b>	<b>2,11,660</b>

**Table 1.21: Estimates of the cultivated and uncultivated areas in the Yavatmal District**

Size category	(Area in hectares)			Total area of holding
	Cultivated area	Fallow	Uncultivated	
9	87062	1247	11301	99610
10	36678	571	5046	42295
11	19245	322	2855	22422
12	34570	1082	7418	43070
<b>Total</b>	<b>177555</b>	<b>3222</b>	<b>26620</b>	<b>207397</b>

The horizontal totals of various size categories of holdings in the four tables do not add up to total areas of the holdings in each district. The totals have been corrected by adjusting the uncultivated area before separating the cultivated and the uncultivated areas of the individual and joint holdings. The figures presented in the tables are arrived at after the necessary corrections.

To the extent the earlier observation regarding the uncultivated area being the first to be surrendered as surplus over ceiling holds good, the proportion of uncultivated area in the surplus estimates will be around 16.64 per cent in the Aurangabad district; 53.71 per cent in the Solapur district and 40.73 per cent in the Yavatmal district. If "other fallows" are included under the uncultivated area in the respective districts the proportion of the uncultivated area in the surplus estimates will go up to 26.19 per cent in Aurangabad district; to 79.72 per cent in Solapur district and to 45.66 per cent in Yavatmal district. The case of Thane district is altogether different from the above three districts, as it is a coastal district having mostly hilly land. The extent of uncultivated area in the district is very high and so we find that the proportion of the uncultivated and fallow area was quite high in the size categories 9 to 12 of individual holdings and 11 and 12 of ~~individual holdings and 11 and 12~~ of the joint holdings. The total uncultivated and fallow area was much more than the estimates of the surplus land. From the above exercise it can be very well seen that a substantial proportion of surplus surrendered and distributed in all the four sample districts is likely to be uncultivated area at least at the aggregate level.

### 1.5 Grant of Financial Assistance

With a view to assist the allottees to take to efficient cultivation of the surplus land allotted to them the Government of India, formulated a Central Sector Plan Scheme. The financial assistance contemplated under this scheme was at the rate of Rs. 250/- per hectare of the surplus land for each of the first two seasons to enable the allottees to meet their immediate requirements of seed, fertilisers, pesticides, agricultural implements, etc. This assistance was however, not admissible for the purchase of bullocks. In addition to this crop assistance, a development assistance at the rate of Rs.500/- per hectare was available for land shaping, land levelling, contour bunding, etc. In the case of the development assistance 50 per cent of the amount of assistance was to be treated as loan and 50 per cent by way of grant. The financial assistance under this scheme was not admissible to the areas covered by special schemes such as Small and Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers Development Agency, the Drought Prone Area Programme, the Command Area Development Agency, the Integrated Area Development Scheme ("Panchayat Yojana"), etc. In so far as the grant or subsidy was concerned 50 per cent thereof was reserved for the allottees of the weaker sections, i.e. Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Vinukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes.

The Government of Maharashtra decided to avail of the aforesaid Central Scheme to the maximum extent possible and accordingly instructed the District Collectors. As per these instructions each allottee of surplus land was to be immediately made a member of the village cooperative society. Since the assistance admissible under the Central

Scheme was not adequate to cater to the entire requirement of the allottees and since in any case the allottees would have to look to the Primary Society after the first two seasons for his credit needs, the Government decided that the crop assistance admissible under the Central Scheme should be administered through the Primary Cooperative Society and the assistance should be given in kind to the extent possible. As regards the development assistance the Government of Maharashtra decided to sanction it on its merit by the Land Development Bank through the Village Cooperative Society up to a ceiling cost of Rs.500/- per hectare and within the overall funds available. The release of this type of assistance was to be made in two instalments and the second instalment would be released only after the Primary Society's certificate that the first instalment was fully utilized for the land development purposes. On completion of the work the primary society would certify the proper utilization of the funds released and 50 per cent of the amount would be treated as subsidy. The amount which was treated as loan would be recovered by the Co-operative Society.

From the records which we obtained from the District Collectorate at Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal, it appears that in 1976-77 about Rs.18.50, Rs. 7.28 and Rs. 21.69 lakhs respectively were disbursed as crop assistance to the allottees of surplus land under the Revised Act. In the next year, i.e. 1977-78, the total amount of such financial assistance stood at Rs.8.52 lakhs in Aurangabad district; Rs. 6.31 lakhs in Solapur district and Rs.25.77 lakhs in Yavatmal district. The talukawise details of the crop assistance given to the allottees in

these three districts for the two years (1976-77 and 1977-78) are presented in Tables 1.22 to 1.24. Such a financial assistance was not provided to the allottees under the Principal Act previous to 1st January 1975 in all these three districts. It was also not provided to the allottees in the Thane district as the Central Sector Plan Scheme was not applicable to it, as the district was already covered under the special scheme of the Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA).

Besides financial assistance provided under different schemes, the Government of Maharashtra ensured, through its Department of Agriculture that proper technical advice was given to the allottees in the matter of selection of agricultural implements and the development of land. The Agricultural Department was further instructed to organise special training programmes to promote proper standard of cultivation among the allottees. If the training programme was organised outside the village, transport cost and subsistence was provided at the rate not exceeding Rs.20/- per allottee. It was considered a primary responsibility of the Gram Sevaks and the Agricultural Extension Officers, to look after and guide the allottees of surplus land at all stages of development and cultivation of the land and selection of inputs and implements.



**Table 1.22 : Financial Assistance given to the allottees of surplus land in Aurangabad district (1977-78 and 1978-79)**

Taluka	1977-78		1978-79	
	Grantees	Amount	Grantees	Amount
1) Ambad	243	100000	799	740000
2) Jalna	104	44000	373	276500
3) Bhokardan	123	30000	423	348500
4) Jafrabad	-	-	119	114400
5) Silled	70	13000	93	76100
6) Soegaon	41	10000	167	75000
7) Paithan	109	30000	145	150000
<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>227000</b>	<b>2119</b>	<b>1780500</b>

**Table 1.24: Financial assistance given to the allottees of surplus land in Yavatmal District (1976-77 and 1978-79)**

Taluka	(Rupees in lakhs)					
	1976-77			1977-78		
	No. of grantees	Amount sanctioned	Amount disbursed	No. of grantees	Amount sanctioned	Amount disbursed
Yavatmal	2213	16.90	5.77	1974	15.49	6.51
Darwaha	1349	9.10	5.46	1397	9.20	6.42
Pusad	426	2.87	1.72	405	3.68	1.59
Wani	1011	5.91	2.37	1181	7.67	2.96
Kelapur	3217	22.00	6.37	3106	26.28	8.29
<b>Total</b>	<b>8216</b>	<b>56.78</b>	<b>21.69</b>	<b>8063</b>	<b>62.32</b>	<b>25.77</b>

## CHAPTER II

### DECLARATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS LAND

In this chapter, we propose to examine the main aspects of the Land Ceiling Act and their implementation in the selected districts, to serve as a background for the later analysis of the collected data of the allottees from the sample villages.

From the implementation point of view, the Act can be broadly divided into four stages :

(1) Declaration of surplus land of a person/family unit holding land in excess of the ceiling limit;

(2) Acquisition by Government of such surplus land from the surplus landholders;

(3) Distribution of the acquired surplus land in the prescribed order of priority; and

(4) Handing over the possession of the distributed land to the allottees.

It is likely that at each of these four stages of implementation of the Act, some errors of commission or omission might have occurred. We, therefore, take each stage of implementation of the Act separately and examine it in some detail to point out the different interpretations given to the Act by different sections of the people. While doing this sort of analysis we have mainly depended on the case-studies made in the Solapur district, and have quoted them as examples to make the issue more clear. Such cases might have occurred in the other districts as well, but we did not have their data in all details. In the present chapter, therefore, we have heavily relied on the case studies from the Solapur district.

Once the surplus land is handed over to the allottees, its development and cultivation constitute a different part of the subject which we propose to study in the following chapters.

## **2.1 Declaration of Surplus Land**

In order to determine the surplus nature of the land holding of a person/family unit and to declare it so, the Rules of the Act prescribe a detailed procedure as given below :

"Under Section 12(2)(1) the surplus holders and the family units are required to furnish to the collector of the district, the returns giving details of all lands held by them during the period from 5th August 1959 to 25th February 1962, as per the Principal Act and during the period from 26th September 1970 to 2nd October 1975 as per the Revised Act. Failure to submit the returns in time or the submission of a false return by a person/family unit is liable to be penalised by the imposition of a fine. When a return is received directly or through the Tahasildar, it would be first entered in the District Register of Returns. To scrutinise such returns and to determine surplus land, Tribunals are appointed by the Collector, practically for each taluka or block in the district. The returns received are sorted out Tribunalwise, and forwarded to the concerned Tribunal for further action under Sections 14 to 21 of the Act. On receipt of the returns by the Tribunal, these are entered in the Register for Enquiries. After making preliminary scrutiny of the returns, the Tribunal enquires into the various issues, such as, transfers or partitions of land, share of a person or member of a family unit, acquisition of land after the commencement

date etc. After considering all these issues the Tribunal concludes about the extent of surplus, if any, in the holding of a person/family unit. When land in excess of ceiling is found, the Tribunal informs its decision to the land holder and expects him to state the land to be retained by him under Section 16 and to furnish his choice of land to be declared as surplus in Form VII prescribed by Rule 7."

In Solapur district we could get data about the returns filed by the landlords under the Principal as well as the Revised Land Ceiling Act. We have presented these data in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. We could not get such data for the other three districts. It may be noted from Table 2.1 that the Collector of the Solapur district had received 1,133 returns filed under the Principal Act by the end of December 1972. Out of these, as many as 906 were the cases where the landholdings were not found to be above the ceiling limit laid down in the Principal Act. Naturally no surplus land was found in these cases as per the Principal Act. In the remaining 227 cases, however, the landholdings were found in excess of the ceiling limit and about 44.51 hectares of land was declared surplus under the Principal Act.

The total number of returns filed under the Revised Act was quite high as the ceiling limit was considerably brought down by Maharashtra 21 of 1975. It was reported that the Collector of the Solapur district had therefore received as many as 9,895 returns filed under the Revised Act by the end of December 1978. Out of the total number of returns, as many as 85 per cent were the cases in which the landholdings were found to be not exceeding the ceiling

**Table 2.2 : Returns filed and enquired and total area declared surplus till 31st December 1978 under the Revised Land Ceiling Act in Solapur district.**

Taluka	Total No. of returns received	No. of returns in which no land was found surplus	No. of returns in which land was declared surplus	Total No. of returns in which enquiries were completed	No. of returns for which enquiries were pending	Total land declared as surplus (hectares)	Average surplus land per surplus landholder (hectares)
North Solapur	342	288	54	342	-	528	9.78
South Solapur	640	512	98	610	30	661	6.74
Barshi	852	704	139	843	9	1289	9.27
Akkalkot	532	471	61	532	-	474	7.77
Madha	857	752	105	857	-	728	6.93
Malsiras	979	747	205	952	27	1676	8.17
Karnala	1039	876	155	1031	8	838	5.41
Sangola	714	621	89	710	4	705	7.92
Nohol	647	550	93	643	4	632	6.80
Mangalwedha	688	621	67	688	-	401	5.99
Pandharpur	605	525	69	594	11	492	7.13
<b>Total</b>	<b>7895</b>	<b>6667</b>	<b>1135</b>	<b>7802</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>8424</b>	<b>7.42</b>

limit laid down in the Revised Act. So, no surplus land could be found in these cases. The remaining cases, however, were the cases of the landholders, whose landholdings were found in excess of the ceiling limit. Of these 1,228 cases of the surplus landholders, 1,135 cases were finally decided and surplus land was finally declared. The remaining 93 cases were still pending as the decision of surplus land taken by the Surplus Land Determination Tribunals, were not acceptable to the landholders, and some of them had gone in appeal to the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal against the decision. Some of the other landholders had chosen to file writ petitions in the High Court or the Supreme Court. The surplus land involved in these cases was around 242 hectares, which could not be considered as land finally declared as surplus and available for distribution. The talukawise distribution of such land in the Solapur district is given below :

<u>Taluka</u>	<u>Area of surplus land which could not be distributed</u>
	(in hectares)
1) South Solapur	17
2) Barshi	22
3) Akkalkot	43
4) Sangola	99
5) Mangalwedha	24
6) Pandharpur	37
	-----
	242
	-----

By the end of December 1978, the total land finally declared as surplus and available for distribution under the Revised Act stood at 8,424 hectares.

The total surplus land finally declared and available for distribution under the Principal and the Revised Act was about 12,875 hectares for the district as a whole.

Reference to the returns filed with the Collector of the Solapur district and declaration of surplus land calls for some indication of details of the widely known case of a big surplus landholder from Mandrup village in the South Solapur taluka. This particular landlord owned about 2,242 acres of land in eleven villages in the South Solapur taluka, before the enactment of the Principal Act. As required under the Principal Act, he filed his returns with the Collector in 1962, but it appears that the entire case of this particular landlord, was misplaced and could not be traced till 1975. He did not file any returns any more under the Revised Act. As the entire case was missing, no enquiry about surplus land could be conducted and no decision about his surplus land could be taken and the entire landholding of the surplus landholder remained intact with him till 1975. On the declaration of Emergency in the country in 1975 the case papers of this landlord were uncovered in the Collector's office itself and an immediate decision was taken to the effect to declare 1976 acres of his land as surplus. But before this surplus land could be distributed to different allottees, the Surplus Landholder went in writ petition to the High Court and secured a stay order against distribution of his surplus land. The State Government took nearly one year to evict this stay order. In October 1976, the High Court evicted its stay and the surplus land was made available for distribution.

Immediately after the decision of the High Court the executive machinery was put into motion. The Assistant Collector, Solapur Division, Solapur, was directed to take immediate steps for distribution of the land declared as



surplus. Accordingly, the then Additional Tahasildar, South Solapur taluka, fixed the distribution programme of the declared surplus land at different villages as under :

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name of village</u>
1) 24.11.1976	Wadakbal, Hanmurgi and Wangi
2) 25.11.1976	Chinchpur and Mandani
3) 30.11.1976	Vinchur and Gunjegaon
4) 03.12.1976	Belkavathe
5) 07.12.1976	Karkal and Lawangi
6) 8/9.12.1976	Mandrup.

Thus, the surplus land measuring about 1,976 acres was formally distributed to 421 allottees from the above stated eleven villages. The process of distribution of the surplus land would have been completed, if the Assistant Tahasildar had directed the Circle Inspector/ the Talathis to give physical possession of the distributed land to the 421 allottees. But he did not do it. Instead he started an enquiry into the eligibility of the allottees regarding their income, landed property, etc. after finalising the distribution of the surplus land. He could not complete the enquiry work till 13.12.1976, on which day he went on leave preparatory to his retirement. In the meantime the surplus landholder filed an appeal in the Supreme Court and secured another stay order against the distribution of the surplus land. In view of this stay order of the Supreme Court, the possession of all the surplus land distributed to the 421 allottees could not be effected till the day of our investigation i.e. 13.12.1979 and the entire surplus land was still under the possession of the surplus landholder. Issues regarding this case were raised in the State Legislative Assembly

on 20th July 1977 during the discussion on the budget grants, and it was alleged that the enquiry in this case as well as the handing over of possession of the surplus land to the allottees concerned, was deliberately delayed by the Revenue Machinery in the Solapur district. We have presented this case as an illustration of how the big landlords manage to keep their surplus lands under their own possession as long as possible and how the executive machinery apparently plays into their hands and becomes an accessory.

The above case was unique in many respects in the entire district. In other cases of surplus landholders, the returns filed by them did not disappear from the Collector's records, but the calculations of surplus land were so done as to be more in favour of the landlords. In village From VII - XII certain area is recorded as "Pot Kharab" and whether such area needs to be excluded or included while calculating the holding is not very clear in the Act. However, the High Court has taken the view (High Court decision in Special Civil Application No. 1495 of 1970 Saraswatibai M. Anjandee Versus State decided on 2nd July 1974 - Ehasme J ) that definition of the expression "land" as contained in Section 2(16) will not permit any exclusion unless the land is not capable of being used for the purpose of agriculture. The word "Agriculture" again includes so many allied operations like dairy, farming, cattle breeding etc. A mere entry in the record of rights (VF VII - XII or crop statement.) to the effect that certain portion of land is "Dagad Pot" is not sufficient to exclude such area from the holding of the petitioner. In another case it has been held that a portion of land covered by a "Nala" or by "Public road" used

by citizens, being uncultivable is liable to be excluded (Special Civil Application No. 866 of 1966 decided on 27th June 1968 - Abhyankar J.). In the light of these decisions the State Government came out with a vis-media and proposed that where the extent of land recorded as "Pot Kharab" does not exceed say 5 (five) acres in any holding under inquiry there should be no objection to exclude such area from the holding on the basis of the entries of "Pot Kharab" in VF VII - XII or the crop statement. This means that a concerned land holder actually will have a ceiling of 59 acres i.e. 5 acres over and above the ceiling prescribed, the additional 5 acres being in the nature of a free allowance for at least that much having been recorded as "Pot Kharab".

In Solapur district, however, we found that in some of the cases more than 5 acres of area was calculated as "Pot Kharab" and was excluded from the land holdings of surplus landholders. A typical case of this kind may be presented here as an example. This case was of a surplus landholder from Soregaon village in North Solapur taluka. The total land holding of this particular landlord, as per the village records (Khata No. 22 in Soregaon) was of 135 acres and 18 gunthas, divided into 5 plots. The details of these plots as recorded in the village form Nos. VII and XII, Record of rights, were as under :

The family of the landlord comprised of the minor landholder, minor sister, their mother and one major sister. As per the village records the total area under "Pot Kharab" was 6 acres and 35 gunthas. However, "Pot Kharab" land up to 5 acres only could be excluded from the total landholding. This means if we exclude 5 acres

Survey Number	Area	"Pot-Kharab"	Cultivable area	Assessment
	A-G	A-G	A-G	Rs.
1) 170	5-10	0-05	5-05	1.43
2) 224/1	36-27	2-10	34-17	37.00
3) 224/2	28-23	-	28-23	26.87
4) 224/3	36-23	3-20	33-03	42.06
5) 224/4	28-15	1-00	27-15	28.62
<b>Total</b>	<b>135-18</b>	<b>6-35</b>	<b>128-23</b>	<b>135.98</b>

of "Pot Kharab" land from the total area we get 130 acres and 18 gunthas from which the surplus was to be calculated. Taking into consideration the members in the family, the minor land-holder was entitled to retain 54 acres of his land and the rest, 76 acres and 18 gunthas were all to be taken as surplus. But the calculations and declaration of the surplus land made by the Special Deputy Collector had classified 23 acres and 18 gunthas as the area under "Pot Kharab, nala-pad" and Seregaon-Dongaon road, when, as pointed out earlier, only the "Pot Kharab" land of 6 acres and 35 gunthas was mentioned in the VF VII - XII, wherefrom the areas under "nala-pad" and Seregaon-Dongaon road were taken was not explained anywhere in the case. After deducting 23 acres and 18 gunthas, a holding of 112 acres was available and a net surplus of 58 acres was declared by the Deputy Collector, whereas the actual surplus land in this case, calculated on the basis of the village records, came to 76 acres and 18 gunthas. The surplus landholder managed to retain more than 18 acres of his landholding with himself, over and above 54 acres, which he was entitled to under the Revised Act.

As pointed out earlier, such cases though not many, might have occurred in all the four sample districts. However the total number of such surplus land involved in such cases could not be ascertained for each district. In Selapur district, however, we came across such cases in the official records and during our investigation, we made a note of them and have presented some as illustrations which may help to draw some broad inferences. As regards declaration of surplus land, the cases we noted, indicated very broadly that the executive machinery was more sympathetic towards surplus landholders in general.

## 2.2 Acquisition of Surplus Land

Once the surplus land is declared by the Surplus Land Determination Tribunal/Special Deputy Collector, the landholder is informed to state the land to be retained for himself under Section 16 and to furnish his choice of land in Form VII prescribed by Rule 7. This means the surplus landholder has the choice of land which he wants to retain for himself and select land which he wishes to surrender to the Government as surplus land. The Act provides that wherever necessary the surplus landholder may prepare a map of the area which he desires to surrender as surplus. He may take help from the village officers to prepare such a sketch, which may enable him to prescribe his choice in the matter.

This particular provision of the Act giving full choice to the surplus landholder to surrender whichever land he desired to, had created many complications. The surplus landholders had obviously taken full advantage of the choice given to them and had surrendered only the lowest quality lands or even uncultivable lands as surplus.

An interesting case was reported in this connection at Dudhani village in the Akkalkot taluka of the Solapur district. In this village a surplus landholder had a landholding of 156.75 acres (Khata No. 143) and was required to surrender about 16 acres of his land as surplus under the Revised Land Ceiling Act. The landlord agreed to the decision given by the Surplus Land Determination Tribunal of the Akkalkot taluka about the surplus land which he had to surrender but acted cleverly while exercising his choice of land to be surrendered. He surrendered 16 acres from his largest plot of 69 acres and chose such a piece from this land that it formed a central area of the big plot. So the surrendered area was all surrounded by his own land retained in the big plot. The possession of the surrendered land was taken by the authorities. It was distributed to the five allottees in the village in 1976. When the allottees went to cultivate the plots allotted to them, the surplus landholder raised an occasion of complaint and did not allow them to enter his land. The allottees went to the village officials and later to the Tahasildar with a request to provide an approach road to their allotted plots but in vain. When we visited the Akkalkot taluka for our investigation the case of these allottees was still pending with the Tahasildar and the surplus land surrendered by the landlord was still under his cultivation. Thus, the surplus landholder succeeded, at least for the time being, in retaining the physical possession of his entire landholding with himself, even after the declaration and distribution of the surplus land surrendered by him on paper according to the Revised Act.

It appears from the above case and other cases that

all sorts of ingenuities were brought in to play by the surplus landholders in order to save themselves from surrendering their surplus areas or to postpone giving actual possession of the surplus lands and keep the same under one's own cultivation as long as possible. Most of the surplus landholders had taken full advantage of the Section 16 of the Ceiling Act and had surrendered only inferior lands. Some of them went to the extent of deceiving the Government by surrendering areas under roads, canals, etc. For example, we may refer to the case No. CR 241 of Lawang village in the Malsiras taluka in the Solapur district. The facts of this case are reproduced here in brief. The particular landlord from Lawang village was declared surplus landholder to the extent of 25 gunthas under the Special Deputy Collector's order given on 11.4.1975. The landholder exercised his choice of retaining the land under Section 16 of the Ceiling Act and stated before the Deputy Collector on 9.4.1975, that the strip of land measuring 25 gunthas out of S. No. 35/2A which was cultivable and perennially irrigated as shown in red in the sketch, might be taken over as surplus land. Accordingly, the Deputy Collector passed the order and directed the Additional Tahasildar to take over possession of the said land under Section 21(2). This land was allotted to one peasant applicant from the same village. While handing over the possession to the allottee the Circle Officer, observed that there was a canal and service road in the said strip of land and that there was very little left for cultivation. The Additional Tahasildar was then directed to inspect the site personally and verify the facts. The sketch drawn by the Additional Tahasildar and his inspection report showed that only an area measuring

552' x 8' i.e. about 3 gunthas was under cultivation, while the remaining part of the delimited land, was under canal and service road and could not be brought under cultivation. From the above stated facts it appears that the surplus landholder in surrendering the land to the Government had clearly tricked it and surrendered 22 gunthas of land which could not be brought under cultivation. The same land was again included in the enquiry under the Revised Act and he was declared non-surplus on 18.8.1976. Once the land was delimited under the Principal Act, there was no reason to include the same under the Revised Act. It was, therefore, decided that this particular case might be taken up in revision by the Government and remanded back to the Deputy Collector for obtaining fresh choice of land from the surplus landholder.

We have presented these two cases of extreme type where attempts were made to deceive the Government while surrendering the surplus areas. Besides these and such other cases, there were quite a number of cases which we came across during our investigation, where the surplus landholders had taken full advantage under Section 16 of the Revised Land Ceiling Act and had surrendered only low quality and uncultivated lands as surplus areas. It is quite natural for the surplus landholder to surrender uncultivated area as surplus to the extent possible under the provisions of the Act, when the choice of land to be surrendered is fully given to them. In the first chapter we have attempted to see the extent of uncultivated area surrendered as surplus in the sample district, and found that a substantial proportion of surplus surrendered and distributed in all the four sample districts was likely to be uncultivated. In the sample villages also a large chunk



of the area surrendered as surplus was from the uncultivated area. The proportion of such area to the total surplus was as high as 80 per cent in some of the sample villages from Malsiras, Barshi, Karmala and Akkalkot talukas in the Solapur district. In view of the larger surplus area accruing from the uncultivated land, it was inevitable that the large number of allottees received only such lands which could not be cultivated even by the big surplus landholders.

### 2.3 Distribution of Surplus Land

Once the declaration of surplus land is done by the Surplus Land Determination Tribunal/Special Deputy Collectors, further steps for its disposal are taken by the Surplus Land Distribution Tribunal appointed in each taluka or block. On receipt of the statement of surplus land from the Tahasildar, the Distribution Tribunal under the Revised Act is first required to consider reservation of 50 per cent of the surplus land for distribution to landless persons belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and persons from Nomadic Tribes 'Vinukta Jatis' and other backward classes as notified by the Government for that purpose. The Chairman of the Tribunal is to draw a detailed programme fixing the date on which and the place at which applications would be received for the grant of land; the date, time and place at which the applications would be considered. Such a programme is to be given wide publicity by issue of public notice and by beat of drum in the village in which the surplus lands are situated and also in the villages within a radius of eight kilometers of such village. As far as possible seven days are allowed for submitting such applications

from the date of issue of the public notice. The detailed procedure as to the scrutiny of the applications received and selection of allottees has been prescribed under Rule (7), (8) and (9) of the Act. As provided thereunder, the whole programme regarding selection of allottees is to be completed in one sitting. After the final list of allottees is drawn up and announced, the Chairman of the Tribunal authorises the Circle Inspector for taking over possession of the surplus land and handing over the same to the allottees.

In Tables 2.3 to 2.6 we present the data about the areas declared surplus and distributed to different allottees in the talukas of the sample districts, under the Principal and the Revised Act. For Aurangabad district, however, we could not get the required data of the surplus land declared and distributed under the Principal Act. We have, therefore, presented such data only for the Revised Act in Table 2.3. It may be noted from the tables that the area declared surplus under the Revised Act was comparatively much more than that under the Principal Act, in Solapur and Yavatmal districts. In the case of Thane district the surplus area declared under the Revised Act was slightly lower than the surplus area under the Principal Act. The proportions of the distributed surplus to the declared areas were quite substantial for both the phases of the Act, in all the sample districts. A small portion of the surplus declared in each district could not be distributed in view of the stay orders given by the High Court/Supreme Court and Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal. Some of the areas were totally uncultivable and were required to be notified under Section 27(1). It may be

**Table 2.3 : Surplus land declared and distributed under the revised Act in Aurangabad district**

<b>Taluka</b>	<b>Area declared surplus</b>	<b>Area distributed</b>	<b>No. of allottees</b>	<b>Percentage of distributed to declared land</b>	<b>Average distributed land per allottee</b>
<b>Aurangabad</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>1.75</b>
<b>Paithan</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>1.95</b>
<b>Silled</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>93.6</b>	<b>2.09</b>
<b>Soegaon</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>86.4</b>	<b>1.64</b>
<b>Jalna</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>85.2</b>	<b>1.83</b>
<b>Ambad</b>	<b>2050</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1124</b>	<b>97.4</b>	<b>1.78</b>
<b>Bhokardan</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>1.86</b>
<b>Jafraabad</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>97.8</b>	<b>1.99</b>
<b>Vaijapur</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>82.6</b>	<b>1.69</b>
<b>Gangapur</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>574</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>96.1</b>	<b>2.02</b>
<b>Kannad</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>1.66</b>
<b>Khultabad</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>98.6</b>	<b>2.09</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>7827</b>	<b>6999</b>	<b>3815</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>1.83</b>

**Table 2.4 : Surplus land declared and distributed under the Principal and Revised Land Ceiling Act in Solapur district**  
(Area in hectares)

Principal Act					
Taluka	Declared surplus land	Distributed surplus land	No. of allottees	Percentage of distributed land to declared land	Average distributed land per allottee
North Solapur	85	85	69	100.0	1.23
South Solapur	1078	821	560	76.2	1.47
Barshi	587	376	130	64.1	2.89
Akkalkot	237	237	139	100.0	1.71
Madha	89	62	31	69.7	2.00
Malsiras	1027	500	251	48.7	1.99
Karmala	378	177	63	46.8	2.81
Sangola	379	210	58	55.4	3.62
Mohol	355	258	73	72.7	3.53
Mangalwedha	138	138	86	100.0	1.60
Pandharpur	198	145	109	73.2	1.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>4451</b>	<b>3009</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>1.92</b>

Contd.

Table 2.4 : Contd.

Taluka	Revised Act					Total				
	Declared surplus land	Districted surplus land	No. of allottees	Percentage of districted to declared land	Average districted land per allottee	Declared surplus land	Districted surplus land	No. of allottees	Percentage of districted to declared land	Average distributed land per allottee
North Solapur	528	449	285	85.0	1.58	613	534	354	87.1	1.51
South Solapur	661	647	496	97.9	1.30	1739	1468	1056	84.4	1.39
Barshi	1289	1149	843	89.1	1.36	1876	1525	973	81.3	1.57
Akkalkot	474	415	372	87.6	1.11	711	652	511	91.7	1.28
Madha	728	747	379	98.5	1.97	817	809	410	95.3	1.97
Malsiras	1678	1399	639	83.4	2.19	2705	1899	890	70.2	2.13
Karnala	838	820	389	97.9	2.11	1216	997	452	82.0	2.21
Sangola	705	592	274	84.0	2.16	1084	802	332	74.0	2.42
Mohol	632	614	283	97.2	2.17	987	872	356	88.3	2.46
Mangalwedha	401	378	165	94.2	2.29	539	516	251	95.7	2.06
Pandharpur	492	371	168	75.4	2.21	690	516	277	74.8	1.86
<b>Total</b>	<b>8426</b>	<b>7581</b>	<b>4293</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>1.77</b>	<b>12977</b>	<b>10590</b>	<b>5862</b>	<b>82.3</b>	<b>1.81</b>

**Table 2.5 : Surplus land declared and distributed under the Principal and the Revised Act in Thane district**

(Area in hectares)

Taluka	Principal Act				
	Declared surplus land	Distributed surplus land	No. of allottees	Percentage	Average
Talasari	2091	1960	2019	93.7	0.97
Dahanu	595	266	460	44.7	0.58
Palghar	1779	262	254	14.7	1.03
Jawhar	42	39	39	92.9	1.00
Shahour	-	-	-	-	-
Murbad	104	91	93	87.5	0.98
Wada	-	-	-	-	-
Mokhada	448	29	18	6.5	1.61
Ulhasnagar	86	47	22	54.6	2.14
Bhivandi	-	-	-	-	-
Vasai	-	-	-	-	-
Thane	21	-	-	-	-
Kalyan	10	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>5176</b>	<b>2694</b>	<b>2905</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>0.93</b>

189330

99

Contd.

Table 2.5 : Contd.

Taluka	Revised Act					Total				
	Declared surplus land	Distributed surplus land	No. of allottees	Percent- tage	Average	Declared surplus land	Distributed surplus land	No. of allottees	Percent- tage	Average
Talasari	1031	760	764	73.7	0.99	3122	2720	2783	87.1	0.98
Dahanu	645	542	739	84.0	0.73	1240	808	1199	65.2	0.67
Palghar	551	394	570	71.5	0.69	2330	656	824	28.2	0.80
Jawhar	167	166	161	99.4	1.03	209	205	200	98.1	1.03
Shehapur	1273	1266	730	99.5	1.69	1273	1266	730	99.5	1.73
Murbad	178	157	142	88.2	1.11	282	248	135	87.9	1.84
Nada	275	266	210	96.7	1.27	275	266	210	96.7	1.27
Mokhada	336	315	176	93.8	1.79	784	344	194	43.9	1.77
Ulhasnagar	365	183	99	50.1	1.85	451	230	121	51.0	1.90
Bhivandi	39	39	26	100.0	1.50	39	39	26	100.0	1.50
Vasai	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thane	128	-	-	-	-	149	-	-	-	-
Kalyan	118	-	-	-	-	128	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>5106</b>	<b>4088</b>	<b>3617</b>	<b>80.1</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>10282</b>	<b>6782</b>	<b>6522</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>1.04</b>

**Table 2.6 : Surplus land declared and distributed under the Principal and the Revised Act in Yavatmal district**

(Area in hectares)

Taluka	Principal Act				
	Declared surplus land	Distributed surplus land	No. of allottees	Percentage	Average
Yavatmal	372	307	112	82.6	2.74
Darwaha	864	605	265	70.0	2.28
Pusad	1458	970	472	66.5	2.05
Wani	518	390	385	75.2	1.01
Kelahur	1048	1030	686	98.3	1.50
	6571*	6552*	2378	99.7	2.75
<b>Total</b>	<b>10831</b>	<b>9854</b>	<b>4298</b>	<b>91.0</b>	<b>2.29</b>

\* Area declared and distributed by the Spl. Deputy Collector

Contd.



Table 2.6 : Contd.

	Revised Act					(Area in hectares) Total				
	Declared surplus land	Distributed surplus land	No. of allottees	Percentage of distributed to declared land	Average distributed land per allottee	Declared surplus land	Distributed surplus land	No. of allottees	Percentage	Average
Yavatmal	3037	2843	2001	93.6	1.42	3409	3150	2113	92.4	1.49
Darwaha	3777	2208	1448	58.5	1.52	4641	2813	1713	60.6	1.64
Pusad	1142	767	520	67.2	1.47	2600	1737	992	66.8	1.18
Nani	2520	1504	1077	59.7	1.40	3038	1894	1462	62.3	1.29
Kalahur	6249	3890	2782	62.3	1.40	7297	4920	3468	67.4	1.41
						6571	6552	2378	99.7	2.75
<b>Total</b>	<b>16725</b>	<b>11212</b>	<b>7828</b>	<b>67.0</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>27556</b>	<b>21066</b>	<b>12126</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>1.74</b>

noted from the tables that there were wide variations in the proportions of the distributed to the declared surplus areas in different talukas of each district. Such a proportion was the lowest in the case of Mokhada (6.5 per cent) and Palghar (14.7 per cent) talukas in the Thane district. A large proportion of the declared surplus in these two talukas was uncultivable and so could not be distributed. In no other talukas in the sample districts, the proportion of the distributed to the declared surplus was so low. It may be seen from the tables that the average distributed land per allottee was less than two hectares in all the sample districts. At the taluka level; however, there were somewhat wide variations in the average area distributed. In some of the talukas such <sup>an</sup> average area was more than two hectares. In Sangola and Mohol talukas of the Solapur district the average area per allottee was above three hectares. It appears from the tables that the distribution of the declared surplus areas was certainly better under the Revised Act than that under the Principal Act. This might be because of the Emergency declared in the country in 1975.

As mentioned earlier the important distinguishing feature of the Revised Act is the reservation of 50 per cent of the Surplus land under Section 27 (4), after excluding lands referred to under Sub-Sections (2) and (3), for distribution to persons belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes, etc. In Tables 2.7 to 2.16, we present the talukwise distribution of the allottees belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and other backward castes, along with the areas of the surplus land distributed to them

**Table 2.7 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from Scheduled Castes/Tribes etc. and other allottees under the revised Act in Aurangabad district**

(Area in hectares)

Taluka	Scheduled Caste			Scheduled Tribes			Other backward castes		
	No. of allottees	Area	Percentage	No. of allottees	Area	Percentage	No. of allottees	Area	Percentage
Aurangabad	135	226	41.85	12	21	3.89	27	46	8.52
Paithan	217	428	55.58	53	109	14.76	10	27	3.51
Silled	63	116	47.15	-	-	-	33	62	25.20
Soegaon	49	83	39.71	4	6	2.87	12	18	8.61
Jalna	210	364	43.59	11	33	3.95	49	87	10.42
Aabad	697	1160	57.83	48	122	6.08	104	207	10.32
Bhokardan	175	338	44.65	23	32	4.23	11	18	2.38
Jafrabad	52	101	37.97	5	9	3.38	2	4	1.50
Vaijapur	127	221	46.43	36	61	12.82	38	67	14.07
Gangapur	173	304	59.14	37	69	13.42	23	40	7.78
Kannad	49	77	34.36	15	25	11.16	5	7	3.13
Khultabad	18	37	50.68	3	7	9.59	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1965</b>	<b>3455</b>	<b>49.96</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>7.14</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>8.43</b>

Contd.

**Table 2.7 : Comtd.**

Taluka	All backward castes			Others			Total		
	No. of allottees	Area	Percentage	No. of allottees	Area	Percentage	No. of allottees	Area	Percentage
Aurangabad	174	293	54.26	134	247	45.74	308	540	100.00
Paithan	280	564	73.25	114	206	26.75	394	770	100.00
Sillod	96	178	72.35	36	68	27.65	132	246	100.00
Soegaon	65	107	51.19	63	102	48.81	128	209	100.00
Jalna	270	484	57.96	184	351	42.04	454	835	100.00
Ambad	849	1489	74.23	278	517	25.77	1124	2006	100.00
Bhokardan	209	388	51.26	197	369	48.76	406	757	100.00
Jafrahad	59	114	42.85	75	152	57.15	134	266	100.00
Vaijapur	201	349	73.32	80	127	26.68	281	476	100.00
Gangapur	233	413	80.34	51	101	19.66	284	514	100.00
Kannad	69	109	48.65	66	115	51.35	135	224	100.00
Khultabad	21	44	60.27	14	29	39.73	35	73	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2526</b>	<b>4532</b>	<b>65.53</b>	<b>1282</b>	<b>2384</b>	<b>34.47</b>	<b>3815</b>	<b>6916</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Table 2.8 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from Scheduled Castes, Tribes, Ex-servicemen and others under the Principal Act in Solapur District**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)											
	Scheduled Castes, Tribes, etc.			Ex-servicemen & Servicemen			Others			Total		
	Allo-tees	Area	Percentage to total area	Allo-tees	Area	Percentage to total area	Allo-tees	Area	Percentage to total area	Allo-tees	Area	Percentage to total area
North Solapur	35	39	45.9	19	29	34.1	15	17	20.0	69	85	100.0
South Solapur	245	338	41.2	111	178	21.7	204	305	37.1	560	821	100.0
Barshi	65	165	43.9	13	43	11.4	52	168	44.7	130	376	100.0
Akkalkot	62	121	51.1	11	22	9.3	66	94	39.6	139	237	100.00
Madha	28	55	88.7	-	-	-	3	7	11.3	31	62	100.0
Malsiras	123	206	41.2	52	94	18.8	76	200	40.0	251	500	100.0
Karmala	26	52	29.4	20	82	46.3	17	43	24.3	63	177	100.0
Sangola	21	56	26.7	14	31	14.8	23	123	58.5	58	210	100.0
Mohol	30	96	37.2	23	81	31.4	20	81	31.4	73	258	100.0
Mangalwedha	26	41	29.7	20	50	36.2	40	47	34.1	86	138	100.0
Pandharpur	50	66	45.6	41	54	37.2	18	25	17.2	109	145	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>1235</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>1110</b>	<b>36.9</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>3009</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 2.9** : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from Scheduled Castes, Tribes, Ex-Servicemen and Others under the Revised Act in Solapur district

Taluka	(Area in hectares)											
	Scheduled Castes, Tribes, etc.			Ex-Servicemen & Servicemen			Others			Total		
	Fami- lies	Area	Percentage to total area	Fami- lies	Area	Percentage to total area	Fami- lies	Area	Percentage to total area	Fami- lies	Area	Percentage to total area
North Solapur	131	206	45.9	74	108	24.1	80	135	30.0	285	449	100.0
South Solapur	237	311	48.0	94	119	18.5	165	217	33.5	496	647	100.0
Barshi	437	561	48.8	155	204	17.8	251	384	33.4	843	1149	100.0
Akkalkot	163	179	43.1	74	85	20.5	135	151	36.4	372	415	100.0
Madha	200	382	51.1	114	229	30.7	65	136	18.2	379	747	100.0
Malsiras	354	831	59.4	110	239	17.1	175	329	23.5	639	1399	100.0
Karnala	230	480	58.5	27	57	7.0	132	283	34.5	389	820	100.0
Langola	161	347	58.6	76	156	26.4	37	89	15.0	274	592	100.0
Chohol	150	341	55.5	37	83	13.5	96	190	31.0	283	614	100.0
Langalwedha	93	218	57.6	46	100	26.5	26	60	15.9	165	378	100.0
Bandharpur	89	201	54.2	58	124	33.4	21	46	12.4	168	371	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2245</b>	<b>4057</b>	<b>53.5</b>	<b>865</b>	<b>1504</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>1183</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>4293</b>	<b>7581</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 2.10 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from Scheduled Castes, Tribes, Ex-servicemen and Others under the Principal and the Revised Act in Solapur district**

(Area in hectares)

Taluka	Scheduled Castes, Tribes, etc.			Ex-servicemen & Servicemen			Others			Total		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage to total area	Allottees	Area	Percentage to total area	Allottees	Area	Percentage to total area	Allottees	Area	Percentage to total area
North Solapur	166	245	45.9	93	137	25.6	95	152	28.5	354	534	100.0
South Solapur	482	649	44.2	205	297	20.2	369	522	35.6	1056	1468	100.0
Barshi	502	726	47.6	168	247	16.2	303	552	36.2	973	1525	100.0
Akkalkot	225	300	46.0	85	107	16.4	201	245	37.6	511	652	100.0
Madha	228	437	54.0	114	229	28.3	68	143	17.7	410	809	100.0
Malsiras	477	1037	54.6	162	333	17.5	251	529	27.9	890	1899	100.0
Karmala	256	532	53.4	47	139	13.9	149	326	32.7	452	997	100.0
Sangola	182	403	50.2	90	187	23.3	60	212	26.5	332	802	100.0
Mohol	180	437	50.1	60	164	18.8	116	271	31.1	356	872	100.0
Mangalwedha	119	259	50.2	66	150	29.1	66	107	20.7	251	516	100.0
Pandharpur	139	267	51.7	99	178	34.5	39	71	13.8	277	516	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2956</b>	<b>5292</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>1189</b>	<b>2168</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>1717</b>	<b>3130</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>5862</b>	<b>10590</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 2.11 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from scheduled castes/tribes etc. and other allottees under the Principal Act in Thane district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)											
	Scheduled Castes			Scheduled Tribes			Other Backward Castes			All Backward Castes		
	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage
Talasari	-	-	-	2019	1960	100.00	-	-	-	2019	1960	100.00
Dahanu	-	-	-	428	251	94.46	-	-	-	428	251	94.46
Palghar	16	12	4.56	153	163	61.98	66	65	24.71	235	240	91.25
Jowhar	3	3	7.69	36	36	92.31	-	-	-	39	39	100.00
Murbad	3	2	-	55	63	-	34	26	-	92	91	98.91
Mokhada	18	29	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	29	100.00
Ulhasnagar	-	-	-	22	47	100.00	-	-	-	22	47	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>1.71</b>	<b>2713</b>	<b>2520</b>	<b>93.47</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>2853</b>	<b>2657</b>	<b>98.55</b>

Contd.



Table 2.11 : Contd.

Taluka	Ex-servicemen			Others			Total		
	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage
Talesari	-	-	-	-	-	-	2019	1960	100.00
Dahanu	-	-	-	32	15	5.64	460	266	100.00
Palghar	-	-	-	19	23	8.75	254	263	100.00
Jowhar	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	39	100.00
Murbad	-	-	-	1	1	1.09	93	92	100.00
Nakhoda	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	29	100.00
Ulhasnagar	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	47	100.00
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	<b>52</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>2905</b>	<b>2696</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Table 2.12 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from scheduled castes/tribes etc. and other allottees under the Revised Act in Thane district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)											
	Scheduled Castes			Scheduled Tribes			Other Backward Castes			All Backward Castes		
	Allo- ttees	Area	Percentage	Allo- ttees	Area	Percentage	Allo- ttees	Area	Percentage	Allo- ttees	Area	Percentage
Talasari	6	6	0.79	758	754	99.21	-	-	-	764	760	100.00
Dahana	46	38	7.01	693	504	92.99	-	-	-	739	542	100.00
Palghar	54	49	12.44	303	186	47.21	168	93	23.60	525	328	83.25
Jowhar	2	2	1.20	155	160	96.39	4	4	2.41	161	166	100.00
Shahapur	21	34	2.68	534	947	74.81	147	238	18.80	702	1219	96.29
Murbad	9	7	4.49	97	119	76.28	34	29	18.59	140	155	99.36
Wada	7	7	2.63	195	247	92.86	5	9	3.38	207	263	98.87
Mokhada	4	21	6.67	172	294	93.33	-	-	-	176	315	100.00
Ulhasnagar	2	3	1.65	69	131	71.98	-	-	-	71	134	73.63
Bhivandi	2	3	7.50	23	35	87.50	-	-	-	25	38	95.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>2999</b>	<b>3377</b>	<b>82.63</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>9.13</b>	<b>3510</b>	<b>3920</b>	<b>95.92</b>

Contd.

**Table 2.12 : Contd.**

Taluka	Ex-servicemen			Others			Total		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage
Talassari	-	-	-	-	-	-	764	760	100.00
Dhanu	-	-	-	-	-	-	739	542	100.00
Palghar	28	52	13.20	17	14	3.55	570	394	100.00
Jowhar	-	-	-	-	-	-	161	166	100.00
Shahapur	-	-	-	28	47	3.71	730	1266	100.00
Marbad	-	-	-	2	1	0.64	142	156	100.00
Kada	-	-	-	3	3	1.13	210	266	100.00
Kokhada	-	-	-	-	-	-	176	315	100.00
Ulhasnagar	-	-	-	28	48	26.37	99	182	100.00
Bhivandi	-	-	-	1	2	5.00	26	40	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>3617</b>	<b>4087</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Table 2.13 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from scheduled castes/tribes etc. and other allottees under the Principal & the Revised Act in Thane district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)											
	All Backward Castes			Ex-Servicemen			Others			Total		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage
Talasari	2783	2720	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	2783	2720	100.00
Dahanu	1167	793	98.14	-	-	-	32	15	1.86	1199	808	100.00
Palghar	760	568	86.45	28	52	7.92	36	37	5.63	824	657	100.00
Jowhar	200	205	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	205	100.00
Shahapur	702	1219	96.29	-	-	-	28	47	3.71	730	1266	100.00
Murbad	197	220	99.10	-	-	-	3	2	0.90	200	222	100.00
Wada	207	263	98.87	-	-	-	3	3	1.13	210	266	100.00
Nokhoda	194	344	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	194	344	100.00
Ulhasnagar	93	181	79.04	-	-	-	28	48	20.96	121	229	100.00
Bhivandi	25	38	95.00	-	-	-	1	2	5.00	26	40	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>6328</b>	<b>6551</b>	<b>96.95</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>6487</b>	<b>6757</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Table 2.14** : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from scheduled castes/tribes etc. and other allottees under the Revised Act in Yavatmal district.

(Area in hectares)

Taluka	Scheduled Castes			Scheduled Tribes			Other backward castes			All backward castes		
	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage	Allo- tees	Area	Percentage
Yavatmal	452	608	21.39	760	1053	37.05	269	359	12.61	1481	2020	71.05
Darwaha	386	588	26.60	273	405	18.34	522	748	33.88	1181	1741	78.82
Pusad	56	83	10.82	93	144	18.85	216	316	41.24	365	543	70.91
Nani	163	230	15.34	629	873	58.06	53	71	4.76	845	1174	78.17
Kelapur	359	503	12.93	1626	2268	58.30	313	427	10.99	2298	3198	82.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>1416</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>17.95</b>	<b>3381</b>	<b>4743</b>	<b>42.31</b>	<b>1373</b>	<b>1921</b>	<b>17.14</b>	<b>6170</b>	<b>8676</b>	<b>77.40</b>

Contd.

**Table 2.14 : Contd.**

Taluka	Ex-servicemen			Others			Total		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage
Yavatmal	134	212	7.49	386	610	21.46	2001	2842	100.00
Darwaha	45	74	3.35	222	394	17.83	1448	2205	100.00
Pusad	78	119	15.47	77	104	13.62	520	766	100.00
Wani	52	72	4.76	180	257	17.07	1077	1503	100.00
Kelapur	30	44	1.13	454	648	16.65	2782	3890	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>1319</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>17.95</b>	<b>7828</b>	<b>11210</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE 2.12 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from scheduled castes/tribes and other allottees under the Principal Act in Yavatmal district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)								
	Scheduled Castes			Scheduled Tribes			All Backward Castes		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage
Yavatmal	1	4	1.45	15	56	18.21	16	60	19.66
Darwha	36	115	17.00	35	120	19.86	71	235	38.86
Pusad	62	144	14.86	88	209	21.58	150	353	36.44
Wani	34	47	12.05	107	149	38.21	141	196	50.26
Kelapur	58	135	13.11	223	549	53.28	281	684	66.39
Special Deputy Collector	341	948	14.46	168	630	9.62	509	1578	24.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>1393</b>	<b>14.14</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>1713</b>	<b>17.38</b>	<b>1168</b>	<b>3086</b>	<b>31.52</b>

Contd.

**Table 2.15 : Contd.**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)								
	Societies			Others			Total		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage
Yavatmal	8	200	65.30	64	46	15.04	88	306	100.00
Darwaha	2	74	12.31	119	296	48.83	192	605	100.00
Pused	2	160	16.49	168	456	47.08	320	969	100.00
Wani	-	-	-	103	194	49.74	244	390	100.00
Kelapur	1	53	5.18	122	293	28.43	404	1030	100.00
Special Deputy Collector	-	-	-	1360	4974	75.92	1869	6552	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>4.95</b>	<b>1936</b>	<b>6259</b>	<b>63.52</b>	<b>3117</b>	<b>9852</b>	<b>100.00</b>



**Table 2.16 : Surplus land distributed to the allottees from Scheduled castes/Tribes etc. and other allottees under the Principal and the Revised Act in Yavatmal district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)								
	All backward castes			Ex-servicemen			Societies		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage
Yavatmal	1497	2080	66.04	134	213	6.76	8	200	6.36
Darwaha	1252	1976	70.23	45	74	2.63	2	74	2.65
Pusad	515	897	51.65	78	119	6.83	2	160	9.21
Wani	986	1371	72.43	52	72	3.78	-	-	-
Kelapur	2579	3883	78.90	30	44	0.90	1	53	1.09
Spl. Deputy Collector	509	1577	24.08	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>7338</b>	<b>11784</b>	<b>55.94</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>2.32</b>

Contd.

Table 2.16 : Contd.

Taluka	Others			Total		
	Allottees	Area	Percentage	Allottees	Area	Percentage
Kavathe	450	656	20.84	2089	3149	100.00
Barwa	341	689	24.49	1640	2813	100.00
Musad	245	561	32.31	840	1737	100.00
Mani	283	450	23.79	1321	1893	100.00
Melapur	576	940	19.11	3186	4920	100.00
pl. Deputy collector	1360	4975	75.92	1869	6552	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>3255</b>	<b>8271</b>	<b>39.27</b>	<b>10945</b>	<b>21064</b>	<b>100.00</b>

in each of the four sample districts. It may be noted here that in Tables 2.8 to 2.10 pertaining to the Solapur district we have clubbed together the allottees belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes as the total number of allottees from Scheduled Tribes was very small - 53 and 11 under the Principal and the Revised Act respectively. This was mainly because Scheduled Tribes as such were not in large numbers in the Solapur district. Another point to be noted about these tables is that we could not get the castes of the ex-servicemen and servicemen who were allotted surplus land in the Solapur district. So it is likely that some of the ex-servicemen and servicemen might belong to Scheduled Castes and the proportion of the distributed land to the Scheduled Caste allottees might change to that extent. It may be noted from Tables 2.7, 2.9, 2.12 and 2.15 that the proportion of surplus land distributed to persons from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in all the four districts was much more than the reservation (50 per cent) prescribed under the provisions of the Revised Act. Thus, in the Yavatmal district, more than three-fourths (77.40 per cent) of the total surplus land declared under the Revised Act was distributed to the allottees from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. In the case of the Aurangabad district the proportion of surplus land allotted to the backward class allottees was comparatively low i.e. 65.53 per cent. In the Solapur district it was still lower - 53.5 per cent. The case of the Thane district was typical, as it is predominantly tribal area, except its Southern part. In this district, therefore, more than 82 per cent of the surplus land distributed under the Revised Act was given to the allottees from the Scheduled Tribes only.

"Warli", "Thakur" and "Katkari" are the three major tribes in the district and more than three-fourths of the total allottees were from these three tribes only. "Warlis" are predominant in Talasari and Dahanu talukas, while "Thakurs" and "Katkaris", in Sahapur and Jawahar talukas. Palghar is the only exceptional taluka in the five sample talukas, where allottees from the Scheduled Tribes were comparatively small in number. It may be seen from the tables that if we add up all the surplus land distributed to the Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes and other Backward Castes, we find that almost all the surplus land in the district (96 per cent of the total surplus) was distributed to the allottees belonging to the Backward Castes, and only 4 per cent to others. Thus, the reservation of the surplus land (50 per cent) prescribed under the provisions of the Revised Act was redundant, as far as the Thane district was concerned. It may be seen from the tables that the inter-taluka variations in the proportions of surplus land distributed to the persons from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in each of the sample districts were quite wide. In Aurangabad district it varied between 42 and 73 per cent; in Solapur district, between 43 and 59 per cent; in Yavatmal district between 70 and 82 per cent and in Thane district between 73 and 100 per cent. These taluka level proportions and the proportions on the district level clearly point out that, by and large, the persons belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, etc. appeared to have received their due share in the surplus land distributed under the Revised Act.

Under the Principal Act, as we know, there was no

such reservation of surplus area for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Even then the proportion of the distributed surplus land to the allottees belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, etc. was not very low. It was 41 per cent in the case of the Solapur district, and 32 per cent in the Yavatmal district. However, between the talukas in the two districts, the proportions of the surplus areas distributed to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, varied very widely. In Solapur district it varied between 26 and 88 per cent; while in the Yavatmal district, between 19 and 66 per cent. On the whole, it appears that the persons from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, etc. received more than their due share of the surplus distributed land under the Revised Act as against the major proportion of the distributed land under the Principal Act going to other Caste people. If we add up the total distributed areas under the Principal and the Revised Act, we see that near about half of the total declared surplus in the sample districts (50 to 55 per cent) was distributed to the allottees belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes etc. and the rest to ex-servicemen and servicemen and persons from other castes.

During our investigations in the four sample districts, we found that there were many complaints of malpractices involved in the distribution of surplus land. We observed that in many of the villages the detailed procedure of distribution of the surplus land as given in the Revised Act was not strictly followed. Even the major provisions of the Act were at times overlooked. We observed that in some of the sample

villages many of the allottees were total outsiders and were not entitled to receive the surplus land in the sample villages. They were not resident even within the required radius of 8 kilometers from the village where the surplus land was situated. In this regard the distribution of surplus land at Kegaon, a sample village in the Solapur district provides an interesting case.

Kegaon is situated at a distance of about 12 kilometers to the west of the Solapur city. About 11.40 hectares of surplus land in this village was distributed to 9 allottees. All the nine allottees were from the Solapur city. None of the nine allottees was either from Kegaon village or from villages within the radius of 8 kilometers of Kegaon. It was not possible to understand how applications from the total outsiders who were neither from Kegaon nor from within the radius of 8 kilometers were considered for the surplus land at Kegaon. Likewise we could not understand how the surplus land at Kegaon could be distributed to the applicants from the Solapur city, which is not within the radius of 8 kilometers from Kegaon. And such allotment was done when actually there were 26 applicants for the surplus land from Kegaon, itself, and 132 applicants from villages within the radius of 8 kilometers of Kegaon. Of the 26 applicants from Kegaon, 20 were from the persons belonging to the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. None from these persons, nor from the 158 applicants, who according to the land Ceiling Act were legally eligible for the surplus land at Kegaon, could get any surplus land. And the entire land was distributed to

of the families from the Solapur city which were not even eligible to apply for the surplus land at Kegaon could be entertained and allotment of the surplus land was made to them? We were told by the applicants at Kegaon that the meeting of the Surplus Land Distribution Tribunal was held at Kegaon itself and the surplus land was distributed by lots, which were drawn in the presence of the applicants. It was difficult to believe that none out of the 158 applicants, not a single one from the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, could come up in the draw while all the nine families from the Solapur city could be drawn up in the lots and proved fortunate to get the surplus land distributed at Kegaon. When we pursued this matter with the Additional Tahasildar of North Solapur taluka for some days, the cat came out of the bag. The modus operandi was very simple and almost silly. The Additional Tahasildar explained to us that all the procedure was followed strictly according to the provisions of the Act upto the point of drawing lots. Lots were drawn but while announcing the successful applicant's name the Chairman of the Tribunal, instead of reading the name written on the drawn chit, read the name from the list of allottees already prepared and kept ready with him. Thus the names of nine allottees from the Solapur city were announced and the surplus land at Kegaon was allotted to them. It is more important to note that out of these nine allottees, four were from the Collector's and Tahasildar's office, one serving as a driver on Government vehicle and the other three, as peons.

In connection with the distribution of surplus land, another serious case which we came across during our

investigation in the Solapur district may be mentioned here. It was the case of a clerk serving in the Animal Husbandry Section of the Zilla Parishad, Solapur, who had managed to secure surplus lands in three different names at three different villages in South and North Solapur talukas. The details of the surplus lands secured by him were as under :

<u>Taluka</u>	<u>Village</u>	<u>Area in hectares</u>	<u>'Cat' No.</u>
1. South Solapur	Manje Ule	1.66	39
2. South Solapur	Nimbergi	1.06	Not given
3. North Solapur	Shelgi (Hippergi)	1.00	76/IC

This case could come to light only because of an anonymous application sent to the then Chief Minister of Maharashtra, who received it in September 1976 and directed the Secretary to make enquiry about the facts stated in the application. The directive for enquiry ultimately came down to the Additional Tahasildar, South Solapur taluka, who enquired into the case and found that the allegations made in the anonymous application were true. He found that the person concerned was serving as a clerk in the Animal Husbandry Section at Mauje Katkute in the Karmala Taluka. He had managed to secure surplus land at Mauje Ule in the name of his wife, and the allotted land was in his possession. At another village called Nimbergi, he had secured surplus land in the name of his brother's wife, but he had not taken its possession till the date of enquiry. At Shelgi village he had managed to secure surplus land in the name of Shri Anjanayya Krishnayya Kalal. The Additional Tahasildar found that there was no person of this name at Shelgi



or in any other neighbouring villages. It was revealed that the clerk concerned had secured the surplus land at Shelgi under the fictitious name and was cultivating it for some time. After the completion of enquiry, the Collector sent his report to the Divisional Commissioner and suggested the institution of departmental action against the clerk concerned. The Commissioner had pointed out in his reply that "the clerk concerned is not a gasetted officer and hence the action has to be taken by the Collector himself." This was the stage of the case when we got its report on 12th February 1979. The surplus land allotted to the clerk concerned was still with him till the day of our visit.

The two cases cited above are adequate enough to know the seriousness of the malpractices followed in the distribution of surplus land in the sample districts.

#### 2.4 Handing over Possession of Distributed Land

As noted earlier once the final list of allottees is drawn up and announced, the Chairman of the Surplus Land Distribution Tribunal authorises an Officer, not below the rank of Circle Inspector or Revenue Inspector as an Authorised Officer to hand over the possession of surplus land to the allottees. The Chairman also announces the date, time and place at which the possession of the surplus land would be handed over to the selected allottees by the Authorised Officer. As soon as the final list of the selected allottees is received, the Authorised Officer issues a public notice that he intends to hand over possession of surplus land on the date announced by the Chairman of the Surplus Land Distribution Tribunal.

On the announced date he hands over the possession of surplus land to the selected allottees and gets the undertaking in Form V prescribed under Rule 11, executed from the allottees. The authorised officer then returns the proceedings to the Tahasildar in charge of the Taluka in which the lands are situated. The Tahasildar thereafter makes necessary entries in the Register of Disposal of Surplus Land. This is the procedure prescribed in the Act for handing over possession of surplus land to the selected allottees.

In Table 2.17 we present the data regarding the allottees in the Solapur District, put in possession of the surplus land distributed under the Principal and the Revised Act. Such data was not available for the other three districts. It may be noted from the table that all the allottees who received land under the Principal Act, were put in possession of their respective plots of surplus area and the necessary entries were made in the Records of Right. Thus, all the formalities as regards distribution of surplus land were completed for all the allottees under the Principal Act and there was not a single case pending in the Solapur district.

The task under the Revised Act was also almost complete. It may be seen from the table that out of the total number of allottees reported under the Revised Act, about 95 per cent were put in possession of their respective land and only 5 per cent had remained to be given possession of land. Of these 217 or 5 per cent allottees, 117 had refused to take possession of lands allotted to them as they found that the lands were mostly

**Table 2.17 : Allottees declared and put in possession of the allotted lands under the Principal and the Revised Act in Solapur district**

Taluka	Principal Act		
	No. of allottees declared	Allottees put in possession of land	Allottees entered in Record of Rights
North Solapur	69	69	69
South Solapur	560	560	560
Barshi	130	130	130
Akkalkot	139	139	139
Madha	31	31	31
Malsiras	251	251	251
Karnala	63	63	63
Sangola	58	58	58
Mohol	73	73	73
Mangalwedha	86	86	86
Pandharpur	109	109	109
<b>Total</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1569</b>	<b>1569</b>

Contd.

Taluka	Revised Act				Total				
	No. of allottees declared	Allottees put in possession of land	Allottees who returned to take possession of land No.	Area in hectares	Allottees entered in record of rights	Allottees entered as members of village societies	No. of allottees declared	Allottees put in possession of land	Allottees entered in record of rights
North Solapur	285	265	17	40	265	265	354	334	334
South Solapur	496	496	-	-	496	496	1056	1056	1056
Barshi	843	722	40	69	687	666	973	852	817
Akkalkot	372	372	-	-	343	316	511	511	482
Madha	379	379	-	-	366	366	410	410	397
Malsiras	639	601	36	108	601	480	890	852	852
Karnala	389	389	-	-	389	389	452	452	452
Sangola	274	241	19	36	241	241	332	299	299
Mohol	283	283	-	-	279	279	356	356	352
Mangalwedha	165	165	-	-	142	138	251	251	228
Pandharpur	168	163	5	12	163	163	277	272	272
<b>Total</b>	<b>4293</b>	<b>4076</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>3972</b>	<b>3799</b>	<b>5862</b>	<b>5645</b>	<b>5541</b>

uncultivable. The area of lands involved in these cases was about 265 hectares. In the case of the remaining 100 allottees, the possession could not be handed over as the surplus landholders had filed writ petitions in the High Court/the Supreme Court and had secured stay orders against the distribution of their surplus land. The talukawise data presented in the table, point out that in six talukas vis. South Solapur, Akkalkot, Madha, Karmala, Mehel and Mangalwedha, all the allottees of surplus land were put in possession of their respective lands. The task could not be completed in the remaining five talukas like North Solapur, Barshi, Malsiras, Sangola and Pandharpur. In these talukas, only 3 to 15 per cent of the allottees remained to be put in possession of the surplus land allotted to them. The number of allottees who refused to take possession of the allotted land as it was all uncultivable, was comparatively larger in Barshi (40) and Malsiras (36) talukas. The surplus land involved in these cases was also larger in the above two talukas.

At the aggregate level, about 96 per cent of the total allottees under the Principal and the Revised Act, were put in possession of the allotted surplus land and only 4 per cent, had remained to be given such possession. It may be seen from the table that the necessary entries of about 95 per cent of the total allottees had also been completed by the end of December 1978. So all the legal formalities of distribution of surplus land were completed for most of the allottees under the Principal and the Revised Act in the Solapur

It is surprising to note that malpractices were prevalent even at the stage of handing over possession of the allotted surplus land in some of the sample talukas. An interesting case in this regard was reported at Pangaon village in Barshi taluka. In this village a landlord was declared surplus landholder to the extent of 60 acres by the Surplus Land Determination Tribunal, Barshi, under its order No. CLD (Pangaon) 40 & 25/75 dated 21.2.1976. This order was confirmed by the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, Pune, under No. MRT/SH/66/75 dated 29.4.1976. The surplus landholder was therefore required to surrender 60 acres of his land under Section 16 of the Act. The dispute arose in respect of Survey No. 22 belonging to the surplus landholder. The S.No. 22 admeasuring 44 acres and 14 gunthas beyond a stream was retained for himself. He had clarified his choice in form No. VII that he desired to retain 7 acres 14 gunthas at the southern side of S.No. 22, where a mango grove and 'jambhul' trees were standing. On the basis of his declaration the Surplus Land Determination Tribunal declared the remaining area measuring 37 acres at the northern portion as surplus in form No. VIII. The same impression was carried forward in the form No. IX issued by the Circle Inspector. But while taking possession and handing it over to the allottees the Circle Inspector handed over the southern portion of the S.No. 22, where the mango grove and 'jambhul' trees were standing. This was evident from the sketch map produced by the Circle Inspector and was also supported by the "panchanama" dated 22.3.1977. The land was personally inspected by the District Collector on 19.7.1977. It was reported that the Circle Inspector had a vested interest and

hence he took possession of land on the southern side and handed it over to the allottees who were inclusive of his relatives. The dispute about this land was still on, when we visited Barshi taluka on 25th February 1979.

Such cases, though not many, were reported in some talukas of the sample districts. But the total number of such cases and the total area of surplus land involved in them, could not be ascertained because of various reasons. The case presented above was found in the official records at the Solapur district collectorate and we have presented it here as an illustration. It can give a broad idea of how malpractices could be effectively adopted even at the stage of handing over possession of surplus land to the allottees.

## 2.5 Compensation

Compensation for any land acquired by the Government for the purposes of the Land Ceiling Act, was awarded to the surplus landholders, at the following rates.

- 1) 200 times the assessment per hectare but not exceeding Rs.1,000/- per hectare of dry land;
- 2) 400 times the assessment per hectare but not exceeding Rs.5,000/- per hectare of land irrigated perennially by flow irrigation;
- 3) 300 times the assessment per hectare but not exceeding Rs.5,000/- per hectare of land irrigated for one season.

Under Section 26 of the Revised Act, the amount of compensation may be paid in transferable bonds carrying

interest at three per cent per annum. Bonds are of two classes - one being payable during a period of twenty years from the date of issue by equated annual instalment of principal and interest; and the other being redeemable at part at the end of a period of twenty years from the date of issue. It is left to a surplus landholder receiving compensation to choose payment in one or the other class of bonds or partly in one class and partly in another. If the amount of compensation or any of its part, could not be paid in bonds, it is to be paid in cash in marginal cases.

In Table 2.18 are presented the cases of compensation, areas of surplus land involved in such cases and the amounts of compensation awarded to surplus landholders in the Solapur district. Such data was not available for the other sample districts. Under the Principal Act, about Rs.2.15 lakhs were awarded in 146 cases for 2,419 hectares of surplus land in the Solapur district. The average amount of compensation per hectare came to Rs.88.7. Of the total amount of compensation awarded under the Principal Act, Rs.1.81 lakhs or about 84.5 per cent had been actually paid to the surplus landholders till 31st December 1978. Out of the total actually paid, Rs.1.77 lakhs or about 98 per cent, was paid in the form of bonds and the remaining amount of Rs.3,955/- or only 2 per cent of the total was paid in cash.

The total amount of compensation awarded under the Revised Act was apparently much bigger in the Solapur district as the number of cases and the surplus areas declared under this Act were quite large. It may be



**Table 2.16 : Compensation awarded under the Principal and the Revised Act in Solapur district**

Taluka	Principal Act				Compensation awarded
	No. of compensation cases		Enquiries into cases completed		
	No. of cases	Area involved	No. of cases	Area involved	
North Solapur	4	85	4	85	14,306
South Solapur	21	1063	18	812	28,255
Barshi	25	586	17	357	23,220
Akkalkot	10	237	10	237	25,858
Madha	11	89	6	24	7,770
Malasiras	73	1027	50	270	39,462
Karnala	19	378	10	81	21,701
Sangola	16	198	11	172	15,746
Mohol	16	273	4	181	11,445
Mangalwedha	11	138	11	138	20,437
Pandharpur	16	198	5	62	6,427
<b>Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>4272</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>2419</b>	<b>2,14,627</b>

Contd.

**Table 2.18 : Contd.**

Taluka	Revised Act					Total				
	No. of compensation cases		Enquiries into cases completed		Compensation awarded	No. of compensation cases		Enquiries into cases completed		Compensation awarded
	No. of cases	Area involved	No. of cases	Area involved		No. of cases	Area involved	No. of cases	Area involved	
North Satara	54	528	50	281	36,000	58	613	54	366	50,306
South Satara	98	664	93	590	1,68,271	119	1727	11	1402	1,96,526
Barshi	167	1248	88	491	1,02,079	192	1834	105	848	1,25,299
Akkalkot	71	454	71	454	1,67,930	81	691	81	691	1,93,788
Madha	100	658	72	362	84,868	111	747	78	386	92,638
Malsiras	164	1488	140	1346	91,308	237	2515	190	1616	1,30,770
Karnala	141	837	140	740	1,11,170	160	1215	150	821	1,32,871
Sangola	93	725	80	556	1,77,323	109	923	91	728	1,93,069
Mohol	85	604	85	598	1,09,570	101	877	89	779	1,21,015
Mangalwedha	73	404	68	373	74,548	84	542	79	511	94,985
Pandharpur	62	378	62	378	65,030	78	576	67	440	71,457
<b>Total</b>	<b>1108</b>	<b>7988</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>6,169</b>	<b>11,88,097</b>	<b>1,330</b>	<b>12,260</b>	<b>1,095</b>	<b>8,588</b>	<b>14,02,724</b>

seen from the table that the total amount of compensation awarded under the Revised Act stood at Rs.11.88 lakhs for 6,169 hectares of surplus land declared from 949 cases. The average amount of compensation came to Rs.193 per hectare of surplus land. The total amount of compensation actually paid till the end of the year 1978, was considerably small. It was hardly 16 per cent of the total amount of compensation awarded under the Revised Act. Most of the amount of compensation paid till 1978, was in the form of twenty-year bonds and only Rs.3,000 or 1.5 per cent of the total, was paid in cash.

The total amount of compensation awarded under the Principal and the Revised Act came to Rs.14.02 lakhs, of which only Rs.3.76 lakhs or 26.8 per cent had actually been paid by the end of 1978. Most of the compensation paid was given in the form of bonds and only a small amount of Rs.6,955 or hardly 2 per cent of the total was paid in cash.

### CHAPTER III

#### SAMPLE ALLOTTEE FAMILIES

We propose to present in this chapter the major characteristics of the sample allottees from the four districts selected for the Study. In major characteristics, we include their castes, family size, proportion of earners, educational standard, their relationship with land and the previous landlord prior to the allotment of surplus land. We also present in this chapter, the data regarding livestock and agricultural implements owned by the sample allottees before and after the allotment of surplus land. The analysis of this data may serve as a background for the later study of the surplus land allotted to these families.

#### 3.1 Surplus Land Distributed and the Allottees

As stated earlier the distribution of surplus land, under the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act 1961, was done in two phases. The two phases are distinguished as distribution under the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act'. The 'Principal Act' i.e. the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act 1961, came into force on 26th January 1962 and the first phase of surplus land distribution began from the enforcement date of 26th January 1962, and continued up to 2nd October 1975, when the relevant amendments in respect of the ceiling area and also the distribution of the surplus land came into operation. The Principal Act was amended by 'Maharashtra 21 of 1975' and was referred to as the 'Revised Act'. The second phase of distribution of surplus land thus began

from the commencement date of 2nd October 1975 of the "Revised Act" and is still operative. The ceiling area prescribed under the Principal Act varied between 66 and 140 acres of dry crop land. Under the Revised Act, not only was the ceiling limit on land holding lowered but a uniform ceiling was prescribed for all the regions in the State. Thus the Revised Act did away with the variations in ceiling area of dry crop land for various 'local areas'. Under the Revised Act the ceiling limit was lowered to 36 acres for paddy lands in the paddy region and to 54 acres for other dry crop lands all over the State. Section 27 of the Principal Act was also substituted by 'Maharashtra 21 of 1975' and the maximum area allocable to individual allottee was drastically reduced to 3 hectares of dry crop lands. So, the lowering of the ceiling limit on landholding and reducing the maximum area allocable to an individual allottee are the two major distinguishing features of the Revised Act. We have therefore attempted to present the data of the declared and distributed surplus land in the selected talukas of the four districts separately for the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act' (See Tables 3.1 to 3.4). In the case of the Aurangabad district, however, we could present the data only for the Revised Act as the information of lands declared and distributed under the Principal Act was not available. At the village level, such a separate treatment was not practicable as the cases of allotment of surplus land and the area of surplus land distributed under the Principal Act were very small, at times negligible in some of the sample villages. So, as far as the sample villages are concerned, we present a total picture of

**Table 3.1 : Surplus land declared and distributed under the Revised Act in Aurangabad district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)			
	Revised Act			
	Surplus land declared	Surplus land distributed	No. of allottees	Average area per allottee
Aurangabad	621	540	308	1.75
Paithan	948	770	394	1.95
Silled	295	276	132	2.09
Seegaon	242	210	128	1.64
Jalna	979	834	454	1.84
Ambad	2050	1996	1124	1.78
Bhokardan	894	757	406	1.86
Jafrabad	273	266	134	1.99
Vaijapur	575	476	281	1.69
Gangapur	597	574	284	2.02
Kannad	273	224	135	1.66
Khultabad	74	73	35	2.09
<b>Total</b>	<b>7821</b>	<b>6996</b>	<b>3815</b>	<b>1.83</b>

the surplus land distributed under the Principal and the Revised Act.

It is evident from Table 3.2 that surplus land under the Principal as well as the Revised Act was found in 54 per cent of the total number of the existing villages in the eight selected talukas of the Solapur district. In the rest of the villages in the Solapur district no surplus area was available. This meant the surplus land was declared and distributed in slightly more than half of the total number of villages in the selected talukas of the Solapur district. In Thane district, however, the total number of villages having surplus land in the selected

talukas was comparatively small, 157 out of 659. It formed only 23.8 per cent of the total number of villages. It means the surplus land was declared and distributed in less than quarter number of the total villages in the selected talukas of the Thane district. In the case of the remaining two districts, Yavatmal and Aurangabad, we did not get the total number of villages where the surplus land was declared and distributed in the selected talukas. It may be seen from Tables 3.1 to 3.3 that in all the selected districts, the total area of surplus land distributed under the Revised Act was much larger than that of the surplus land distributed under the Principal Act. In the Solapur district only 21 per cent of the total land was distributed under the Principal Act and the rest, 79 per cent of the total land was distributed under the Revised Act. In Thane and Yavatmal districts also the area of surplus land distributed under the Revised Act was larger but not so much as we noticed in the case of the Solapur district. This was all the effect of lowering the ceiling limit under the Revised Act. As the ceiling limit was lowered, more surplus land could be found under the Revised Act than that under the Principal Act in each of the four districts. It may be noted from Table 3.2 that of the total of 4,933 allottees in the Solapur district, as many as 4,177 or about 85 per cent were reported under the Revised Act and only 756 or about 15 per cent under the Principal Act. In the other districts as well the case was similar, though the proportions might be comparatively smaller. In the case of individual talukas also in each district, the total number of allottees was much larger under the Revised Act than that under the Principal Act. This meant that because of the amendments

brought about by "Maharashtra 21 of 1975" not only was more surplus land found but it was also distributed to greater number of allottees in the selected districts. As the maximum area allocable to individual allottee was drastically reduced more number of allottees could be given surplus land under the Revised Act. Obviously, the average surplus area per allottee was comparatively smaller than that under the Principal Act. It may be noted from Table 3.2 that the average area per allottee in the Solapur district was about 1.77 hectares under the Revised Act and 2.63 hectares under the Principal Act. In the case of the Yavatmal district the average area per allottee was as large as 7.81 acres under the Principal Act and 3.54 acres under the Revised Act. In Thane district, however, the case was reverse. The average area per allottee was smaller (0.91 hectares) under the Principal Act, than that (1.06 hectares) under the Revised Act. On the whole, it may be concluded from the four tables that larger area of surplus land, greater number of allottees and smaller average area of surplus land per allottee, formed the three major features of the Revised Act and all of these indicate that the Revised Act was certainly an improvement over the Principal Act.

### 3.2 Sample Allottees

The procedure followed for selection of the sample talukas and villages for the present study in the four districts is described in the first chapter. The sample in the selected districts was to have covered surplus land allottees under both the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act'. The distinction between the two sets of allottees as explained earlier was to be used on the



eligibility to receive the benefits of the 'Central Assistance Scheme' to new allottees under the Twenty Point Programme. Thus, in view of the assistance contemplated all the allottees after 1st January 1975, irrespective of the surplus allotment being under either of the Acts, were included under 'Revised Act' as new allottees. All the other allottees getting surplus allotment previous to 1st January 1975 were to be included under the 'Principal Act'. This is in so far as the division of grantees in the two sets for the purpose of survey in the Solapur, Thane and Yavatmal districts. In the case of Aurangabad district, however, we could cover only the allottees under the 'Revised Act'. We could not cover in our sample the allottees under the 'Principal Act' as detailed information of such allottees was not available and it was not possible to draw a sample with whatever little information was made available to us. Distribution proceedings in this particular district had changed hands from one authority to another and records were spread all over the district and thus, it was impossible to collect the necessary information. In the Aurangabad district, therefore, we were required to restrict our sample to the allottees under the Revised Act alone.

As pointed out earlier our objective was to study all the sample allottees from the villages selected for the study. But we could do it only partially as we could not contact all the sample allottees in all the selected villages as some of them could not be located at all and some were not available in their respective village at the time of our visit. In Tables 3.3 and 3.4 we give the talukwise distribution of the allottees who could be contacted and those who could not be contacted in the

sample villages from the Solapur and Thane districts. In the case of the Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts, such data was not available. It is evident from Table 3.5 that we could contact and collect data from 571 or about 80 per cent of the total sample allottees in the selected villages from the Solapur district. This meant that 149 sample allottees or 20 per cent of the total could not be contacted in spite of our earnest attempts. In the case of the Thane district, however, the percentage of the sample allottees who could not be contacted by us was insignificant. It may be noted from Table 3.6 that most of the sample allottees (547 out of 611 sample allottees) were contacted and only 64 or 10.47 per cent of the total could not be studied as we could not meet them in the sample villages at the time of our investigation. We found that two main factors were responsible because of which we could not cover the entire sample of the allottees in the selected villages; First, the taluka and the village lists of the sample allottees provided to us by the officers in charge of distribution of the surplus lands were faulty, and Second, the allottees to whom the surplus land was granted did not stay in the village where the allotted surplus land was situated. We shall discuss in brief these two factors separately.

(1) Taluka and Village Lists

We found that at each taluka office where the registers were maintained, one was for the land allotted under the Principal Act and the other for the land distributed under the Revised Act. It must be mentioned here that in all the Tahasildars' offices of the selected talukas, the registers were kept uncared for. In some

**Table 3.5 : No. of allottees who were contacted and who could not be contacted in the sample villages from Solapur district**

	No. of villages	No. of allottees according to taluka records	No. of allottees according to village lists	No. of allottees who were contacted	No. of allottees who could not be contacted as per village lists	Proportion of allottees who could not be contacted
North Solapur	7	178	104	92	12	11.5
South Solapur	5	147	117	114	3	2.6
Barshi	8	109	121	109	12	9.9
Akkalkot	6	65	66	53	13	19.7
Madha	6	54	61	35	26	42.6
Malsiras	6	93	112	62	50	44.6
Karnala	6	64	69	58	11	15.9
Sangola	6	63	70	48	22	31.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>20.7</b>

of the talukas they were also incomplete. It was disturbing to note that the registers dealing with an important aspect of land and its distribution should have been kept in such unkempt condition. As a result we found a number of discrepancies in the total number of allottees given in the records of the district Collectorate and the registers available at the Tahasildar's office (see Tables 1.4 and 3.2 of the Solapur District). For example, in South Solapur taluka of the Solapur district the total number of allottees under the Principal Act listed in the records of the district Collectorate was as high as 560 and at the Tahasildar's office, the number listed was as low as 83 allottees. Similar was the case in the Malsiras taluka of the same district. The same kind of discrepancies was noticed in the case of the Revised Act as well, even though its records were more recent. For example, in the South Solapur taluka again, the total number of the allottees under the Revised Act, was 496, as per the Collector's records, while at the Tahasildar's office which is located in the same premises of the Collector's office it was as high as 1082. In the other talukas also the total number of allottees under the Revised Act, supplied to us by the two offices did not tally but the differences were not very large.

In the case of Thane district also our experience was more or less similar. For example, in the Talasari taluka the total number of allottees under the Principal and the Revised Act was as high as 2,783 as per the Collector's lists, while at the taluka office, we could get the list of 1,411 allottees only. In Palghar taluka, the total number of the allotted registered under both

the Acts came to 1,146 according to the taluka lists, though the records at the Collector's office, showed only 824 allottees. It may be noted from Table 3.6 that the total number of allottees listed at the Talasari, Dahanu and Shahapur talukas was much lower than their respective numbers reported at the Collector's office. The reverse was the case in the Palghar taluka. Of all the talukas in the Thane district, the number of allottees recorded in the Registers of the Talasari taluka was ridiculously low to substantiate the figure of the total number of allottees recorded at the Collector's office.

Another discrepancy which we found in the case of the Thane district in particular, had resulted from mixing of the allottees of the surplus land acquired under the Ceiling Act and those who were allotted the forest and the Government waste lands. In the Dahanu taluka it was observed that the Register showing the distribution of surplus land was common and it included the distribution of forest and Government waste lands as well. We found that some of the allottees who were given the forest lands were included in the list of the allottees of the surplus land. In Modgaon village from the Dahanu taluka three cases of such allottees were reported. Upon interrogating these allottees, they replied that they were given the government forest lands and not the lands declared surplus under the Land Ceiling Act. Similarly two allottees at Kurga village in Talasari taluka also reported that they were allotted the forest land and not the surplus land. In the case of the sample villages in the Thane district we were, therefore, required

to reconstruct the lists of these allottees who had received surplus lands under the Land Ceiling Acts and of those who had acquired lands under other schemes.

The discrepancy which we noticed in the records from the Collector's offices and those from the Tahasildar's offices in the Solapur and Thane districts appeared to have percolated from the Taluka records to the village records. (See Tables 3.5 and 3.7). For example, in the North and South Solapur talukas, the total number of allottees in the sample villages, as noted in the village records was far lower than their number recorded in the taluka records. The opposite was the case in the other remaining talukas - the total number of allottees in the sample villages as listed in the village lists was much higher than their numbers recorded at the Tahasildar's office. However the discrepancy was not very large in the case of the sample villages from Akkalkot, Karnala and Sangola talukas. In the case of the Thane district also similar type of discrepancies were noted between the taluka and the village Records. In the sample talukas in the Thane district the total number of the allottees as noted in the village lists was lower than their number recorded at the Taluka office (see Tables 3.6 and 3.8). It appeared from the taluka and the village records in both the districts that such a discrepancy had crept in mainly because of the three factors : (i) double counting of allottees under the Principal and the Revised Act, (ii) Benami allottees, and (iii) delay in the correction of records. In the first category, all the cases of allottees were found to be recorded twice under the Principal as well as the Revised Act. The total number of such cases reported in the

**Table 3.6 : No. of allottees who were contacted and who could not be contacted in the sample villages in Thane district**

Taluka	No. of villages	No. of allottees according to collectors office records	No. of allottees according to the taluka records	No. of sample allottees	No. of sample allottees contacted	No. of sample allottees not contacted	Proportion of sample allottees who were not contacted
Talasari	5	2783	1411	160	149	11	6.88
Dahanu	5	1119	921	189	160	29	15.34
Palghar	6	824	1146	122	117	5	4.10
Jawhar	2	200	193	33	30	3	9.09
Shahapur	6	730	681	107	91	16	14.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5736</b>	<b>4352</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>10.47</b>

**Table 3.7 :** The total number of allottees in the sample villages as per village lists and surplus land allotted to them in Solapur district

(Area in hectares)				
Taluka	Village	No. of allottees	Area of land	Average area
1	2	3	4	5
North Solapur	Karba	28	58.45	2.09
	Tirah	18	28.43	1.58
	Kalman	16	21.91	1.37
	Soregaon	15	45.05	3.00
	Darphal	6	24.79	4.13
	Kegaon	5	6.65	1.33
	Bhegaon	4	5.72	1.43
<b>Total</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>191.00</b>	<b>2.08</b>
South Solapur	Nimbargi	60	97.75	1.22
	Kasegaon	20	24.05	1.20
	Barur	9	12.12	1.35
	Aherwadi	3	3.63	1.21
	Kasur	2	2.03	1.02
<b>Total</b>		<b>114</b>	<b>139.58</b>	<b>1.22</b>
Barshi	Sasure	47	61.10	1.30
	Yawali	18	28.77	1.60
	Umbarge	15	25.42	1.69
	Uphale Dumale	10	10.75	1.08
	Deegaon	6	13.51	2.25
	Bheienje	5	7.25	1.45
	Keregaon	5	6.90	1.38
	Sarele	3	4.19	1.40
<b>Total</b>		<b>109</b>	<b>157.89</b>	<b>1.45</b>
Akkalkot	Badele Bk.	22	41.43	1.88
	Devikavathe	10	20.00	2.00
	Chapalgaon	9	12.20	1.36
	Boregaon	7	12.79	1.83
	Babaled	4	3.70	0.93
	Boroti Bk.	1	1.00	1.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>53</b>	<b>91.12</b>	<b>1.72</b>
Madha	Mhaisgaon	14	40.28	3.02
	Akele Kd.	8	16.67	2.08
	Wadshinge	4	11.50	2.88
	Upalwate	4	8.86	2.22
	Mungshi	3	9.28	3.09
	Padsali	2	2.26	1.13
<b>Total</b>		<b>35</b>	<b>88.85</b>	<b>2.54</b>



Table 3.7 : (contd.)

1	2	3	4	5
Malsiras	Girawi	17	42.92	2.52
	Chakore	13	30.92	2.38
	Bijawadi	12	18.03	1.50
	Shingorni	12	29.13	2.43
	Khalawe	5	12.04	2.41
	Islampur	3	4.08	1.36
<b>Total</b>		<b>62</b>	<b>137.12</b>	<b>2.21</b>
Karmala	Kandar	27	56.77	2.10
	Jinti	10	23.48	2.35
	Naogaon	9	16.52	1.84
	Wadshiyane	6	11.90	1.98
	Kugaon	4	9.08	2.27
	Kingaon	2	3.42	1.71
<b>Total</b>		<b>58</b>	<b>121.17</b>	<b>2.09</b>
Sangola	Latewadi	15	33.83	2.26
	Manegaon	14	26.26	1.88
	Hingarge	7	12.28	1.75
	Medsingi	5	11.61	2.32
	Chopadi	5	7.44	1.49
	Pare	2	4.20	2.10
<b>Total</b>		<b>48</b>	<b>95.62</b>	<b>1.99</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>571</b>	<b>1022.35</b>	<b>1.79</b>

sample villages from the Solapur district was 16. In the case of the Thane district the number of such allottees was 26. In the second category we found that some of the allottees as recorded in the Tahasildar's office could not be traced at all in the sample villages. No one in the sample villages could guide us to the persons bearing the names given in the taluka lists. Such was the case of 22 allottees in the sample villages from the Solapur district. In the sample villages from the Thane district such cases were not reported. The third category is purely of administrative delays in correcting the records of allottees kept at the taluka and the village

**Table 3.6 : The total number of allottees in the sample villages as per village lists and surplus land allotted to them in Thane district**

(Area in hectares)

Taluka	Village	No. of allottees	Area of land (ha.)	Average area
Talasari	Kurse	19	16.91	0.89
	Varavade	58	43.85	0.76
	Vadavali	43	28.81	0.67
	Vovaji	1	0.97	0.97
	Zai	9	6.07	0.67
<b>Total</b>		<b>130</b>	<b>96.61</b>	<b>0.74</b>
Dahanu	Madgaon	3	2.92	0.97
	Ambesari	44	33.43	0.76
	Chari	10	5.23	0.52
	Janshet	56	42.56	0.76
	Kelavali	5	7.27	1.45
<b>Total</b>		<b>118</b>	<b>91.41</b>	<b>0.77</b>
Palghar	Akkarpatti	24	13.68	0.57
	Alyali	11	5.37	0.49
	Shirgaon	11	4.73	0.43
	Umbapada	2	1.37	0.69
	Tembheda	2	0.99	0.49
	Durves	60	58.86	0.98
<b>Total</b>		<b>110</b>	<b>85.00</b>	<b>0.77</b>
Jawhar	Male	9	8.18	0.91
	Nyahale	21	19.39	0.92
<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>27.57</b>	<b>0.92</b>
Shahapur	Atgaon	29	35.32	1.22
	Dhamani	29	43.73	1.51
	Musai	2	1.37	0.69
	Shirvanje	2	2.43	1.22
	Sakurli	4	6.50	1.63
	Birvadi	15	24.19	1.61
<b>Total</b>		<b>81</b>	<b>113.54</b>	<b>1.40</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>469</b>	<b>414.13</b>	<b>0.88</b>

levels. For example in some cases the surplus land already allotted to the allottees was taken back and restored to the surplus landholders who obtained a stay order from the High Court/Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal etc. against the distribution of their surplus areas. The names of such allottees were taken off from the village lists but not from the taluka records. In some other cases the converse had occurred. The net result of both was a discrepancy in the total number of allottees in the sample villages noted at the Taluka and the Village levels. Such cases were reported in almost all the selected talukas in the Solapur district and their total number was also comparatively large - (56 allottees). In the case of the Thane district number of such allottees was not available.

(2) Absentee Allottees

Besides the above stated discrepancies, there were many other allottees, who had correctly appeared in the taluka and the village lists, but we could not contact them and collect the required data for our study during the period of our investigation. We could not meet these allottees because of several reasons the important reasons, however, were four :

- 1) migration of allottees;
- 2) non-receipt of the allotted surplus land;
- 3) native village far off from the village of the allotted surplus land; and
- 4) death of allottees.

In the Solapur district, we could not contact 127 allottees in the sample villages because of the above stated

four reasons. Of these, 54 allottees could not be contacted as they had left the village either provisionally or permanently in search of employment. We could not collect the required data from 21 other sample allottees as possession of the allotted surplus land was not handed over to them till the date of our enquiry. In 49 cases the allottees did not stay in the village where the allotted surplus land was situated. They stayed in the neighbouring villages, in some cases in far off places like Ahmednagar, Pandharpur, Daund, etc. and it was not practicable for us to contact them for our study. However, it is difficult to understand how the surplus land could be allotted to some of these allottees staying in far off places like Ahmednagar, Daund, etc. when the Act specifically prescribes that the surplus land should be distributed to families within the village of the surplus land or within a radius of 8 kilometers, stipulated under Section 27(5) Sub-Clause (iv) of the Revised Act. The last reason of death of allottees was reported in three cases in the sample villages from the Solapur district. These three allottees had died after the allotment of the surplus land and their widows refused to give any data required for our study.

In the sample villages from the Thane district, we could not contact around 10 per cent of the allottees as they were not available in their respective villages at the time of our investigation. We, however, enquired about their whereabouts from other local farmers and found interesting information. We found that in Vadavali village from the Talasari taluka, all

the four Adivasi allottees, who could not be contacted, were employed in some distant villages and towns. One of them was an agricultural graduate, <sup>Two of them, including the agricultural graduate,</sup> were brought up by the Vishva Hindu Parishad at Talasari and the Parishad was managing their lands with the objective of raising a plant nursery thereon. We could not ascertain how the lands of the other two allottees in this village were being managed. The absentee allottees in the other sample villages in the taluka had left their villages in search of seasonal employment elsewhere. One of the allottees at Varavade had not even taken possession of his land and the previous owner of the land was using it for growing fodder.

In Ambesari village from the Dahanu taluka, sixteen allottees were such, whose whereabouts could not be traced at all. Nobody in the village could help us in locating these allottees. Besides these 16 there were seven other allottees to whom we could not contact, but we could get some information about them. One of these allottees had died after the allotment of the land and the remaining six allottees had left the village for employment at some other places. One of them was an agricultural graduate and was managing a land unit at the Dabchari Milk Project where he was maintaining cross-bred cows and cultivating 2 hectares of land. We could not get information whether these seven allottees were at least in possession of the lands allotted to them.

The absentee allottees in the other villages in the Dahanu Taluka and in villages in the other talukas, noted in the table to whom we could not contact had left the village mostly in search of seasonal employment.

Some allottees in the villages in Shahapur taluka had left the village for work at the Bhatsa dam whereas some others from the other talukas had gone out for work at the brick-kilns, salt-pans, etc. It was not, therefore, possible for us to enquire.

### 3.3 Contacted Sample Allottees

In Table 3.9 to 3.12 we give the talukawise distribution of the sample allottees in the four districts who were contacted and from whom the required data were collected for our study. It may be noted from the tables that the final total of the sample allottees who were studied by us was 388 in Aurangabad district, 571 allottees in the Solapur district, 469 allottees in the Thane district and 1,014 allottees in the Yavatmal district. These allottees in each district constitute the final sample of the allottees for the analysis of the present study. The areas of surplus lands allotted to these allottees in each of the sample talukas are also given in the tables. The tables are self explanatory. The average area of surplus land per allottee was rather high (more than the two hectares) in some of the talukas in the Solapur and Yavatmal districts. This was mainly because, under the Principal Act large areas of the surplus land (between 5 and 7 hectares) were allotted to some of the sample allottees in these talukas. In all other sample talukas the average area of surplus land per allottee was below two hectares. It varied between 0.74 and 1.99 hectares. This was within the limits (two hectares or five acres) laid down in the Revised Act.

**Table 3.9 : Sample allottees who were contacted and the surplus land allotted to them in the sample villages from the Aurangabad district**

Taluka	No. of sample villages	No. of sample allottees	Area of land allotted	Average area per allottee
Ambad	13	132	238.06	1.80
Jalna Ehokardan Jafrabad	18	98	186.40	1.90
Silled Seegaon	8	48	89.69	1.67
Paithan	6	40	58.74	1.47
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	8	70	126.65	1.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>699.54</b>	<b>1.80</b>

**Table 3.10 : Sample allottees who were contacted and the surplus land allotted to them in the sample villages from the Solapur district**

Taluka	No. of villages	No. of sample allottees	Area of land allotted	Average area per allottee
North Solapur	7	92	191.00	2.08
South Solapur	5	114	139.58	1.22
Barshi	8	109	157.89	1.45
Akkalkot	6	53	91.12	1.72
Kadha	6	35	88.85	2.54
Malsiras	6	62	137.12	2.21
Karmala	6	58	121.17	2.09
Sangola	6	48	95.62	1.99
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>1022.35</b>	<b>1.79</b>

**Table 3.11 : Sample allottees who were contacted and the surplus land allotted to them in the sample villages from the Thane district**

Taluka	No. of sample villages	No. of sample allottees	Area of land allotted	Average area per allottee
Talasari	5	130	96.61	0.74
Dahanu	5	118	91.41	0.77
Palghar	6	110	85.00	0.77
Jowhar	2	30	27.57	0.85
Shahapur	6	81	113.54	1.40
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>414.13</b>	<b>0.88</b>

**Table 3.12 : Sample allottees who were contacted and the surplus land allotted to them in the sample villages from the Yavatmal district**

Taluka	No. of sample villages	No. of sample allottees	Area of land allotted	Average area per allottee
Yavatmal	9	205	432.29	2.11
Darwaha	5	167	337.22	2.02
Pusad	3	275	544.55	1.98
Wani	3	138	282.08	2.04
Kelapur	3	229	429.40	1.88
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1014</b>	<b>2025.54</b>	<b>2.00</b>



#### 3.4 Size of Allotted Land Holdings

Section 27(7) of the Revised Act stipulated that the upper limit to granting land would be 3 hectares of dry crop land falling under sub-clause (e) of clause 5 of Section 2. However, when actual distribution of surplus land was about to be undertaken, the Government of Maharashtra by its circular No., ICH 1376/5993-L7 (Revenue and Forest Department) dated 29th January 1976 made it clear that the limits given for distribution of surplus land to allottees in respect of lands under different sub-clauses of Clause 5 of Section 2 were the upper limits and it is open to Surplus Land Distribution Tribunal to allot land less than the above limits whenever it is found essential to do so. It seems that the Government expected most of the allottees to get approximately 2 hectares or 5 acres of surplus land.

In Tables 3.13 to 3.15 we give the distribution of the allottees in the sample talukas from Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal districts by the sizes of areas of surplus lands allotted to them. The case of the sample allottees from the sample talukas in the Thane district was found different, in the sense that the distribution of surplus areas in this district was more or less, of a uniform nature. Most of the allottees in the sample talukas of this district had received less than one hectare of surplus land. We, therefore, did not present the concerned information in a table form. It may be noted from Tables 3.13 to 3.15 that majority of the allottees were allotted surplus land below 3 hectares each. In Solapur district, for example, the proportion of such allottees was as high as 97 per cent.

**Table 3.13: Distribution of sample allottees according to their sizes of the allotted surplus land in Aurangabad district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)											
	Upto 1.21		1.22 to 1.62		1.63 to 2.00		2.01 to 2.91		2.92 & above		Total	
	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area
Ambad	18	17.27	31	45.77	43	78.18	40	96.84	-	-	132	238.06
Jalna, } Bhokardan, } Jafrabad }	9	10.34	17	26.80	49	93.10	22	52.99	1	3.17	98	186.40
Silled, } Soegson }	8	9.51	17	26.35	9	16.60	11	27.88	3	9.35	48	89.69
Paithan	12	12.46	20	27.49	1	1.65	7	17.14	-	-	40	58.74
Vaijapur, } Gangapur, } Kannad }	12	13.85	11	16.97	32	57.77	12	27.88	3	10.19	70	126.65
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>63.43</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>143.38</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>247.30</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>222.73</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22.71</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>699.54</b>

In this district, we noticed that there were only 17 sample allottees who had received more than 3 hectares of surplus land each. The total area of surplus land distributed to these allottees came to 8.06 per cent of the total surplus area distributed in all the sample villages. As against this, there were only four cases, two each in Barshi and Malsiras talukas, where the allottees were given very small area of below half an hectare each. We found that the surplus land allotted to the two allottees in the Malsiras taluka was canal irrigated, while in the Barshi taluka, it was all dry but likely to go under seasonal irrigation from the local tank. Barring these extreme cases on both sides of the average, we find that there was concentration of the sample allottees in the <sup>size</sup> three/groups of 1.01 to 1.50 hectares; 1.51 to 2.00 hectares and 2.01 to 2.50 hectares. These three groups of size holdings taken together covered about 79 per cent of the total number of allottees and about 75 per cent of the total surplus land distributed in the sample villages. This means more than three-fourths of the total allottees had received 1 to 2.50 hectares of the surplus land and the total surplus area distributed to them also came to about three-fourths of the total surplus land.

The distribution of the surplus lands appears to be more or less similar in the Aurangabad district as well. It may be seen from Table 3.13 that 134 allottees in the total sample had received 247.30 hectares of the surplus land with an average allotment of 1.84 hectares of land per allottee. The allottees in the other two groups of 2.07 to 2.91 hectares and 2.91 and more, had received somewhat larger area, varying between 2 to 3

hectares. Considering the total distribution by size of area allotted in the sample talukas, it is clear that 60 per cent of the allottees (between 2 to 3 hectares) had received 70 per cent of the area distributed. The average holding of these allottees came to near about 2 hectares. On the other hand, allottees getting less than two hectares of surplus land accounted for 40 per cent of the total allottees and they had received 30 per cent of the total distributed area. The average size of land allotted to these allottees was about one and half hectares each, i.e. far less than the area (2 hectares) that the Government expected to grant to each allottee. It appears that in the Aurangabad district the distribution of surplus land was somewhat inequitable. However, it is difficult to say whether this could have been improved in the given circumstances.

In the case of Yavatmal district also the distribution of surplus land appears to be inequitable to some extent. It may be seen from the Table 3.15 that more than half of the total allottees (58.48 per cent) in the sample talukas of the Yavatmal district had received on an average about 1.31 hectares of surplus land. Only 13.8 per cent of the total allottees had secured about 1.93 hectares or about 5 acres of surplus area each. This means majority of the sample allottees in the district were allotted far less land than the prescribed area under the Revised Act. As against this there were 27.7 per cent of the sample allottees who had secured on an average 3.98 hectares of surplus land each which was much more than the prescribed area. Of the total distributed land nearly half (48.26 per cent) was claimed by these allottees. We found that the distribution of

surplus land in the district appears inequitable mainly because of the areas distributed under the Principal Act. Most of the allottees who had received more than 2 hectares of the surplus land were under the Principal Act. It may be noted from the table that two allottees had secured more than 6 hectares of land each and both of them had received it under the Principal Act. Majority of the allottees coming under the size groups of 2.91 to 6 hectares were those who had received surplus lands under the Principal Act, which stipulated the upper limit to allotment of surplus land to an allottee at one-sixth of the ceiling area prescribed for respective 'local areas' as given in the 'First Schedule'. If we look to the distribution of surplus lands under the Principal Act and the Revised Act separately, we find distinctly different patterns. Under the Principal Act larger areas of surplus lands were allotted to the majority of allottees in the district. We found that more than 90 per cent of the total allottees under the Principal Act had received more than 2 hectares of surplus land each. Only 5.86 per cent of the allottees had secured less than 2 hectares each. The reverse was true under the Revised Act. We observed that 84.49 per cent of the sample allottees under the Revised Act were allotted less than 2 hectares of the surplus land. This means only 15.51 per cent of the allottees could get bigger size holdings of more than 2 hectares of surplus land. The total distribution of the surplus areas in the Yavatmal district appears inequitable because of these two distinct patterns of distribution followed under the Principal and the Revised Act.

Thus, the distribution of the surplus land to the sample allottees appears rather inequitable in Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts. In Selapur and Thane districts, on the other hand, it was more equitably distributed. The quality of the surplus land distributed in the four districts was generally poor as only inferior lands were surrendered by the surplus landholders. This was to be naturally expected when the choice of land to retain for self cultivation and to surrender as surplus was entirely left to the surplus landholders. It was but natural that surplus landholders retained good quality land for themselves and surrendered only inferior land as surplus. The land revenue data available for the surrendered lands in the Aurangabad and the Yavatmal districts brings out this fact very clearly. We find in these two districts that as the land revenue per acre increases the surplus area surrendered to the Government decreases. This means the better the quality of land, the smaller was the area surrendered as surplus. This was as we expected to happen particularly when the choice of land to be surrendered as surplus, was entirely left to the surplus landholders.

### 3.5 Castewise Classification of the Allottees

As pointed out earlier the Revised Act <sup>had</sup> ~~had~~ special stress on distribution of surplus land to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes by reserving 50 per cent of the surplus land for the landless persons from these castes. In view of such reservation the castewise analysis of the allottees and the surplus land distributed to them gets added importance. In Tables 3.16 to 3.19, therefore, we

**Table 3.17 : Castewise classification of the sample allottees in Solapur district**

Taluka	Scheduled Castes			Sche- duled Tribes	Noma- dic Tribes	Other Back- ward Castes	Other Hindu Castes			Muslims	Total		
	Mahar	Mang Cham- bhar	Total				Brah- min	Maratha	Lingayat			Total	
North Solapur	24	9	2	35	2	3	21	-	16	6	22	9	92
South Solapur	22	10	6	38	2	17	31	1	11	4	16	10	114
Barshi	29	21	3	53	-	9	11	-	24	3	27	9	109
Akkalkot	21	2	5	28	-	1	6	-	2	6	8	10	53
Madha	4	8	3	15	1	2	13	-	4	-	4	-	35
Malsiras	6	24	-	30	-	-	23	1	8	-	9	-	62
Karnala	17	11	-	28	-	3	13	-	10	-	10	4	58
Sangola	16	3	3	22	-	-	21	-	5	-	5	-	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>571</b>
				<b>43.60</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>6.13</b>	<b>24.34</b>				<b>17.69</b>	<b>7.36</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Table 3.16 : Castewise classification of the sample allottees and surplus land allotted to them in Solapur district**

Taluka	Scheduled Castes			Scheduled Tribes			Nomadic Tribes		
	No. of allottees	Area	Avg. area	No. of allottees	Area	Avg. area	No. of allottees	Area	Avg. area
North Solapur	35	74.19	2.12	2	3.65	1.83	3	2.35	0.78
South Solapur	38	46.61	1.23	2	2.18	1.14	17	19.29	1.13
Barshi	53	79.99	1.51	-	-	-	9	13.76	1.53
Akkalkot	28	48.63	1.74	-	-	-	1	1.00	1.00
Madha	15	34.51	2.30	1	1.58	1.58	2	3.49	1.75
Malsiras	30	68.16	2.27	-	-	-	-	-	-
Karmala	28	60.05	2.14	-	-	-	3	6.13	2.04
Sangola	22	40.12	1.82	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>452.26</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7.41</b>	<b>1.48</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>46.02</b>	<b>1.31</b>
	<b>43.60</b>	<b>44.24</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6.13</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>-</b>

Contd.



**Table 3.18 : Contd.**

Taluka	Other Backward Castes			Other Hindu Castes			Muslims			Total		
	No. of allo-tees	Area	Avg. area	No. of allo-tees	Area	Avg. area	No. of allo-tees	Area	Avg. area	No. of allo-tees	Area	Avg. area
North Solapur	21	61.32	2.92	22	41.03	1.87	9	8.46	0.94	92	191.00	2.08
South Solapur	31	40.78	1.32	16	18.11	1.13	10	12.61	1.26	114	139.58	1.22
Barshi	11	14.79	1.34	27	34.45	1.78	9	14.90	1.66	109	157.89	1.45
Akkalkot	6	10.70	1.78	8	12.05	1.51	10	18.74	1.87	53	91.12	1.72
Kadha	13	34.76	2.67	4	14.51	3.63	-	-	-	35	88.85	2.54
Malsiras	23	56.88	2.47	9	12.08	1.34	-	-	-	62	137.12	2.21
Karnala	13	28.60	2.20	10	18.27	1.83	4	8.12	2.03	58	121.17	2.09
Sangola	21	45.68	2.18	5	9.82	1.96	-	-	-	48	95.62	1.99
<b>Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>293.51</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>160.32</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>62.83</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>1022.35</b>	<b>1.79</b>
	24.34	28.71	-	17.69	15.68	-	7.36	6.15	-	100.00	100.00	

present the castewise distribution of the sample allottees in the three selected districts (Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal) and the surplus land allotted to them.

The castewise classification of the sample allottees in the Thane district is not included in the tables as most of the sample allottees belonged to the Scheduled Tribes. Thane district, as we know, is predominantly a tribal area, except its southern portion. We found that more than three-fourths of the sample allottees in the district were from the Scheduled Tribes only. Amongst the Scheduled Tribes 'Warli' was very predominant, accounting for more than 57 per cent of the total sample allottees. Surplus lands were distributed exclusively to the persons from this single tribe in the Talasari and the Dahamu talukas in the western part of the district. In the Shahapur taluka, the 'Thakur' was the predominant tribe and so, more than 38 per cent of the allottees in the taluka belonged to Thakur tribe alone. Another important tribe was that of 'Katkari' which accounted for about 16 per cent of the allottees in the Shahapur taluka. This, 'Warli', 'Thakur' and 'Katkari' were the three important tribes to which most of the sample allottees belonged in the Thane district. The castewise classification of the sample allottees in the other three districts was quite different.

It may be seen from Tables 3.17 and 3.18 that in the Solapur district nearly three-fourths of the sample allottees were from the backward castes. Of the remaining, 17.69 per cent belonged to other Hindu castes and 7.36 per cent were Muslims. Amongst the backward castes, the Scheduled Castes formed a dominant group claiming

about 43.60 per cent of the total allottees and within the group of the Scheduled Caste allottees, Mahars were in majority (56 per cent of the total allottees from the Scheduled Castes). The allottees belonging to Scheduled Tribes were only 5 or less than one per cent of the total. Amongst the allottees belonging to Nomadic tribes, 'Pardhis' were relatively more in number. In the other Hindu Castes, Marathas formed a dominant group, claiming about 79.2 per cent of their total allottees. It is evident from Table 3.18 that the allottees belonging to the Backward Castes were the major beneficiaries of the distribution of surplus land in the sample village. As pointed out earlier they were about three-fourths of the total allottees and claimed more than three-fourths of the total surplus area distributed in the selected villages. Thus, it appears that the Backward Caste persons had quite a fair share of the distribution and more than what was reserved for them. In the case of the Aurangabad and the Yavatmal districts as well the allottees from the Backward Castes were the major beneficiaries of the distribution of surplus lands. In the Yavatmal district the Backward Caste allottees accounted for about 78 per cent of the total allottees under the Revised Act and they had received more than 74 per cent of the total surplus area distributed in the district. In the sample allottees also the proportion of allottees from the Backward Castes was as high as 83 per cent and the surplus area allotted to them was as high as 85 per cent of the total distributed surplus. In the Aurangabad district the proportion of allottees from the Backward Castes was about 66 per cent of the total allottees, and they had received near about the

same proportion of the total surplus area distributed. In the sample allottees also the proportion of the Backward Caste allottees was as high as 77 per cent and they were given almost the same proportion of the total surplus area. Thus, in all the four sample districts the Backward Caste allottees appear to have received quite a fair share in the distribution of surplus land. In fact they had secured far more than what was reserved for them under Section 27(9) of the Revised Act. Some of the Backward Caste allottees, therefore, must have received land out of the unreserved portion of the surplus land and this is as it should be in so far as they meet the priorities provided under Section 27. There is nothing in the Act that prohibits Backward Castes persons from getting surplus land from the unreserved areas. Since there were no complaints regarding distribution on these grounds, their getting land out of the unreserved areas appears to have been in order.

### 3.6 Family Members and Earners in Allottee Families

In Tables 3.20 to 3.23 we give the distribution of members and the earners in the families of the sample allottees in the four selected districts. It may be noted from the tables that the total population of the sample allottee families was reported at 1,765 persons in the Aurangabad district, Two thousand nine hundred seventy six persons in the Solapur district, 2,504 persons in the Thane district and 4,861 persons in the Yavatmal district. The average size of family for all the sample allottees was 4.5 persons in the Aurangabad district, 5.2 persons in the case of the Solapur district,

**Table 3.20: Members and earners in the allottee families in Aurangabad District**

Taluka	No. of families	Family Members				Earners in the			
		Adult		Non-adult		Adult		Non-adult	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Ambad	132	214	162	89	69	202	145	11	3
Jalna Bhokardan Jafrabad	98	176	141	104	68	156	115	13	5
Silled Soegaon	48	77	68	54	42	70	59	-	-
Paithan	40	63	52	44	28	58	47	2	1
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	70	116	96	62	40	106	78	5	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9</b>

**Table 3.21: Earners in the population of the allottee families in Solapur District**

Taluka	Number of allottees families	Total population	Male earners	Female earners	Total earner persons	Average number of earners per family
North Solapur	92	480	140	70	210	2.28
South Solapur	114	530	146	88	234	2.05
Barshi	109	647	209	153	362	3.32
Akkalkot	53	276	85	63	148	2.79
Madha	35	166	51	29	80	2.29
Malsiras	62	322	85	62	147	2.37
Karwala	58	304	92	44	136	2.34
Sangola	48	251	75	34	109	2.27
<b>Total</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>2976</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>1426</b>	<b>2.49</b>

**Table 3.22: Number of earners in the allottee families in Thane District**

Taluka	Popula- tion	Average size of the family	Earners			Proportion of earners in the population (per cent)	Average number of earners per family	Persons above 15 years	
			Male	Female	Total			Male	Female
Talasari	783	6.69	260	216	476	60.79	4.09	240	198
Dahanu	614	5.25	194	187	381	62.05	3.26	180	117
Palghar	537	4.88	183	148	331	61.64	3.01	181	156
Jawhar	151	5.00	51	48	99	65.56	3.30	48	48
Shahapur	419	5.17	128	104	232	55.37	2.86	132	116
<b>Total</b>	<b>2504</b>	<b>5.50</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>1519</b>	<b>60.66</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>781</b>	<b>695</b>

5.25 persons in the Thane district and 4.8 persons in the Yavatmal district. More than half of the total population of the allottee families was reported economically active in each district. Non-adults, both male and female, formed an insignificant proportion of the total working force. Females participated almost on par with the males in the economic activity. The working force includes only those engaged in some productive activity other than domestic work. It may be noticed from the tables that the average number of earner members per allottee family did not vary much in the four selected districts. It was between 2.40 persons in the Solapur district and 3.0 persons in the Thane district.

### 3.7 Agricultural Experience

In Tables 3.24 and 3.25 we give the distribution of the sample allottees in the Solapur and the Thane districts, according to their experience and knowledge of agriculture, either as owner or tenant cultivator, attached farm servant, casual labourer, etc. Such data were not available for the sample allottees from the Aurangabad and the Yavatmal districts. It may be noted from Table 3.24 that majority of the sample allottees in the Solapur district (more than 83 per cent) had experience and some knowledge of agriculture as such. Only 100 allottees or 17 per cent of the total, reported to have no experience of agriculture prior to the allotment of the surplus land. The proportion of the allottees who were familiar with agriculture either as owner of land or as tenant cultivator prior to the allotment of surplus land was comparatively very small. There were only 21 allottees or about 4 per cent of the



**Table 3.24: Allottees having knowledge of agriculture prior to allotment of surplus land in Solapur District**

(District Agriculture Department, Solapur)

Taluka	No. of Owners allottees	Area	No. of tenant allottees	Area	As Saldar part of the estate	Casual agricultural labourer	Watchmen	Allottees having no knowledge of agriculture	Total
North Solapur	3	4.00	7	6.17	18	46	-	20	92
South Solapur	1	0.80	-	-	7	69	-	37	114
Barshi	2	4.21	1	2.28	5	91	4	6	109
Akkalkot	2	1.40	-	-	-	49	-	2	53
Madha	2	4.13	-	-	2	27	-	4	35
Malsiras	5	12.91	-	-	1	43	-	11	62
Karwala	1	1.00	1	1.60	1	51	1	3	58
Sangola	5	6.85	-	-	4	22	-	17	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>35.30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10.05</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>571</b>
	<b>3.68</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1.58</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6.65</b>	<b>69.70</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>17.51</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**Table 3.25: Allottees having knowledge and experience of agriculture prior to allotment of land in Thana District**

(Figures in the bracket indicate percentage to the total)

Taluka	As tenants and persons encroaching the owner's land	Cartmen of the owners	Casual labourers on the owner's farm	As a salaried servant of the owner	Owner's relative	No specific association	Total number of allottees
Talasari	90 (69.23)	2 (1.54)	28 (21.54)	-	-	10 (7.69)	130 (100.00)
Dahanu	33 (27.96)	1 (0.85)	28 (23.73)	-	-	56 (47.46)	118 (100.00)
Palghar	-	-	40 (36.36)	2 (1.82)	-	68 (61.82)	110 (100.00)
Jawhar	-	-	14 (46.67)	-	-	16 (53.33)	30 (100.00)
Shahapur	-	-	7 (8.65)	-	3 (3.70)	71 (87.65)	81 (100.00)
Total	123 (26.23)	3 (0.64)	117 (24.95)	2 (0.42)	3 (0.64)	221 (47.12)	469 (100.00)

total who owned 35.30 hectares of land even more before the allotment of the surplus land and were familiar with the traditional techniques of cultivation. The number of tenant cultivators was also very small (only nine or 1.58 per cent) who had leased-in 10.05 hectares of land and had experience of agriculture prior to the allotment of surplus land. Barring these 30 allottees, the rest of the sample allottees did not cultivate any land for themselves, prior to the allotment of the surplus land. However, many of them had experience of cultivation as they worked as casual labourers or as attached farm servants. It may be noted from the table that the majority of the allottees, 398 or about 70 per cent of the total worked as casual labourers and had the experience and knowledge of agriculture on that count. The number of Saldars or attached servants was comparatively small - only 38 or about 6.65 per cent. There were five other allottees who knew cultivation technique as they had worked as watchmen on farms of the big landlords. Most of the allottees who did not have any experience of cultivation of land were ex-servicemen who had spent their life mainly in the Army service, and they knew very little about agriculture as such. Another group of allottees having no knowledge of cultivation of land was that of the allottees belonging to the Nomadic Tribes, most of whom were the "Fase Pardhis". These allottees had never settled anywhere permanently and had no occasion to work on any farm. Even so, they were allotted surplus lands so that they develop interest in cultivation of land and settle down in the village of the allotted land. It was observed from the data that 37 sample allottees from the Solapur

district, were familiar with the surplus lands allotted to them. In some of these cases, the land which were previously leased-in by the allottees were declared as surplus lands and the Government had allotted the same lands to the same persons who were cultivating them as tenants. Five cases of such tenants were reported and the surplus land allotted to them was about 5.37 hectares. Similar was the case of 17 other allottees who were previously working as attached farm servants with the landlords whose surplus land was allotted to them. The area of surplus land allotted to these attached farm servants was about 19.57 hectares. The remaining 15 cases were of the allottees who had some relationship with the landlords whose surplus land was allotted to them. The area of surplus land allotted to these relatives of the previous landlords was about 17.23 hectares. Barring these 37 allottees, the rest of the sample allottees in the Solapur district (534 or about 94 per cent) had no familiarity with the specific plots allotted to them.

In the Thane district also majority of the sample allottees (67 per cent of the total) had some experience of cultivation of land as the lands which were previously leased-in or encroached by them were declared as surplus lands and the Government had allotted the same lands to the same persons. It was observed that 123 allottees from the Talasari and Dahanu talukas in the Thane district had received lands which were already in their possession either as lessees under some mutual agreement with their previous owners or as persons unlawfully encroaching the lands of the absentee land owners. In terms of area 69 per cent of the allotted land in Talasari taluka and 28 per cent in Dahanu taluka involved

merely a change in their title. It was observed that the entire areas which were leased-in or encroached by the allottees in the two talukas prior to the allotment of the land were now transferred to them under the Revised Act, leaving no land of any of these categories in their possession. The seven allottees in Shahapur taluka leasing-in land prior to the distribution of the surplus land had continued their practice of cultivating the leased-in land even after receiving the surplus lands. It appears from the data that leasing-in and leasing-out of cultivable lands was rather more common in the sample talukas of the Thane district and because of this practice majority of the sample allottees had experience and some sort of knowledge of cultivation of land.

### 3.8 Livestock

Majority of the sample allottees in the four selected districts were landless persons and normally would not be expected to possess any livestock for want of assured fodder availability. However, a few of the allottees did have some livestock mainly cows, sheep and goats. Another few did report holding a bullock or two and majority of these allottees were holding small pieces of land even before securing the surplus lands. Some of them were tenant cultivators cultivating leased-in lands before the allotment of the surplus lands. In Tables 3.26 to 3.29, we present the livestock data of the sample allottees in the four districts, before and after the allotment of surplus land. It was expected that the main interest of the allottees would be in acquiring draught cattle for tillage of the allotted lands and the

**Table 3.27 : Livestock owned by the allottees before and after the allotment of surplus land in Solapur district**

Taluka	Bullocks				He-buffaloes				Cows				She-buffaloes			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	No. of flyes.	No. of bull- ocks	No. of flyes.	No. of bull- ocks	No. of flyes.	No. of he- buffa- loes	No. of flyes.	No. of he- buffa- loes	No. of flyes.	No. of cows	No. of flyes.	No. of cows	No. of flyes.	No. of she- buffa- loes	No. of flyes.	No. of she- buffa- loes
North Solapur	10	22	13	26	1	1	2	3	9	11	12	15	1	2	12	15
South Solapur	3	6	5	9	-	-	-	-	9	12	14	17	11	12	28	28
Barshi	3	5	12	18	-	-	-	-	16	20	25	31	8	12	17	24
Akkalkot	1	2	3	6	-	-	-	-	4	5	5	6	2	4	3	6
Madha	2	4	2	4	-	-	1	2	1	4	3	6	1	1	2	2
Malsiras	2	3	5	6	-	-	1	1	16	16	21	21	4	5	5	7
Karmala	3	5	8	10	2	2	3	3	20	24	19	23	2	2	4	4
Sangola	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	13	15	16	4	4	7	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>96</b>

Contd.

**Table 3.27 : Contd.**

Taluka	Young stock				Goats				Sheep			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	No. of flus.	No. of young ones	No. of flus.	No. of youns ones	No. of flys.	No. of goats	No. of flys.	No. of goats	No. of flys.	No. of sheep	No. of flys.	No. of sheep
North Solapur	6	8	19	22	7	19	22	54	-	-	-	-
South Solapur	10	13	32	35	11	45	26	115	--	-	-	-
Barshi	2	3	10	12	19	84	40	135	2	35	2	84
Akkalkot	3	3	7	8	9	28	13	46	-	-	-	-
Madha	-	-	-	-	4	25	11	39	-	-	-	-
Malsiras	1	1	11	12	7	8	11	20	1	2	3	29
Karmala	4	5	8	9	14	58	19	49	1	4	2	34
Sangola	4	5	4	5	16	24	23	40	3	32	3	95
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>242</b>

**Table 3.28: Number of allottee-families owning bullocks and he-buffaloes at the time of investigations and prior to the allotment of the land in Thane District District and after the allotment of surplus land**

Taluka	Number of selected families in the taluka	Type of draft animal		Prior to the allotment of land		At the time of the investigations	
		Bullocks	He-buffaloes	No. of families owning draft animals	Number of draft animals owned	No. of families owning draft animals	Number of draft animals owned
Talasari	117	147	148	75	173	79	162
				3	6	7	13
		<b>Total</b>		<b>78</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>175</b>
Dahanu	117	10	13	41	69	54	81
				2	3	4	7
		<b>Total</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>88</b>
Palghar	110	110	146	19	30	25	43
				11	1	1	1
		<b>Total</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>43</b>
Jawhar	30	10	22	7	12	8	15
				2	1	1	1
		<b>Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>
Shahapur	81	10		13	18	13	19
				1	2	1	2
		<b>Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>			<b>155</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>320</b>
				<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>
		<b>Total</b>		<b>161</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>342</b>



**Table 3.29: Livestock holding of the allottee families in Yavatmal District before and after the allotment of surplus land**

Taluka	No. of families	Bullocks		Cows		Buffaloes		Calves		Buffalo calves		Sheep & goat	
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Yavatmal	205	70	129	147	118	8	9	55	57	3	15	155	95
Darwaha	167	7	43	10	13	-	2	-	4	-	-	123	73
Pusad	275	70	207	150	126	11	8	4	63	1	10	375	95
Wani	138	50	144	46	92	2	1	4	35	-	1	75	92
Kelapur	229	67	184	155	149	8	6	15	77	-	3	459	102
<b>Total</b>	<b>1014</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1187</b>	<b>457</b>

acquisition of other cattle would be of secondary importance. It may be seen from the tables that the number of allottees owning bullocks and the number of bullocks owned was on the increase after the allotment of surplus lands in all the four districts. For example, in the Solapur district, the total number of allottees owning bullocks had increased from 24 to 48 and the bullocks owned by them from 47 to 79. In the Aurangabad district the total number of bullocks held by the sample allottees had gone up from 27 to 202 after the allotment of the surplus land. More or less similar was the case in the remaining two districts. However, we must note that even though the number of bullocks and the number of bullock owning allottees had increased after the allotment of the surplus lands, they formed a small proportion to the total number of allottees in each district and their total requirement of draught power. The draught cattle owned by the allottees after the allotment of lands, was quite inadequate to meet the tillage requirements of the total surplus lands distributed to the allottees. Majority of the allottees in all the four districts, were therefore, dependent on the cultivating families in the village for meeting their tillage needs. Timely tillage of the allotted land was a problem for all of them in each district. They were required to adjust the tillage of their allotted lands to the availability of bullocks according to the convenience of bullock owners in the village.

As mentioned in Chapter I, the Central Sector Assistance Scheme did not contemplate any advance of loan and subsequent subsidy for the purchase of bullocks

by the allottees under the Revised Act. The area of surplus land granted to individual allottees under the Revised Act was so small that howsoever one might wish, it was not possible to maintain a pair of bullocks for the necessary tillage operations. The capacity of a pair of bullocks, as noted by the Maharashtra Government Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH 1375/57403-L7, dated 7th April 1976, was to tend to approximately 6 hectares or 15 acres of dry crop land. Considering the pattern of distribution of surplus land under the Revised Act, the Government suggested that groups of allottees should be encouraged to obtain jointly, a medium term loan from the cooperatives to purchase bullocks, and for this purpose the allottees should be allowed to jointly offer the security of lands allotted to them. This recommendation does not seem to have been accepted and followed by either of the parties (the allottees or the cooperatives), nor was it pursued seriously by the State Government. As a result, a majority of the allottees under the Revised Act remained without owning any bullock and were wholly dependent on the bullock-owning cultivators in the village for the tillage of their allotted lands. Under such conditions timely tillage was not possible and tillage as suits the convenience of the bullock owners was the rule.

Thus, the sample allottees were wholly on their own to arrange for the necessary finance from whatever sources to purchase bullocks required for the tillage of their allotted lands. The policy of the Government of Maharashtra was of no help to them. In Tables 3.30 to 3.32, we give the sources of financing the purchases of livestock acquired by the sample allottees in the four

Table 3.30: Investment in livestock after allotment of land by source of finance in Anantnag District

Taluka	Source of finance							Total investment in livestock
	Owned funds	Crop loan	Land development bank	Scheduled bank	Private bank	Sale of produce	Sale of other sources	
Amamb	12110	10000	2272	-	2000	-	3270	32272
Bhokrand (Talab)	6042	1000	2232	-	12000	820	-	3270
Soerzon (Talab)	3222	-	1132	-	2200	2400	-	10820
Patthan	3000	-	3300	-	1420	-	-	3120
Kannad (Gangapur)	6840	400	-	2000	1400	-	-	11240
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>32210</b>	<b>11400</b>	<b>11342</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>33820</b>	<b>2200</b>	<b>3270</b>	<b>117282</b>

**Table 3.31: Investment in draught cattle in Solapur District**

Taluka	Relative Cooperative Society		Society		Total	
	Number of borrowers	Amount	Number of borrowers	Amount	Number of borrowers	Amount
Barshi	1	1,000	3	700	4	1,700
Akkalkot	-	-	2	1,200	2	1,200
Malsiras	-	-	1	300	1	300
Karnala	-	-	6	5,780	6	5,780
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7,980</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8,980</b>

**Table 3.32: Investment in livestock by source of finance in Yavatmal District**

Taluka	Owned funds		Co-operative society		Sale of produce		Private loan		Taccavi	
	Allo-tees	Amount in Rs.	Allo-tees	Amount in Rs.	Allo-tees	Amount in Rs.	Allo-tees	Amount in Rs.	Allo-tees	Amount in Rs.
Yavatmal	40	9115	22	3400	20	6250	3	700	-	-
Darwha	38	9460	3	500	4	1100	5	700	1	125
Pusad	121	38345	13	1950	21	3670	10	3050	-	-
Wani	47	17376	35	5350	22	5150	7	1800	3	600
Kelapur	46	16615	16	2310	23	6850	15	2900	2	400
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>90911</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>13510</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>23020</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>9150</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1125</b>

districts. Sale of produce from agriculture, mainly raw cotton, owned funds, crop loans and loans from relatives were by far the more important sources of finance for the livestock bought by the allottees. The owned funds were reported really large in the Yavatmal district, considering that most of the allottees were landless labourers. The only explanation seems to be that of financing such purchases through wage earnings and savings in the form of gold, etc., if any, and the sale of sheep and goats kept prior to securing the allotted surplus lands. While this explanation does not fully resolve the problem of large owned funds invested in acquiring livestock in the Yavatmal district, the occurrence seems to be quite reasonable though none of the allottees had reported disposal of ornaments or other livestock for these purposes. Of the two possible sources suggested above, the second i.e. disposal of sheep and goats seems more plausible considering their earlier vocation and economic conditions. Bank loans taken for acquiring livestock were mainly reported by the allottees in Jalna, Bhokardan, Jafraabad and Paithan talukas of the Aurangabad district. Takavi loans as a major source of finance for this purpose were reported only in Jalna taluka of the Aurangabad district. It appears from the data that the allottees of the surplus land did not get much financial assistance to acquire bullocks from the nationalized Banks, or from the cooperative credit agencies or from the Block Development Agencies. We feel that the possibility of giving long term loan to acquire draught cattle for tillage, through the Land Development Bank may be considered. Though the other farmers who were well established in farming might be able to repay a medium

term loan in 3 to 5 years, the allottees of the surplus land might find it difficult to do so. Hence it was necessary to extend the period of repayment of such loans specifically for the allottees. It was observed that the allottees were required to spend Rs.50 to 60 per year over hire charges for bullocks required to cultivate the allotted lands. If the equated annual instalment of the loan did not exceed say Rs.50 it was likely that many of the allottees might purchase bullocks with such loans and repay the loans through the amount saved over the hire charges and through the additional income accrued from hiring out the bullocks and carting, etc.

### 3.9 Agricultural Implements

The State Government had endowed (though at a certain price) surplus land on the allottees and to undertake necessary tillage of the allotted land, some implements like a plough, a harrow, seed-drill, etc. were quite essential. In the Central Sector Scheme embodied in the preamble of the Government Resolution, Revenue and Forest Department, No. ICH-1375/57403-L7, dated 7th April 1976, the crop assistance of Rs.250/- per hectare (all subsidy) also includes assistance for agricultural implements, the relevant statement in the above mentioned Resolution being as given below :

"The assistance contemplated is at the rate of Rs.250/- per hectare of such assigned land for each of the first two seasons, to enable the assignees to meet this immediate requirements of seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, agricultural implements, etc. This assistance is, however, not admissible for the purchase of bullocks."



The Commissioner of Cooperation, however, brought to the notice of the Government (quoted in Revenue and Forest Department, Resolution No. ICH-3276/51225/L-7, dated 1st November 1976) that purchase of agricultural implements is not a purpose which can be covered under 'seasonal agricultural operations' for which also short term credit is dispensed by the primary credit societies in the State. As a result, the Government was, therefore, pleased to direct that item 'agricultural implements' should be treated to have been deleted from the items for which financial assistance was admissible under the scheme. Effectively no assistance for acquisition of agricultural implements was available and the allottees under the Revised Act were left on their own.

In Tables 3.35 to 3.38 we give the distribution of major agricultural implements with the sample allottees in the four selected districts. It may be seen from the tables that in comparison with the extent of the total area in possession of the allottees in each district, the total number of agricultural implements like ploughs, harrows, etc. was so inadequate that it was impossible for the allottees to meet, by themselves, all the cultivation needs of their allotted lands. As a result majority of the allottees were, to a great extent, dependent on other cultivators for use of necessary implements and such implements were obviously made available to the allottees during spare time and their non-use by the owners. This naturally affected the timely tillage of the allotted lands under cultivation. It was observed that none of the allottees in the four districts had borrowed from the Government for purchase of agricultural implements and thus with no financial assistance

**Table 3.39: Agricultural implements with the allottee families and cash expenditure on them in Aurangabad District**

Taluka	Seed drill		Wooden ploughs		Harrow		Seed drills		Bullock carts		Other implements		Cash expenditure on agricultural implements	
	No. of allottees	No. of drills	No. of ploughs	No. of seed drills	No. of harrows	No. of bullock carts	No. of seed drills	No. of bullock carts	No. of bullock carts	No. of other implements	No. of allottees	Amount		
Ambad	7	132	9	11	10	15	4	8	5	-	3	17	707	
Jalna	}	98	9	7	2	26	19	-	7	-	18	16	1990	
Bhokardan														
Jafrabad	1	1	2	5	1	1	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	
Sillod	}	48	1	3	1	3	3	-	-	-	-	2	525	
Soegaon														
Paithan	2	46	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	-	3	117	
Vaijapur	}	70	2	4	3	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	250	
Gangapur														
Kannad	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>388</b>		<b>26</b>		<b>49</b>		<b>34</b>		<b>8</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>3589</b>

Taluka	Seed drill				Bullock cart				Oil engine pump set																
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After														
	No. of fami- lies	No. of seed drills	No. of fami- lies	No. of seed drills	No. of fami- lies	No. of bullock carts	No. of fami- lies	No. of bullock carts	No. of fami- lies	No. of pump sets	No. of fami- lies	No. of pump sets													
North Solapur	7	1	7	1	9	1	10	1	4	1	4	1	5	3	5	3	-	3	-	11	-	11	-	24	
South Solapur	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	4
Barshi	1	-	1	-	5	-	5	-	1	-	1	-	4	-	4	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	6	
Akkalkot	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	3	
Madha	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	
Malsiras	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
Karmala	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	
Sangola	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>	

**Table 3.34: Agricultural implements owned by the allottees before and after the allotment of land in Solapur District**

Taluka	Iron plough				Wooden plough				Harrow			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	No. of families	No. of iron ploughs	No. of families	No. of iron ploughs	No. of families	No. of wooden ploughs	No. of families	No. of wooden ploughs	No. of families	No. of harrows	No. of families	No. of harrows
North Solapur	117	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	8	11	11	14
South Solapur	117	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	3	4
Barshi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	6	6
Akkalkot	117	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Madha	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
Malsiras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	3
Karmala	117	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2
Sangola	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>35</b>

Contd...

**Table 3.35: Talukawise number of allottees possessing agricultural implements like ploughs and levelling planks ('Alwats') in Thane District**

Taluka	Number of allottee-families	Item		Number of allottee-families possessing the ploughs	Number of ploughs possessed	Number of allottee-families possessing the levellers	Number of levellers possessed	Total
		Before	After					
Talasari	117	Prior to the allotment	88	98	71	72	110	
		At the time of investigations	99	114	82	83	110	
Dahanu	117	Prior to the allotment	45	45	44	44	110	
		At the time of investigations	72	72	73	73	110	
Palghar	110	Prior to the allotment	6	6	6	6	110	
		At the time of investigations	37	38	38	38	110	
Jawhar	30	Prior to the allotment	4	4	4	4	110	
		At the time of investigations	12	12	12	12	110	
Shahapur	81	Prior to the allotment	13	13	13	13	110	
		At the time of investigations	14	14	11	11	110	
<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>Prior to the allotment</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>110</b>	
		<b>At the time of investigations</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>110</b>	

**Table 3.36: Agricultural implements with the allottees in Yavatmal District before and after the allotment of surplus land**

Taluka	No. of families	Wooden plough		Harrow		Seed drill		Other implements	
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After
Yavatmal	205	37	57	29	70	41	86	34	110
Darwha	167	5	24	5	23	4	21	4	19
Pusad	275	22	111	21	113	20	104	20	101
Wani	138	15	80	18	94	20	88	22	99
Kelapur	229	16	88	18	128	22	122	22	130
<b>Total</b>	<b>1014</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>459</b>

from the 'Central Sector Scheme of Assistance' or the State Government, the allottees were wholly on their own to acquire whatever implements they could. Acquisition of implements against one's own resources was reported by a few of the allottees in each district. In Tables 3.37 to 3.38, we give the cash expenditures on agricultural implements reported by the sample allottees in the <sup>Solapur & Yavatmal</sup> ~~four~~ districts. It may be seen from the tables that some of the allottees in the Yavatmal and the Aurangabad districts had purchased wooden ploughs, harrows, seed-drills, etc., from their own funds. The total amount of expenditure involved was highest, Rs.1,990 in Jalna, Bhokardan and Jafarabad talukas of the Aurangabad district, <sup>See table (3.33).</sup> In Solapur district four allottee families had surprisingly reported the purchase of pump sets used for irrigation. Three of them had bought the pump sets even before the allotment of the surplus land. They had leased-in some irrigated land and were small sugarcane growers themselves and hence could instal oil-engine pump sets on wells for irrigation. The tenancy of their lands was off the record and they could proclaim themselves as landless persons and could secure surplus land. The remaining allottee had acquired the oil-engine pump set after the allotment of land and was financed by a nationalised Bank for that purpose.

Another important fact about the agricultural implements was their possession by the sample allottees even prior to the allotment of surplus land. It is quite true that most of the allottees were landless persons and only a few of them had lands either owned or leased-in even prior to the allotment of surplus lands. Almost

**Table 3.37: Investment in agricultural implements according to sources of finance in Solapur District**

Taluka	Harrow		Seed drill		Bullock cart			Oil engine pump set								
	Own funds		Society		Own funds		Society		Bank							
	No. of fami- lies	Amo- unt	No. of fami- lies	Amo- unt	No. of fami- lies	Amo- unt	No. of fami- lies	Amo- unt	No. of fami- lies	Amo- unt						
North Solapur	2	70	1	40	1	30	1	50	1	700	1	900	-	-	-	-
South Solapur	5	190	-	-	4	210	-	-	2	1500	1	900	-	-	-	-
Madha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	400	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malsiras	1	40	1	40	-	-	1	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Karmala	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	650	-	-	1	1200	-	-
Sangola	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5250
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3250</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1800</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5250</b>



**Table 3.38: Cash expenditure on agricultural implements by the allottees in Yavatmal District**

Taluka	(Amount in Rs.)													
	Size of holding													
	Upto 3 acres		3.01 to 4.0 acres		4.01 to 5.0 acres		5.01 to 7.20 acres		7.21 to 10.00 acres		10.01 to 15.00 acres		15.01 to 20.00 acres	
	Allo-tees	Amo-unt	Allo-tees	Amo-unt	Allo-tees	Amo-unt	Allo-tees	Amo-unt	Allo-tees	Amo-unt	Allo-tees	Amo-unt	Allo-tees	Amo-unt
Yavatmal	10	202	8	278	3	119	6	331	10	409	7	480	-	-
Darvha	-	-	2	140	-	-	1	40	9	695	1	40	-	-
Pusad	1	60	9	489	41	2081	22	1353	12	834	-	-	-	-
Wani	8	352	9	347	1	20	-	-	3	191	16	1116	1	83
Kelapur	7	387	41	1255	3	104	7	234	16	855	5	188	1	172
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1001</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>2509</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>2324</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1958</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>2984</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1824</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>255</b>

all the agricultural implements reported as held prior to the allotment of the surplus land were with the small landholders having some land previous to the grant of surplus lands.

CHAPTER IVALLOTTED SURPLUS LAND AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

In the present Chapter we propose to deal with the surplus lands allotted to the sample allottees in the four selected districts. We will make an attempt to assess the quality of the allotted lands, whether they are cultivable or otherwise; and if they are cultivable, whether they are brought under cultivation by undertaking some developmental operations. We will look into the measures undertaken by the allottees and other agencies to bring the allotted lands under cultivation and the expenditures incurred over them. Where the allotted land are not brought under cultivation, we will look into the reasons thereof and explore the possibilities of bringing them under cultivation and the measures necessary for the

4.1 Possession of the Allotted Land

As mentioned earlier, more than three-fourths of the total allottees in the four selected districts were allotted surplus lands under the Revised Act i.e. after 2nd October 1975; and only a few (15 to 20 per cent of the total) under the Principal Act i.e. before October 1975. Obviously, majority of the allottees had received the possession of their allotted surplus lands from 1975 onwards. It was observed from the data that most of the allottees in all the four districts had received the possession of the allotted surplus lands in the year of allotment itself. As we noted earlier, the decisions of allotment of the surplus lands to the specific persons were taken mostly at the taluka places by the Surplus Land Distribution Tribunals appointed for the purpose.

In some instances the Tribunals had met at some important villages and had distributed the surplus lands in the nearby villages. It was reported that once the decisions of the Tribunals were finalised, the orders of allotment of land were sent to the allottees and within a period of three to six months thereafter, possessions of the allotted lands were handed over to the respective allottees. This had happened in the case of nearly 90 per cent of the total sample allottees in the selected districts. However, there were a few allottees in each district who could not get possession of the allotted lands in the year of allotment and they had to wait for a year or two. For example, in Solapur district the total number of such allottees was 51 or about 9 per cent of the total sample allottees. Of these, 45 allottees had received the possession of the allotted land one year after the allotment order and the remaining six, two years after the allotment order (see Table 4.1). Thus, in the Solapur district all the sample allottees had received surplus lands allotted to them though some had received it rather late by a year or two.

In the case of Thane district also majority of the allottees had received the possession of the allotted land to them in 1976-77. (see Table 4.2). In this district the problem of those allottees who had received the allotted lands was rather serious. As the data indicated, 78 sample allottees had not at all received the possession of the allotted lands till the day of our investigation. Fifty four other allottees had left their respective villages either provisionally or permanently and we could not know whether they were in possession of the allotted land or not. Four of the allottees died after the allotment

**Table 4.2 : Classification of the allottees according to the year of their getting possession of the land in Thane district**

Taluka	Year of getting possession of the land				Total
	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	
Talasari	12	114	3	1	130
Dahanu	9	107	2	-	118
Palghar	1	97	12	-	110
Jawhar	-	22	8	-	30
Shahapur	-	80	1	-	81
Total	22	420	26	1	469

of the land and hence we could not enquire about their allotted lands. Thus, in the Thane district a little more than one-fifth of the allottees, either did not possess the land or had left the village or were missing or dead. As quite a significant proportion of the allottees in the Thane district were not in possession of the allotted lands, we tried to examine this issue village-wise, in somewhat greater details to find out the reasons for the same.

We found that in the village Vasavade in the Talasari taluka, 13 of the 73 sample allottees had not received the allotted land. Surprisingly, twelve of these allottees were not shown the allotted land at all by the Talathi of the village and they reported that the previous owner of these lands, a landlord in the village, was harvesting and selling the grass grown on these lands. The Talathi and the Circle Inspector confirmed that some of the allottees were not shown their allotted lands and they proposed to show them within a

few days. One fails to understand why the allotted lands could not be shown to the allottees in a period of two years which had elapsed after the allotment order. In the remaining case, the allotted land was shown to the allottee but it being already occupied by a tenant of the previous landlord, the allottee could not get its possession. In another village, an allottee was employed with a landlord who was the previous owner of the allotted land and the landlord feared that if the Talathi showed the allottee his allotted land, the allottee would not continue in his service. Apparently, the Talathi was under the influence of the landlord and did not show him the land and the landlord continued to get his services and also continued to harvest the grass on his entire land as he was doing in the past. The situation at the village Ambesari in the Daharu taluka was still worse. Thirty-four of the sample allottees in this village were not in possession of their allotted lands. Eleven of these allottees were shown their lands by the Talathi and the Circle Inspector but the previous owner forbade them by force to cultivate their allotted lands and he continued to harvest the grass on all his lands.

The villages noted above in the Talasari and the Daharu taluka were in the interior and the lands declared surplus, were mostly the grass lands which the owners were unwilling to surrender possibly because they yielded a good income simply through harvesting the naturally grown grass. In the Durvas village in the Palghar taluka, a female allottee was given even a pass book for the allotted land and she had paid the revenue for the allotted land for the past two years but she was not in possession of the land allotted to her. The allotted

land was not even shown to her by the Talathi of the village.

It may be observed from the above cases that the major cause for the allottees not getting possession of their lands was that the village Talathis and the Circle Inspectors had kept them away from the allotted lands by not showing them their allotted piece of land. Such cases were mostly reported in the Adivasi areas which were much in the interior. The unlawful leasing-out of land, fictitious land-sales, faulty distribution of land and distribution of uncultivable lands were the other important reasons for the allottees not getting possession of the allotted lands in the Thane district.

Another important point to be noted is that most of the sample allottees in the four districts had received possession of their lands in 1976-77. This means most of the allottees had the allotted surplus lands with them for two to three years before our investigation. The period of two to three years may be considered as adequate to bring the allotted lands under cultivation provided they are cultivable. It was reported that most of the allottees who were in possession of the land at the time of our investigation did not generally face any difficulty in cultivating the allotted lands after receiving their possession. In a few cases, however, the allottees had to struggle for sometime in order to establish their possession on the allotted lands. For example, in Solapur district, in seven cases of the sample allottees the previous owners of the surplus land were not happy with the redistribution of their land and raised many objections to the cultivation of the allotted land by the allottees.

In another case the previous owner of the surplus land wanted to recover the price of the land from the allottee in a single instalment and so had objected to its cultivation by the allottee. Such objections however were successfully removed by the village officials and the local leaders and most of the allottees in the four districts could establish their possession of the allotted land and could bring it under their cultivation.

#### 4.2 Quality of Land Allotted

The quality of lands allotted in the four districts can be examined from different angles. The revenue for land can be considered as an indicator of its quality. In the case of Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts this indicator of land revenue was used while in Solapur and Thane districts we could not use it, as the revenue data could not be collected. In Thane district particularly, many of the allottees did not know the revenue for their allotted lands. Many of them had not even received the pass books for their lands. The Talathis for the Adivasi areas in Thane district invariably stayed either at the taluka place or in some other villages of their choice and hence it was not possible to get the figures for land revenue for the allotted lands even from the Talathis. Again, the revenue settlement in the areas having taken place in the remote past, the revenue figures did not reflect their present quality. Some of the grass lands in the Thane district, for example, had been converted into paddy fields and varkas lands; but such lands were still classified as the grass lands in the Village Records. Under such circumstances, we felt that classification of the allotted lands on the basis of their per acre



revenue would not give a proper judgement about their quality, apart from the fact that land revenue was not available for all the allotted lands. In the case of Thane and Solapur districts, therefore, the allotted lands have been classified on the basis of the conventional soil types viz. lands having either light or medium or deep black soils or their combinations. It was generally observed that lands with light soil were considered as inferior lands with very low fertility because of their low capacity to retain moisture. Lands of medium black soils, however, were considered as better lands as they were of high fertility with a high capacity to retain moisture. Deep black soils were the highest quality lands having very good fertility and a high capacity to retain moisture.

As pointed out earlier, the choice of land to be surrendered to the Government as surplus area was entirely vested in the surplus landholders, and it was to be expected that they would surrender lands which were of the lowest quality in their holdings. This is evident from Tables 4.3 and 4.4 which show that the proportion of the lands with light soils, which were the inferior quality lands, was the largest in the total surplus land distributed in Solapur and Thane districts. It may be noted from Table 4.3 that in the Solapur district, 45 per cent of the total allotted lands was of light soils and if we include in it the combination of light and medium black soils, the proportion of such lands went up to 63 per cent. This means more than half of the total allotted lands in Solapur district was of inferior quality. In the case of the Thane district the proportion of such quality land was still high. It was around 75

**Table 4.4 : Classification of the allotted lands by the type of soil in Thane district**

		(Area in hectares).					
Taluka	Item	Light soils	Medium soils	Heavy soils	Light and medium soils	Light and heavy soils	Total
Talasari	Area	78.67	6.62	-	8.83	2.49	96.61
	No. of allottees	107	11	-	9	3	130
Dahanu	Area	75.37	5.79	3.15	4.80	2.30	91.41
	No. of allottees	103	5	3	6	1	118
Palghar	Area	23.99	41.94	18.07	1.00	-	85.00
	No. of allottees	25	61	23	1	-	110
Jawhar	Area	23.76	0.75	-	1.76	1.30	27.57
	No. of allottees	25	1	-	2	2	30
Shahapur	Area	105.15	3.39	0.25	4.75	-	113.54
	No. of allottees	73	3	1	4	-	81
Total	Area	306.94	58.49	21.47	21.14	6.09	414.13
	No. of allottees	333	81	27	22	6	469

per cent of the total land distributed to the sample allottees. The proportion of the allotted lands having medium black soils was about 28 per cent in Solapur district and about 15 per cent in Thane district. The allotted land having deep black soils was comparatively very small in both the districts - 1.33 per cent in Solapur district and about 5 per cent in Thane district. This was bound to happen as no surplus landholder was expected to surrender his best quality lands to the Government as his surplus area.

In Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts also where we have used land revenue as an indicator to determine the quality of the distributed land, we found that the major portion of surplus land distributed to sample allottees was of the lowest quality having a land revenue of less than Re. one per acre. It was evident from the data that more than half of the total surplus land distributed to sample allottees in both the districts had land revenue up to 40 paise per acre. In Aurangabad district the proportion of such lands was as high as 60 per cent of the total distributed area and in Yavatmal district it was slightly low - 52.3 per cent. It was further observed from the data in these two districts that as the land revenue per acre increases, the surplus distributed decreases and with it the number of sample allottees. Such an occurrence was expected particularly when the choice of land to be surrendered to the Government as surplus area was entirely vested with the surplus landholders. It is quite natural that the surplus landholders surrendered only the lowest quality lands as surplus areas and these were distributed to the allottees. Obviously, the major

portion of surplus land distributed to the allottees was of poor quality or uncultivable in all the four districts.

Another point which evidently appears from the data is that the quality of surplus lands was taken into consideration while distributing it sizewise to different allottees in each district. It was observed that on the aggregate level, the average area per allottee of the land having light soils was relatively larger (1.85 to 2.30 hectares each) than that of the lands of medium-black soils (1.50 to 1.68 hectares each). Similarly, the average area per allottee of the medium-black soil was in its turn larger than that of the lands having deep-black soils (1.10 to 1.24 hectares each). The average areas of different combinations of the three types of soils did not indicate any clear trend. However, on the aggregate level it appears that some consideration was given to the quality of land while allotting surplus lands to different allottees in the four districts.

### 4.3 Cultivated and Uncultivated Lands

We may now examine how much of the allotted surplus land was brought under cultivation by the sample allottees in the four districts. In this connection, we found that the total area of surplus lands allotted to sample allottees  $x$  could be classified into three classes, viz. (1) allotted areas wholly brought under cultivation by the allottees; (2) allotted areas partially brought under cultivation by the allottees; and (3) allotted areas wholly not brought under cultivation by the allottees. Such a classification of the allotted land was

done only in the case of Solapur district. In the remaining three districts, the allotted surplus land was classified into two categories only viz. (1) allotted area brought under cultivation by the allottees; and (2) allotted area which was not brought under cultivation by the sample allottees. The number of allottees and the classification of the allotted lands in the sample district are presented in Tables 4.5 to 4.8.

It may be noted from Table 4.6 that of the total allotted land to sample allottees in Solapur district, about 481 hectares or about 47 per cent of the total allotted land was wholly brought under cultivation; 403 hectares or about 39 per cent was partially brought under cultivation and the rest about 138 hectares or about 14 per cent had remained totally uncultivated. The table reveals that more than half of the total allottees in Solapur district had brought their entire landholdings under cultivation. This means more than half of the total allottees had brought under cultivation, somewhat less than half of the total allotted land. About one-third of sample allottees had brought only a portion of their allotted lands under cultivation. The total number of allottees who did not bring under cultivation any portion of their allotted lands was as large as 65 and the allotted area still uncultivated by them even after the period of two to three years since the allotment was about 138 hectares or about 14 per cent of the total. The important observation to be noted from the above discussion is that of the total allotted area to the sample allottees in Solapur district 713 hectares or about 70 per cent was brought under cultivation

**Table 4.5 : Cultivated and uncultivated areas of the allotted land in Aurangabad district**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Total area of land allotted	(Area in hectares)			
			Area brought under cultivation	Proportion to total	Area not brought under cultivation	Proportion to total
Ambad	132	238.06	223.26	93.70	14.80	6.30
Jalna Bhekardan Jafrabad	98	186.40	147.48	79.12	38.92	20.88
Silled Soegaon	48	89.69	71.58	79.81	18.11	20.19
Paithan	40	58.74	55.62	94.69	3.12	5.31
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	70	126.65	105.21	83.07	21.44	16.93
<b>Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>699.54</b>	<b>603.15</b>	<b>86.22</b>	<b>96.39</b>	<b>13.78</b>

**Table 4.7 : Cultivated and uncultivated areas of the allotted land in Thane district.**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Total area of land allotted	Area brought under cultivation	(Area in hectares)		
				Proportion to total	Area not brought under cultivation	Proportion to total
Talasari	130	96.61	80.51	83.33	16.10	16.67
Daham	118	91.41	65.71	71.88	25.70	28.12
Palghar	110	85.00	40.40	47.53	44.60	52.47
Jawhar	30	27.57	17.43	63.22	10.14	36.78
Shahapur	81	113.54	30.82	27.15	82.72	72.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>414.13</b>	<b>234.87</b>	<b>56.71</b>	<b>179.26</b>	<b>43.29</b>

**Table 4.8 : Cultivated and uncultivated areas of the allotted land in Yavatmal district**

Taluka	No. of allottees	(Area in hectares)				
		Total area of land allotted	Area brought under cultivation	Proportion to total	Area not brought under cultivation	Proportion to total
Yavatmal	205	432.29	358.35	82.90	73.94	17.10
Darwa	167	337.20	205.02	60.80	132.18	39.20
Pusad	275	544.55	447.37	82.15	97.18	17.85
Wani	138	282.07	222.50	78.88	59.57	21.12
Kelapur	229	429.42	352.80	82.16	76.62	17.84
<b>Total</b>	<b>1014</b>	<b>2025.53</b>	<b>1586.04</b>	<b>78.30</b>	<b>439.49</b>	<b>21.70</b>



by 506 allottees and the rest, 309 hectares or about 30 per cent was still uncultivated.

It may be seen from Table 4.5 that in Aurangabad district more than 86 per cent of the total surplus land allotted to sample allottees was brought under cultivation and about 14 per cent had remained still uncultivated. In Yavatmal district also the proportion of total surplus land brought under cultivation by sample allottees was slightly less than 80 per cent (78.30 per cent) and only 22 per cent of the allotted land was not brought under cultivation till the day of our enquiry. In Thane district however, the case was different. In Thane district the proportion of surplus land brought under cultivation by sample allottees was the lowest (56.71 per cent) amongst the four districts. Obviously the uncultivated area was as high as 43.29 per cent of the total. In this district, we found that 40 per cent of the allottees had brought their entire landholdings under cultivation; 35 per cent had brought only parts of their holding under cultivation; whereas nearly a fourth of the allottees had still kept their allotted lands uncultivated even after a period of two-three years since allotment. It was observed that most of the allottees who were in possession of lands in Talasari and Dahanu talukas had brought their lands either wholly or partially under cultivation. This may be for the reason that a majority of these allottees were already cultivating the same lands either as tenants or persons encroaching upon those lands. The proportion of allottees keeping their lands uncultivated was, however, very large viz. 47 per cent in Palghar taluka and 44 per cent in Shahapur taluka. It was so in Palghar

taluka in spite of the allotted lands being levelled and quite superior. In Shahapur taluka, more than 80 per cent of the allotted surplus land had remained uncultivated as most of the allottees in this taluka were cultivating their allotted land only partially. Most of them had kept large portion of their allotted lands, uncultivated as they could not bring it under cultivation. Similarly more than half of the allotted land in Palghar taluka had remained uncultivated on account of the large proportions of the allottees, not bringing even a small part of their holdings under cultivation. The problem of uncultivated area is quite important but we shall take it up later. In the following we shall first examine the efforts made by the allottees in bringing their allotted lands under cultivation.

#### 4.4 Development of the Allotted Land

It was observed from the data that majority of the allottees in the four districts, had brought their allotted lands under cultivation in the same year of getting its possession. In Solapur district, for example, of the total 506 allottees who had brought their allotted land, wholly or partially, under cultivation, 413 or 82 per cent had done it almost immediately after getting possession. Of the remaining allottees 68 or about 13 per cent had brought their land under cultivation one year after getting their possession, and the rest 25 or about 5 per cent, two years after getting possession. In Thane district also, the proportion of allottees, who had brought their allotted lands under cultivation immediately after getting its possession was as high as 88 per cent. The rest of the allottees had done it

within a year or two after getting possession of their allotted land. In the case of Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts yearwise data was not available, but we observed that majority of the allottees in these two districts as well, had brought their allotted lands under cultivation in the same year of getting its possession. We can safely say that majority of the allottees in the sample districts were keen to put their allotted land under cultivation and had done it immediately after getting its possession. However, all the allotted land could not be put under cultivation immediately after getting its possession. There <sup>were</sup> some areas of the allotted land which were not readily cultivable and the allottees were required to undertake some efforts either on their own or with the help of the Government Agencies to bring such areas under cultivation. Some other areas of allotted land were poor in quality, and were not cultivated till their allotment and were to be brought under cultivation for the first time. The allottees were required to incur cash expenditures in addition to their own labour in order to bring the allotted land under cultivation. In Tables 4.9 to 4.12, we give such cash expenditure incurred by the allottees in the sample districts, to undertake different operations, in order to bring their allotted land under cultivation. The cash expenditures incurred on land development should not be considered with the area brought under cultivation as a majority of the allottees had done it by their own labour and with the help of other cultivators.

It may be seen from the tables that the major items of expenditure for development of the allotted lands in the four districts were, ploughing, bunding,

**Table 4.9 : Cash expenditure on land development in Aurangabad district**

Taluka	No. of reporting allottees	Area allotted	Area brought under cultivation	Expenditure on land development (Rs.)						Total expenditure on land development in (Rs.)
				Stone clearing etc.	Removing stumps	Land levelling & soil replenishment	Bunding	Ploughing	Other Expenses	
Anbad	45	76.48	45.65	112.00	2483.00	-	-	5780.00	-	8375.00
Jalna Bhorarden Jafrabad	41	80.42	35.42	1136.00	2469.00	-	70.00	5350.00	68.00	9093.00
Silod Seegaon	17	35.67	20.00	3247.00	2978.00	125.00	250.00	2950.00	1150.00	10700.00
Paithan	8	14.80	9.24	-	1075.00	1100.00	-	1435.00	-	3610.00
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	11	24.29	17.26	650.00	-	-	-	2655.00	-	3305.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>231.66</b>	<b>127.67</b>	<b>5145.00</b>	<b>9005.00</b>	<b>1225.00</b>	<b>320.00</b>	<b>18170.00</b>	<b>1218.00</b>	<b>35083.00</b>

Table 4.11 : Cash expenditures on development of the allotted land in

Taluka	Stones clearing			Uprooting st		
	No. of allottees spent	Amount	AVG. Amount per allottee	No. of allottees spent	Amount	AVG. Amount per allottee
Talaseri	2	160	80	-	-	-
Dahanu	1	300	300	2	350	175
Palghar	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jawhar	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shahapur	1	130	130	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>175</b>

Taluka	Levelling			Ploughing		
	No. of allottees spent	Amount	AVG. Amount per allottee	No. of allottees spent	Amount	AVG. Amount per allottee
Talaseri	-	-	-	6	1380	230
Dahanu	1	80	80	6	1950	325
Palghar	10	3390	339	3	1400	467
Jawhar	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shahapur	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3470</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4730</b>	<b>315</b>

**Table 4.12 : Cash expenditure on land development in Yavatmal district**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Total area allotted	Brought under cultivation	Uncultivated area	Expenditure on development (Rs.)					Total expenditure
					Stones etc. clearing	Ploughing	Bunding	Soil replanting	Other expenditure	
Yavatmal	89	185.24	152.10	33.14	925	10930	200	1610	2002	15667
Darwaha	143	274.23	177.44	96.79	11475	23605	390	-	9495	44965
Pusad	198	418.36	341.42	76.95	11247	19897	515	700	7261	39620
Wani	42	112.82	92.40	20.42	1525	1215	5970	1220	3610	13540
Kelapur	88	185.63	167.79	17.84	1960	4692	3075	720	3040	13487
<b>Total</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>1176.28</b>	<b>931.15</b>	<b>245.14</b>	<b>27132</b>	<b>60339</b>	<b>10150</b>	<b>4250</b>	<b>25408</b>	<b>127279</b>

levelling and clearing lands of stones, etc. Ploughing was such an important operation in the development of such land that it alone accounted for nearly half of the total expenditure incurred by the allottees in each district. Ploughing was necessary tillage for sowing the crops and in most of the cases it need not be considered as development of land but should be taken as part of the current cost of cultivation. Some of the areas of allotted land were required to be ploughed every year before sowing any crop. If this item of expenditure is excluded, the total expenditure on development of the allotted land would come down substantially. Another item claiming major part of the total expenditure on land development was bunding of the allotted lands, particularly in Thane and Solapur districts. It must be made clear that these bunds laid down by the allottees were in addition to the bunds constructed under the Government Programme by the Soil Conservation Units in the two districts. It was reported that the soil conservation unit at Solapur district had completed its activity of bunding in all the sample villages. But the bunds prepared under the Government Programme belonged to large area according to their contours while the individual allottees were required to construct additional bunds specifically needed on their allotted land. It may be noted from the table that 85 sample allottees in Solapur district were required to undertake bunding on 106 hectares of their allotted land. The total amount of expenditure incurred on bunding by these allottees came to Rs.23,320 or on an average Rs.274 per allottee. In Thane district bunding was more essential in order to prepare small paddy fields

on the allotted land. In this district, therefore, we find that nearly three-fourths of the total allottees bringing their lands under cultivation, had put bunds on their allotted land. They had constructed the bunds on their own. Twenty-four of them had also spend Rs.7,840 or on an average Rs.325 per allottee on this work. Bunding was not an important item of expenditure in Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts.

Another item claiming substantial funds was that of clearing the lands of shrubs, stumps, roots of trees and stones, etc. The work of cutting trees, removal of stumps, and roots, etc. was largely carried out by the sample allottees in Thane, Yavatmal and Aurangabad districts. In Thane district the work was done mostly by the allottees themselves. Jawhar taluka, however, was the only exception where the Forest Department had carried out the task of cutting trees and removing stumps and roots, etc. In the case of some of the allottees, cutting of trees, etc. had turned out to be a source of funds for land development or as income in terms of being used as firewood in the allottees' household, so that part of expenditure on development could be met out of the allotted land itself and even before the crops being raised and produce harvested.

It may be noted from the tables that the total amount of cash expenditures incurred by the sample allottees on all operations of development of allotted land came to Rs.35,083 in Aurangabad district; Rs.1,12,910 in Solapur district; Rs.16,930 in Thane district and Rs.1,27,279 in Yavatmal district. The average expenditure per allottee, undertaking some sort



of developmental work on the allotted land, was about Rs.287 in Aurangabad district, Rs.224 in Solapur district, Rs.302 in Thane district and Rs.227 in Yavatmal district. It may be noted that all this expenditure on land development was not incurred in a single year, but was spread over three years, 1976-77 to 1978-79. However, nearly three-fourths of the total expenditures on land development, was incurred in the first year of allotment i.e. 1976-77 when most of the allottees brought their allotted land under cultivation.

#### 4.5 Sources of Finance

In Tables 4.13 to 4.15, we give the developmental expenditure by its sources of finance for the three districts - Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal. In Thane district most of the development work was done by the allottees themselves by utilising their own family labour and owned funds. As will be seen from the tables, the major sources of funds for land development in all the districts except Thane, were two viz. (1) owned funds, and (2) central assistance provided through the cooperative societies. The financial assistance under the Central Sector Scheme was not admissible in Thane district as it was covered by the Special Schemes such as Small Farmers Development Agency, etc. Owned funds as a source of investment in land development were rather difficult to explain. However, it appears that the only possible source of owned funds was the sale of produce and wage earnings. This means the allottees were undertaking capital expenditure by foregoing their current consumption. In this respect nothing can be said conclusively for want of data on consumption and family

**Table 4.13 : Sources of finance for cash expenditure on land development in Aurangabad district**

Taluka	Sources of finance for land development (Rs.)									
	Owned funds	Private borrowings	Crop loan	Nationalised bank	Taccavi	Sale of produce	Sale of goats & cattle	Sale of farm yard manure	Other sources	Total expenditure on land development Rs.
Ambad	3005	450	4770	-	-	-	-	-	150	8375
Jalna Bhokardan Jafrabad	3338	600	3625	800	250	-	300	180	-	9093
Silled Soegaon	6503	-	3470	-	-	162	215	-	350	10700
Paithan	2910	150	250	-	300	-	-	-	-	3610
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	985	370	1550	-	-	-	400	-	-	3305
<b>Total</b>	<b>16741</b>	<b>1570</b>	<b>10195</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>35083</b>

**Table 4.14 : Sources of Finance required for the development of the allotted land in Solapur district**

Taluka	Owned funds		Co-operative Society		Money lender		Relatives		Total	
	No. of allottees	Amount	No. of allottees	Amount	No. of allottees	Amount	No. of allottees	Amount	No. of allottees	Amount
North Solapur	18	2,080 (13.31)	56	12,250 (78.37)	2	1,300 (8.32)	-	-	76	15,630 (100.00)
South Solapur	33	7,460 (25.88)	63	15,060 (52.26)	1	200 (0.69)	12	6,100 (21.17)	109	28,820 (100.00)
Barshi	21	2,970 (25.36)	63	8,160 (69.69)	3	580 (4.95)	-	-	87	11,710 (100.00)
Akkalkot	20	1,610 (14.22)	49	9,710 (85.78)	-	-	-	-	69	11,320 (100.00)
Madha	12	2,180 (39.00)	14	3,260 (58.32)	-	-	1	150 (2.68)	27	5,590 (100.00)
Malsiras	16	11,810 (48.69)	49	12,470 (51.36)	-	-	-	-	65	24,280 (100.00)
Karmala	11	2,150 (26.64)	25	5,040 (62.46)	-	-	2	880 (10.90)	38	8,070 (100.00)
Sangola	7	1,310 (17.49)	25	6,180 (82.51)	-	-	-	-	32	7,490 (100.00)
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>31,570 (27.96)</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>72,130 (63.89)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2,080 (1.84)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7,130 (6.31)</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>1,12,910</b>

expenditure. The possibility of meeting this developmental expenditure out of past savings either in the form of cash or gold ornaments etc. seems to be very remote as majority of the allottees were landless persons and were very poor.

As mentioned earlier, the Government was aware of the need for land development of allotted lands and had accordingly provided funds under the "Central Sector Assistance Scheme" for the purpose. The Government of Maharashtra decided under Resolution No. ICH/1375/57403/L-7, dated 7th April, 1976, to avail of the Central Sector Assistance Scheme to the maximum extent. In the guidelines issued to the implementing authorities it was stated that, "Since a large majority of the allottees would need to undertake development to improve the productivity of the assigned land, the land development work, comprising land levelling, land shaping, contour bunding, etc. may be sanctioned on merits by the District Central Cooperative Bank, through the Village Society upto a ceiling cost of Rs.500 per hectare and within the overall funds available. The release of funds will be made in two instalments and the second instalment will be released after the primary society has certified that the first instalment has been fully utilized for land development purposes. On completion of the work, the primary society will certify the proper utilization of the funds released and half of the amount will be treated as subsidy. The amount which is treated as loan will be recovered by the Cooperative Sector which will account to the Government."

It may be seen from the tables that the sample

alottees had taken benefit of the Central Assistance Scheme and so the Cooperative Sector formed an important source of finance for development of the allotted lands in Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal districts. On the aggregate level, about 20 to 40 per cent of the total amount on land development account in these three districts, was financed through the Cooperative Societies under the Central Assistance Scheme. The Central Assistance Scheme could have been the major source of finance for land development if it had been put in to force a year earlier. As we have seen earlier most of the land development work was undertaken by the allottees in the year 1976-77 when no assistance facility was available. More than three-fourths of the total expenditure on land development was incurred in 1976-77 and only the balance of one-fourth in the subsequent years. The Central Assistance Scheme as it was put into practice in 1977-78 and 1978-79 had a limited scope in the three sample districts.

As mentioned earlier, proper utilisation certificates of these loans were to be obtained and kept on record as per the Government Resolution. However, no such completion certificates were kept at the Taluka office or at the Collectorate. The Government had advised that the Authorised Officer should, immediately after handing over possession of the allotted land to the allottees, prepare and submit a report to the Collector through the Tahasildar, on the following points :

(1) Whether lands distributed by him are situated in the area covered by any special programme;

(2) If not any of the lands distributed needs development vis. levelling, bunding, etc. and if so, the approximate cost per hectare of the improvement so needed;

(3) A statement showing the names of each allottee, extent and particulars of land allotted to him.

Availability of data on these three points would have given us the size of the problem involved, so that adequate measures could be put forth. But, no such information was available at the Taluka or the District headquarters. In the absence of any such information the assistance was sanctioned to the allottees whenever asked for and obviously without even a broad idea as to whether any such assistance was necessary at all. As said earlier, the development that the allottees deemed necessary to bring the allotted area under cultivation had taken place about one year before the assistance was sanctioned and such late disbursement of loans should have resulted in misutilization of the assistance granted for the land development purpose.

In Thane district, which was covered by the Special Schemes like Small Farmers and Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers Development Agency, etc. the Central Sector Scheme was not applicable. Similarly in Aurangabad district, Vaijapur, Kannad and Gangapur talukas were put under the "Paga Yojana" and so these three talukas were not eligible to receive any developmental assistance under the Central Sector Scheme. In Thane district, however, the SFDA had not taken any steps to provide finance to develop the allotted surplus lands. During our visit to the SFDA in November 1978,

we learnt that they were not supplied with the list of the allottees who were granted lands in the district by the Collectorate and hence they could not provide finance to any allottees. In May 1979 during our final visit, to the SFDA we came to know that they had then obtained the list and they would grant a subsidy to the allottees, provided the Banks sanctioned loans to them. The SFDA functioned only when a loan was granted by the financing agencies. This major alternative to the Central Sector Scheme in the form of the SFDA, had, therefore, proved to be of no use to the allottees at least during the first three years of implementation of the programme in Thane district. The District Central Cooperative Bank in Thane district had financed a few of the allottees but we could not obtain the data for them as no separate accounts were kept by the Bank for these allottees. The information available at the Collector's Office in May 1979 revealed that the quantum of finance disbursed through this Bank was extremely small. The Land Development Bank was another financing agency which had provided some loans to the allottees in Shahapur and Palghar talukas. It was reported that as the sanctioning of loan for land improvement involved prior sanction of the District Collector, the process had become cumbersome and caused much delay in getting a loan. This factor had become an additional hurdle in granting loans to the allottees besides the nonavailability of their lists.

Among the Commercial Banks, the Dena Bank had adopted a village (Jamshet) in Daharu taluka and had granted loans of Rs.3,250 to eight allottees in the sample villages. The Bank of Maharashtra, which was a

lead Bank for the district, had not sanctioned any loan for the development of land to any of the sample allottees. It had not even formulated any programme of financing the allottees of surplus land in the district till we completed our field work. However, most of the sample allottees in Thane district did not wait for any financial assistance from any agency and carried out the development of the land allotted to them on their own and brought it under cultivation.

It appears from the above discussion that the Central Assistance Scheme providing finance through the cooperative societies and owned funds were the only two major sources of finance for development of allotted lands in Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal districts. In Thane district, however, owned funds was the only major source of finance as most of the allottees had developed their allotted lands on their own. The other sources of finance, like "Moneylenders", "Relatives" and "Taccavi", etc. were quite unimportant in terms of the total finance provided by them for development of allotted lands in all the four districts.

#### 4.6 Leasing-out the Allotted Land

Any leasing-out of the surplus land allotted to a person under Section 27 of the Act was prohibited without the previous sanction of the District Collector under Section 29(1) Sub-clause (a) of both the Principal and the Revised Act. The only exception to such leasing-out of land was provided in the Revised Act by "Maharashtra 21 of 1975," S. 23(b); the exception made being in favour of the serving members of the armed forces, etc. the relevant proviso being as stated below :



"Provided that, no such sanction shall be necessary where land is to be leased by a serving member of the armed forces or where the land is to be mortgaged as provided in sub-section (4) of Section 36 of the Code for raising a loan for effecting any improvement of such land.

In spite of such strict prohibition on leasing-out the allotted surplus lands, we found some cases of leasing-out in Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal districts. In Thane district we didnot find any case of leasing-out the allotted land, presumably because the surplus land distributed to the allottees was of poor quality and was bought under cultivation for the first time by the allottees themselves. In Tables 4.16 to 4.18 we give the distribution of the sample allottees and their leased-out lands in Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal districts. It may be noted from the tables that the total number of such allottees was comparatively larger in Yavatmal district. In this district 49 allottees had leased-out about 111 hectares of the surplus land allotted to them. In Solapur district 21 allottees had leased-out their entire allotted landholdings having an area of 37 hectares to other cultivators. In Aurangabad district only one case reported leasing-out the allotted land of 3 hectares. This case was a genuine one coming under the above-mentioned proviso of the Revised Act. The allottee in this case was a serving member of the armed forces and was allotted land in 1976. His family was resident in the village of the land allotment and the land had been leased-out from the year of grant. This was quite in order as the allottee was stationed outside the village and there was no one else in the family to undertake

**Table 4.16 : Areas leased out of the allotted land by the allottees in Aurangabad district for the year 1978-79**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Area allotted	Allottees cultivating allotted land	Area cultivated	Allottees leasing out land	Area leased out	(Area in hectares)	
							Allottees leaving allotted land fallow	Area left fallow
Ambad	132	238.06	130	234.27	-	-	2	3.78
Jalna Bhokardan Jafrebad	98	186.40	96	183.00	-	-	2	3.40
Billed Seegaon	48	89.69	45	85.85	1	1.21	2	2.63
Paithan	40	58.74	40	58.74	-	-	-	-
Vaijapur Gangapur Kennad	70	126.65	62	112.29	-	-	8	15.36
<b>Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>699.54</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>673.15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25.17</b>

cultivation. The only objectionable aspect was that the allottee despite leasing-out the allotted land, was granted crop loan in 1977-78 and 1978-79 and also received the subsidy as per the provisions. Such grant of crop loan and subsequent cost assistance subsidy was against the very purpose since cost subsidy was not to be an endowment of income on the allottee for not cultivating the allotted land but assistance granted by the Government in the initial years to overcome the expected difficulties in bringing the allotted land under cultivation.

We shall now look into the reasons reported for leasing-out the allotted lands in Solapur and Yavatmal districts and find out whether there was any justification for it. In Tables 4.19 and 4.20, we give the distribution of the allottees by reasons for leasing-out the allotted lands in Solapur and Yavatmal districts. The only reason for leasing-out such lands that could meet the proviso, if at all, would be those under "Resident Outstation". Ten allottees from Solapur district and 18, from Yavatmal district had given this as the reason for leasing-out their allotted holdings to the other cultivators. The area of the allotted land leased-out by them was about 19 hectares in Solapur district and 54.27 hectares in Yavatmal district. We found that none of these allottees in both the districts were serving members of the armed forces and they were only residents outside the village of the allotted lands. These cases, therefore, were all against the explicit provisions of the Section 29 of the Act. We found that in these cases members of the allottee families were

**Table 4.19 : Reasons for leasing out surplus land allotted in the sample villages in Solapur district.**

Taluka	Village	Disabled		No resources		Resident our Station		Total	
		No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area
North Solapur	Kegaon	-	-	-	-	1	1.20	1	1.20
	Bhogaon	-	-	-	-	2	3.08	2	3.08
Barshi	Sasure	-	-	1	0.95	-	-	1	0.95
	Yawali	-	-	-	-	2	4.06	2	4.06
	Upale-dumale	-	-	-	-	1	1.00	1	1.00
Akkalkot	Bablad	-	-	2	1.70	-	-	2	1.70
Karmala	Kandar	-	-	2	2.57	-	-	2	2.57
	Jinti	-	-	1	2.35	-	-	1	2.35
	Wadshivane	-	-	4	8.08	-	-	4	8.08
	Kugaon	-	-	-	-	1	2.04	1	2.04
Sangola	Latewadi	-	-	-	-	1	2.34	1	2.34
	Manegaon	1	1.96	-	-	-	-	1	1.96
	Hangirge	-	-	-	-	2	5.29	2	5.29
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15.65</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>19.01</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>36.62</b>

**Table 4.20 : Reasons for leasing-out surplus land allotted in Yavatmal district**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)									
	Disabled		No resources and uneconomic		Resident out station		Own business no labour		Total	
	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
Yavatmal	1	3.24	4	13.08	3	9.00	2	7.75	10	33.07
Darwaha	-	-	3	8.95	-	-	-	-	3	8.95
Pused	2	3.14	5	10.32	7	18.99	4	8.50	18	40.94
Wani	-	-	2	5.80	6	19.87	-	-	8	25.67
Kelapur	1	1.23	6	10.05	2	6.41	1	1.37	10	19.04
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7.61</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>48.20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>54.27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17.62</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>127.67</b>

resident in the village or in the nearby village of the allotted land and the allottees were either salaried employees in some other place or working as wage labour in a nearby town. The only reason for receiving the surplus lands allotted to them was related to the future times when the allottees would retire and return to the village and cultivate the allotted lands for themselves. In the meanwhile, they could manage to get some income by way of share or cash rent by leasing-out lands allotted to them.

Another important reason for leasing-out of the allotted lands was "no resources and uneconomic" to bring the allotted land under cultivation. Ten allottees from Solapur district and 20 from Yavatmal district had leased-out their entire allotted lands, measuring 16 and 48.20 hectares respectively, as they did not have any means to cultivate or they cultivated the allotted lands for a year or two and having suffered losses had finally decided to lease-out their lands to somebody else. The allottees giving "no resources" as their reason for not cultivating the allotted lands reported that they did not have any bullocks, nor any agricultural implements to undertake cultivation of the allotted lands. They had tried to secure Central Assistance for the development of land but they could not get it. They did not know the reason for not getting the Central Assistance through the Cooperative Society. Under the circumstances they felt it better to lease-out their lands to other cultivators and get whatever income they could by way of share or cash rent rather than keeping the land uncultivated.

Other reasons for leasing out the allotted lands were not of much importance since in none of these cases the respondent allottee ever intended to cultivate the allotted land. They were either physically disabled or were totally engaged in other activities and had no intention to undertake cultivation of the allotted land. While the reasons reported to us were true in relation to the allottee, the other members of the families, if they so wished, could have undertaken cultivation of the allotted land.

All the cases of leasing-out of the allotted surplus land were off the record and no tenancy could be established for want of any recorded proof and thus, such leasing-out was wholly in contravention of Section 29 of the Act. Further some of these allottees had put the allotted land to misuse by lifting the crop loans and securing subsidies provided for to the allottees under the Revised Act. This again was against the very purpose of the crop loan and the current cost subsidies granted by the Government.

#### 4.7 Uncultivated Allotted Lands

As pointed out earlier the proportion of uncultivated land to total distributed surplus was the highest (43.29 per cent) in the case of Thane district. In the remaining three districts the proportions of uncultivated land were comparatively lower - 14 per cent in Aurangabad district, 22 per cent in Yavatmal district, and 30 per cent in Solapur district. The fact that the allotted lands remaining uncultivated (whatever the proportions) since their distribution was quite serious, especially when it was a necessary

condition that the allottees take to self cultivation immediately after receiving the surplus land. In Tables 4.21 to 4.24, we give the distribution of the allottees keeping the allotted land uncultivated, and its area, by reasons thereof in the four districts.

It may be seen from the tables that the major portion of the total uncultivated land in the four districts could not be brought under cultivation mainly because it was mostly uncultivable. It was all reported under the categories of "rocky and pot-kharab", "roads, nallahs, etc." and "forest and trees". The proportion of such areas to the total uncultivated land was as high as 84 per cent in Solapur district, 77 per cent in Yavatmal district, 55 per cent in Aurangabad district and 45 per cent in Thane district. The allottees reported that lands coming under the category of "rocky and pot-kharab" were in the hilly and undulating terrain having very poor soils where cultivation was not possible at all. The allottees, therefore, did not venture to bring these lands under cultivation for the obvious reason that their efforts would be wasted. The lands under "roads and nallahs etc." were obviously uncultivable and how such lands were declared surplus and were distributed to different allottees in the districts was difficult to understand. The areas under "forest and trees" could not be brought under cultivation on two counts; firstly quite a few allottees reported that they could not secure permission to fell trees and clear lands for cultivation. Under the Maharashtra Felling of Trees Act, 1964, permission has to be sought for felling trees of certain valuable classes such as teak, fruit bearing trees, etc. and unauthorised cutting of



**Table 4.21 : Reasons for the allotted land remaining uncultivated since allotment in Aurangabad district**  
 (Area in hectares)

Taluka	No. of allottees	Total un-cultivated area	Reasons					
			Rocky & potkharab	Road etc. other un-cultivable	Erosion	Forest & trees	No resources	Other
Ambad	132	14.80	6.66	1.09	4.21	-	1.21	1.63
Jalna Bhekardan Jafabad	98	38.92	25.61	2.83	2.79	0.32	0.40	6.97
Silled Soegaon	48	18.11	7.41	-	3.10	0.72	2.63	4.25
Paithan	40	3.13	1.07	0.20	0.61	-	1.25	-
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	70	21.43	6.05	1.21	0.59	-	-	13.58
<b>Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>96.39</b> (100.00)	<b>46.80</b> (48.53)	<b>5.33</b> (5.52)	<b>11.30</b> (11.74)	<b>1.04</b> (1.08)	<b>5.49</b> (5.69)	<b>26.43</b> (27.44)

**Table 4.22 : Reasons for the allotted lands remaining uncultivated since allotment in Solapur district**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Total uncultivated area	(Area in hectares)											
			Uncultivable		Under roads nallas & tanks		Rocky land		Allotment disputed		Resident out-station		No Resources	
			No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area	No. of allottees	Area
North Solapur	14	30.35	6	15.79	1	2.56	1	1.10	1	1.65	2	2.60	3	6.65
South Solapur	26	8.97	11	4.55	6	0.79	7	2.65	1	0.58	-	-	1	0.40
Barshi	55	47.50	13	15.26	20	7.57	19	21.38	1	0.20	-	-	2	3.09
Akkalkot	29	24.75	11	13.50	3	0.84	5	1.43	10	8.98	-	-	-	-
Madha	13	13.80	6	11.93	3	0.87	4	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malsiras	54	88.52	10	11.43	4	3.15	36	65.88	4	8.06	-	-	-	-
Karnala	30	43.88	8	16.11	1	0.20	16	21.14	3	2.08	-	-	2	4.35
Sangola	38	51.10	8	8.14	1	0.40	23	31.31	-	-	-	-	6	11.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>308.87</b> <b>(100.00)</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>96.71</b> <b>(31.31)</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>16.38</b> <b>(5.30)</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>145.89</b> <b>(47.24)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21.55</b> <b>(6.98)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.60</b> <b>(0.84)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25.74</b> <b>(8.33)</b>

**Table 4.23 : Reasons for the allotted land remaining uncultivated since allotment in Thane district**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Area un-cultivated	Reasons for uncultivated area						
			Rocky & Potkharab	Road etc. other un-cultivable	Grazing lands	Encroachment	Absence of approach road	Undemarcated	No resources
Telasari	130	16.10	1.02	0.63	6.44	1.11	-	1.11	5.79
Dahanu	118	25.70	5.51	-	6.22	-	-	1.08	12.89
Palghar	110	44.60	9.52	-	-	5.06	2.20	8.60	19.22
Jawhar	30	10.14	0.27	-	-	-	-	7.28	2.59
Shahapur	81	82.72	62.93	0.12	-	-	-	-	19.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>179.26</b> (100.00)	<b>79.25</b> (44.21)	<b>0.75</b> (0.42)	<b>12.66</b> (7.06)	<b>6.17</b> (3.44)	<b>2.20</b> (1.23)	<b>18.07</b> (10.08)	<b>60.16</b> (33.56)

**Table 4.24 : Reasons for the allotted land remaining uncultivated since allotment in Yavatmal district**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Area un-cultivated	Reasons for uncultivated areas									No Resources
			Erosion	Rocky & Potkharab	Undulating	Forest trees	& Grazing land	Roads etc.	Culti-vated area	Other uncul-tivated	Resident outstation	
Yavatmal	205	73.94	9.41	23.53	3.05	20.75	1.47	2.48	0.61	1.42	4.80	6.46
Darwaha	167	132.18	1.82	39.95	-	60.98	8.91	1.86	-	2.95	-	15.71
Pusad	275	97.18	14.53	39.62	0.40	26.90	1.27	4.12	1.42	-	4.04	4.85
Wani	138	59.57	5.89	37.95	-	12.73	1.41	1.01	-	0.57	-	-
Kolapur	229	76.62	4.59	38.32	6.52	15.34	0.61	2.03	-	1.12	4.04	4.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>1014</b>	<b>439.49</b> (100.00)	<b>36.24</b> (8.24)	<b>179.37</b> (40.82)	<b>9.97</b> (2.27)	<b>136.70</b> (31.10)	<b>13.67</b> (3.11)	<b>11.50</b> (2.62)	<b>2.03</b> (0.46)	<b>6.06</b> (1.38)	<b>12.88</b> (2.93)	<b>31.07</b> (7.07)

trees invited the penal provisions of the Act. Secondly, in some cases trees were felled despite the prohibition but the large stumps and roots could not be removed from the soil and the land could not be properly cultivated. The allottees reported that they suffered heavy losses in the first year of cultivation and since then had kept the lands uncultivated.

Another important reason for keeping the allotted lands uncultivated was the non-availability of resources. This reason was reported by quite a few allottees in all the four districts. It may be noted from the tables that the proportion of the allotted land which had remained uncultivated because of non-availability of resources, was about 34 per cent of the total uncultivated area in Thane district; 16 per cent in Solapur district; 7 per cent in Yavatmal district; and 6 per cent in Aurangabad district. During our investigation, however, we found that the reason of non-availability of resources put forth by these allottees in the sample districts was much away from the facts. Some of these allottees had lifted development assistance from the cooperative societies and had not done anything to develop the lands allotted to them. Some of them had even lifted crop loans though never cultivating the allotted lands, and had become defaulters. The fact is obvious that these allottees were not interested in cultivating the allotted lands, were not prepared to exert themselves to bring the allotted lands under cultivation and must be solely held responsible for keeping the lands uncultivated since allotment, and thereby causing a double loss (loss of production and misuse of the development and crop loans) to the country.

Allotment disputes, soil erosion, encroachment from neighbouring fields, absence of approach roads to the allotted lands were some of the other major reasons reported by the sample allottees for keeping the lands uncultivated since their allotment. Allotment disputes as the reason for keeping the lands uncultivated was reported by 22 allottees in Solapur district and by 3 allottees in Yavatmal district. The area involved in these disputes was about 22 hectares or 7 per cent of the total uncultivated area in Solapur district; and 11.62 hectares or 2.60 per cent in Yavatmal district. In all these disputes, the surplus landholders had taken objections and had not allowed the allottees to cultivate their lands. The cases of all disputed lands were before the proper authorities and nothing more could be said about them.

"Resident outstation" was another important reason reported in Solapur and Yavatmal districts, for keeping the lands uncultivated since their allotment. In Solapur district there were two allottees of such type who could not cultivate the land of 2.60 hectares as they were not residents in the village of the allotted land. Both of them were engaged in salaried services and were resident in the Solapur city which is about 10 kilometers from Kegaon, the village of the allotted land. It was, therefore, not convenient for them to go to Kegaon village and cultivate their land. In Yavatmal district also, the case of such allottees was similar. They were also engaged in salaried services and were resident in the Yavatmal city. The issue of allotting surplus land to non-residents of its village was more serious particularly in Solapur and Yavatmal districts,

where a large number of such allottees were reported. During our field work we found that many of the residents in the Solapur and the Yavatmal cities, had managed to secure surplus lands in their nearby villages, some of which are not even within the stipulated limit of 8 kilometers under Section 27(5), Sub-clause (iv), of the Revised Act. It was a difficult task for us to locate these allottee in the two cities. In fact, we could not locate all of them. Normally, it would be expected that the addresses of these allottees would be available from the official records at the District Collectorate or at the Tahasildar's office but on the basis of merely their names and their present place of residence such as Solapur city or Yavatmal city, it was difficult to locate them. We could contact only those allottees, whose family members resided in the village of the allotted land and who could give the correct address or place of work of the allottees concerned. Where no such information was available, the only way was to leave these allottees out of the sample. Thus, 34 allottees from the Solapur city and 29 from the Yavatmal city who were allotted lands in the nearby sample villages could not be located and could not be included in our sample.

To sum up, it may be said that a large proportion of the uncultivated land in each district had remained so, mainly because it was uncultivable. Why such uncultivable lands were distributed at all was a difficult point to explain. For the major portion of the remaining uncultivated land, however, the allottees should be held responsible. It appears that some of them had not exerted themselves fully to bring their land under

cultivation since allotment. In such cases the Government should withdraw the allotted land from such allottees and redistribute it to other landless persons who would take to its cultivation immediately.

#### 4.8 Measures to Develop the Lands

Though many of the allottees had brought their lands either wholly or partially under cultivation, systematic soil conservation measures were essential even on their lands, besides the lands of those allottees who had not brought them under cultivation. Cutting of trees and clearing the lands of old stumps and shrubs was another important measure necessary on lands of the allottees who could not bring them under cultivation, particularly in Thane, and Yavatmal districts. The Government had assigned the work of removal of stumps to the Forest Department whereas that of terracing, leveling and bunding was entrusted to the Soil Conservation Division in the Agricultural Department. In Thane district, the programme of removal of stumps was discontinued by the Collector and there being no proper co-ordination between the two Departments, the Soil Conservation Unit had also limited its work only to the lands which were devoid of stumps.

The problem of ownership of trees was another problem confronting the allottees as well as the Soil Conservation Unit. It was essential that trees should have been declared as a property of either the allottees themselves or the Soil Conservation Division, which undertakes the work of clearing the lands for bunding and terracing. To bring about a proper co-ordination



in all these activities, it would have been better if a unit specialised in cutting of trees and removal of stumps was specially created in the Soil Conservation Division so that the work of soil conservation might not be delayed till trees were cut and stumps removed from the allotted lands. This could be done even by borrowing some staff from the Forest Department. The lands distributed had to be developed and not merely provided with the Soil Conservation measures on a watershed basis. It was therefore essential that cutting of trees, removal of stumps and shrubs, terracing, increasing the depth of soil, levelling and bunding, would have to be done by a single Land Development Unit, operating under the Soil Conservation Division. If such a Land Development Unit is established, the work of land development over a substantial proportion of the allotted lands in each district would be completed within a short period.

## CHAPTER V

### CULTIVATION OF THE ALLOTTED LAND

Land development and areas brought under cultivation by the sample allottees in the four districts have been looked into in the last chapter. In the present chapter, we propose to deal with the area brought under cultivation in each district; crops grown on these areas; their cost of cultivation; use of inputs such as seeds, labour and fertilizers, etc.; production of the different crops grown and surplus generated from them. We may then discuss the second and the third objectives of the study, viz., "to recommend the steps that could be taken" to assist the allottees in the selection of seeds, fertilizers, etc., and to provide them facilities for harrowing, ploughing of land with a view to increasing the agricultural production from the land", and "to ascertain and recommend the facilities (such as irrigation facility) which could be provided to the allottees for developing the land and the steps which could be taken for the purpose."

#### 5.1 Land Use Pattern of the Allotted Land

As stated in the last chapter the total area brought under cultivation, wholly or partially, by the sample allottees, was around 603 hectares in Aurangabad district; 677 hectares in Solapur district; 235 hectares in Thane district; and 1586 hectares in Yavatmal district. The proportion of the area brought under cultivation to the total allotted lands was about 86, 66, 56 and 78 per cent in the four districts respectively.

The remaining proportion of the total allotted land in the four districts was kept uncultivated since its allotment. Some of the sample allottees in each district had leased out their allotted land to other cultivators. As against this, there were other allottees who had leased-in other lands and were cultivating them along with the allotted surplus lands. In Tables 5.1 to 5.4 we try to summarise all these details of lands and present the land use pattern of the allotted lands in the four districts. It may be noted that the pattern of land use for the Yavatmal district presented in Table 5.4 was for the year 1977-78; and for the remaining three districts, it was for the year 1978-79. It may be seen from the tables that only in the case of Aurangabad district the total uncultivated area of the allotted surplus land was proportionately smaller than in the other three districts. In Aurangabad district it was around 17 per cent of the total allotted land, while in the other three districts it was between 30 and 43 per cent. A major portion of these areas in each district were kept uncultivated since their allotment. We have examined such areas in the last chapter and have discussed the reasons for keeping them uncultivated. The remaining portion of the uncultivated areas was reported so, for the reference year only and may be treated as "current fallow". The proportion of the current fallow varied between 3 and 9 per cent of the total lands in each district. Besides these uncultivated lands there were some areas which were leased out by the allottees to other cultivators. The proportion of such leased out land as we have seen earlier, was comparatively higher in Yavatmal and Solapur

**Table 5.1 : Land use pattern of the allotted land in Aurangabad district for the year 1978-79**

Taluka	No. of allottees	Total allotted land	Uncultivated land	Fallow land	Total uncultivated area	Leased-out land	(Area in hectares)		
							Cultivated surplus land	Leased-in land	Total cultivated land
Ambad	132	238.06	14.80	3.78	18.58	-	219.48	-	219.48
Jalna Bhokardan Jafraabad	98	186.40	38.92	3.40	42.32	-	144.08	-	144.08
Silled Seegaon	48	89.69	18.11	2.63	20.74	1.21	67.74	-	67.74
Paithan	40	58.74	3.12	-	3.12	-	55.62	-	55.62
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	70	126.65	21.44	15.36	36.80	-	89.85	-	89.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>699.54</b>	<b>96.39</b>	<b>25.17</b>	<b>121.58</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>576.75</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>576.75</b>

**Table 5.2 : Land use pattern of the allotted lands in Solapur district for the year 1978-79**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)											
	No. of allottees	Total allotted land	Uncultivated land	Current fallows	Total uncultivated land	Leased-out land	Cultivated surplus land	Leased-in land	Total cultivated land	Irrigated land	Dry land	Proportion to total cultivated land
North Solapur	92	191.00	76.05	4.87	80.92	4.28	105.80	9.40	115.20	1.00	114.20	99.13
South Solapur	114	138.59	12.33	1.64	13.97	-	125.61	6.00	131.61	0.50	131.11	99.62
Barshi	109	157.89	22.93	4.57	27.50	6.01	124.38	-	124.38	1.20	123.18	90.04
Akkalkot	53	91.12	46.23	8.37	54.60	1.70	34.82	-	34.82	-	34.82	100.00
Madha	35	88.85	31.73	0.37	32.10	-	56.75	-	56.75	-	56.75	100.00
Malsiras	62	137.12	86.00	2.52	88.52	-	48.60	0.22	48.82	5.94	42.88	87.83
Karmala	58	121.17	2.91	2.05	4.96	15.04	101.17	-	101.17	-	101.17	100.00
Sangola	48	95.62	30.69	11.82	42.51	9.59	43.52	0.20	43.72	1.00	42.72	97.71
<b>Total</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>1022.35</b> <b>(100.00)</b>	<b>308.87</b> <b>(30.21)</b>	<b>36.21</b> <b>(3.54)</b>	<b>345.08</b> <b>(33.75)</b>	<b>36.62</b> <b>(3.58)</b>	<b>640.65</b> <b>(62.67)</b>	<b>15.82</b>	<b>656.47</b>	<b>9.64</b>	<b>646.83</b>	<b>98.53</b>

**Table 5.3 : Land use pattern of the allotted land in Thane district for the year 1978-79**

(Area in hectares)

Taluka	No. of allottees	Total allotted land	Uncultivated land	Fallow land	Total uncultivated land	Leased-out land	Cultivated surplus land	Leased-in land	Owned land	Total cultivated land	Irrigated land	Dry land	Proportion of dry to total cultivated land
Talasari	130	96.61	16.10	-	16.10	-	80.51	52.59	69.92	203.02	1.17	201.85	99.42
Dahanu	118	91.41	25.70	-	25.70	-	65.71	25.07	22.22	113.00	-	113.00	100.00
Palghar	110	85.00	44.60	-	44.60	-	40.40	-	0.10	40.50	-	40.50	100.00
Jawhar	30	27.57	10.14	-	10.14	-	17.43	-	6.34	23.77	-	23.77	100.00
Shahapur	81	113.54	82.72	-	82.72	-	30.82	2.32	3.23	36.37	-	36.37	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>414.13</b>	<b>179.26</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>179.26</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>234.87</b>	<b>79.98</b>	<b>101.81</b>	<b>416.66</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>415.49</b>	<b>99.72</b>

**Table 5.4 : Land use pattern of the allotted lands in Yavatmal district for the year 1978-79**

(Area in hectares)										
Taluka	No. of allottees	Total allotted land	Uncultivated land	Fallow land	Total uncultivated land	Leased-out land	Cultivated surplus land	Leased-in land	Owned land	Total cultivated land
Yavatmal	205	432.29	73.94	30.18	104.12	33.07	295.10	23.17	45.80	364.07
Darwaha	167	337.20	132.18	89.46	221.64	8.95	106.61	2.83	-	109.44
Pusad	275	544.55	97.18	7.77	104.95	40.94	398.66	-	19.43	418.09
Wani	138	282.07	59.57	18.83	78.40	25.67	178.00	4.07	29.61	211.68
Kelapur	229	429.42	76.62	49.33	125.95	19.04	284.43	7.65	36.12	328.20
<b>Total</b>	<b>1014</b>	<b>2025.53</b>	<b>439.49</b>	<b>195.57</b>	<b>635.06</b>	<b>127.67</b>	<b>1262.80</b>	<b>37.72</b>	<b>130.96</b>	<b>1431.48</b>

districts. It was negligible in Aurangabad district. In Thane district leasing out of the allotted lands was not reported at all. If we deduct all the above stated areas i.e. uncultivated areas since allotment, current fallows and leased out areas, from the total allotted land, we get the total area cultivated by the allottees themselves in each district for the survey year. Thus, the total area of the allotted land cultivated by the allottees in 1978-79, came to about 577 hectares or 82.42 per cent in Aurangabad district; 641 hectares or 62.66 per cent in Solapur district; and 235 hectares or 56.71 per cent in Thane district. In the case of Yavatmal district the total area cultivated in 1977-78 came to about 1263 hectares or about 62.34 per cent of the total. Besides these cultivated surplus areas there were leased in and owned lands reported by some of the allottees in each district. Of course the proportion of leased in and owned lands was very small in all the four districts. Thus, the total cultivated area (cultivated surplus land + leased in + owned lands) of the allottees came to 577 hectares in Aurangabad district; 656 hectares in Solapur district; 417 hectares in Thane district and 1,431 hectares in Yavatmal district. It may be noted from the tables that almost all the area cultivated by the allottees in each district was dry, mainly depending on rainfall for its cultivation. The areas having some sort of irrigation facility were reported only in Solapur (10 hectares) and Thane (1.17 hectares) districts and their proportion to the total cultivated area was negligible. The cultivation of the distributed lands, therefore, was wholly under rainfed conditions.



## 5.2 Cropping Pattern

In Tables 5.5 to 5.8, we give the cropping pattern followed by the sample allottees in the four districts. It may be noted that the cropping pattern presented for the Yavatmal district in Table 5.8 is for the year 1977-78; and for the other three districts, it was for 1978-79. Normally, the cropping pattern can be said to be broadly the appraisal of the cultivators' resources and considering that majority of the allottees were landless persons with labour as the main source of income, the resources as such could not be expected to exist. While crop loan facility was made available to all the allottees by registering them as members of the village cooperatives, their major resource was their own labour. Under such circumstances the cropping pattern followed by the allottees could not be expected to be much different from the cropping pattern followed before these lands were distributed. There was always a possibility of its deterioration rather than improvement as the allottees did not have any resources. Another matter that needs to be noted refers to the class of land surrendered as surplus and the endowment of the natural resources of the district as such. As we have seen earlier most of the area distributed in each district was of low quality and was dry crop land with no prospects of irrigation facility in the near future. The cultivation of the distributed lands, therefore, was wholly under rainfed conditions. In such a situation a wide variety of crops could not be expected to be grown by the allottees and the cropping pattern expected to be followed by them would be directed mainly towards meeting the family's demand for feed consumption.

**Table 5.5 : Cropping pattern of the cultivated land in Aurangabad district for the year 1978-79**

Taluka	Culti- vating allot- tees	Cropped area	Fallow area	(Area in hectares)									
				Cropping pattern									
				Jowar	Hybrid Jowar	Bajra	Wheat	Pulses	Hulga	Cotton	Oilseeds	Other crops	Double cropped
Ambad	130	215.48	18.79	136.32	1.12	7.15	--	14.12	10.45	60.01	1.62	2.23	17.54
Jalna Bhokardan Jafrabad	96	145.68	37.31	57.34	24.31	2.63	0.40	5.08	9.61	24.95	24.52	2.67	5.84
Silled Seegaon	45	74.01	11.84	14.31	20.84	10.35	0.40	1.53	2.59	13.66	7.80	2.93	0.40
Paithan	40	54.43	4.31	40.04	-	2.34	2.17	0.40	1.82	5.98	0.13	1.56	-
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	62	104.81	6.49	74.59	1.95	11.09	-	2.42	6.41	4.71	2.43	1.62	0.40
<b>Total</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>594.41</b>	<b>78.74</b>	<b>322.60</b>	<b>48.22</b>	<b>33.56</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>23.55</b>	<b>30.88</b>	<b>109.31</b>	<b>36.50</b>	<b>11.01</b>	<b>24.18</b>

**Table 5.7 : Cropping pattern on the cultivated land in Thane district**

		(Area in hectares)									
Taluka	Item	Paddy	Nagali	Vari	Jewar	wheat (irri- gated)	Tur	Udid	Kulathi	Irrigat- ed vege- tables	Total *
Talasari	Area	45.38	22.18	3.57	5.11	0.40	0.39	1.21	-	0.17	78.41
	No. of allottees	94	66	15	35	1	6	3	-	1	123
Dahanu	Area	46.50	7.21	7.77	3.91	-	0.03	1.24	-	-	66.66
	No. of allottees	101	34	42	56	-	1	3	-	-	109
Palghar	Area	35.72	-	-	0.60	-	-	-	-	-	35.78
	No. of allottees	53	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	58
Jawhar	Area	3.32	7.49	2.17	-	-	-	0.20	0.05	-	13.23
	No. of allottees	12	17	9	-	-	-	3	1	-	21
Shahapur	Area	4.19	9.20	5.97	-	-	-	0.03	-	-	19.39
	No. of allottees	16	29	20	-	-	-	2	-	-	45
Total	Area	135.11	46.08	19.48	9.08	0.40	0.42	2.68	0.05	0.17	213.47
	No. of allottees	276	146	86	93	1	7	11	1	1	356

\* The total against the item 'area' indicates the total area of crops whereas the total against the item 'No. of allottees' indicates the number of allottees cultivating the lands.

**Table 5.8 : Cropping pattern on the cultivated land in the Yavatmal district for the year 1977-78**

Taluka	(Area in hectares)						Total cropped area	Area cropped more than once	Net cropped area
	Jawar	Hybrid Jawar	Cotton	Oil-seeds	Other crops				
Yavatmal	107.91	46.47	91.82	14.98	7.74	268.92	0.72	268.20	
Darwa	57.53	30.15	60.97	17.23	10.64	176.52	-	176.52	
Pusad	255.78	45.23	50.65	28.32	14.84	394.82	-	394.82	
Wani	85.01	12.04	79.47	2.62	7.21	186.35	3.14	183.21	
Kelapur	114.33	58.64	114.73	10.32	16.48	314.50	0.64	313.86	
<b>Total</b>	<b>620.56</b>	<b>192.53</b>	<b>397.64</b>	<b>73.47</b>	<b>56.91</b>	<b>1341.11</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>1336.61</b>	

Considering the average area cropped and the size of family, it is very much doubtful whether all the demand for the family feed requirements could be met from the allotted land. Despite this, the approach towards cropping of the allotted lands is likely to be towards meeting whatever feed needs could be met out of the given land.

It may be seen from the tables that the cropping pattern followed by the sample allottees in all the four districts was predominantly of feed crops like jowar, paddy, bajara, wheat, etc. Jowar was predominantly grown by the allottees in Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal districts, and paddy, in Thane district. The proportion of the total area put under jowar was as high as 69.44 per cent in Aurangabad district; 67.50 per cent in Solapur district; and 54.23 per cent in Yavatmal district. Like jowar in these three districts, paddy was a predominant crop in the Thane district. The proportion of the area devoted to it was also as high as 63.29 per cent in Thane district. In the case of jowar crop we observed that the allottees in the three districts had grown the local as well as hybrid variety of jowar during both the Kharif and the Rabi seasons. Rabi jowar was grown more widely in Solapur district and had claimed more than 90 per cent of the total area under jowar crop. Of the remaining area, about 6 per cent was put under Kharif jowar and 4 per cent, under hybrid jowar. In Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts, however, Kharif jowar was more predominant than Rabi jowar. It is an important fact that in these three districts, the allottees could venture to grow hybrid jowar on the allotted lands, however small that area might be. Next to jowar, bajara was another

important food crop grown by the allottees particularly in Solapur and Aurangabad districts. Bajara was not grown at all in Yavatmal district. High yielding variety of wheat was grown by some of the allottees in these three districts, wherever irrigation was available. The total area put under wheat, however, was very small in all the three districts. It was only 5 hectares or less than one per cent of the total gross cropped area in Solapur district. Similar was the case in Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts.

Amongst the non-feed crops grown by the allottees, groundnut was more important in Solapur district; while cotton and groundnut in Aurangabad district; and only cotton in Yavatmal district. Cotton was not preferred in Solapur district, presumably because the lands distributed were of very inferior quality. In Yavatmal district cotton commanded an important place, claiming nearly 85 per cent of the total area under non-feed crops. In Aurangabad district, most of the area devoted to non-feed crops was shared by cotton and groundnut. No other non-feed crops were widely grown in these three districts.

As mentioned earlier, paddy was the main crop grown by the allottees in the Thane district. It commanded more than three-fourths of the total gross cropped area in Talasari, Dahanu and Palghar talukas. Another important food crop grown in Thane district was "magli", mostly grown by the allottees in Jawhar and Shahapur talukas. 'Magli' was grown mainly on inferior soils which were rabbed; the crop thrived mostly on account of the ash supplied through rabbing. As against this, paddy was

grown on comparatively superior soils which were banded and which could impound water atleast for a few days after the rains. Another important point to be observed from Table 5.7 is that in Thane district only food crops were grown by the allottees. They did not report any area of the allotted land under any non-food crop.

From the cropping pattern followed by the allottees in the four districts, it is obvious that they had preferred to grow mostly food crops like jowar, bajara, wheat and paddy, etc., in order to meet, as far as possible, their family food requirements from the lands allotted to them. It may be seen from the tables that more than 95 per cent of the gross cropped area in Solapur district was devoted to food crops alone. The proportion of such area was around 73 per cent in Aurangabad district and 62 per cent in Yavatmal district. The non-food crops were not largely grown by the allottees because of two major facts; first, the inferior quality of the lands that were distributed to them, and second, the non-availability of necessary financial resource to meet the higher cost of cultivation of the non-food crops.

### 5.3 Cash Expenses on Cultivation and Value of Production

The survey of allottees in the four districts was conducted in a short period and the collection of data on costs was largely limited to out-of-pocket expenses on cultivation and to that extent the cost data is not capable of giving a detailed account but can only broadly spell out the cultivation expenses and the resulting production and surplus generated. This surplus should not be taken to mean income or profit

from cultivation. Certain aspects of costs of cultivation could not be collected in the short period at our disposal during the survey and the results should be taken to be broadly indicative of the course of the surplus land distribution process. Tables 5.9 to 5.12 give the cash expenses incurred by the allottees in the four districts on cultivation of different crops on the allotted lands in the year of survey. The major items of cash expenditure were four : (1) seeds, (2) manure, (3) fertilisers, and (4) tillage. In tillage we include bullock as well as human labour required to carry out different operations during pre-sowing and post-sowing periods. In fact, in majority of the cases no wage labour was reported as the allottees themselves and their family members worked on their allotted lands. As mentioned earlier, majority of the allottees in all the four districts, were largely dependent on other cultivators for the requisite preliminary and other tillage, as they did not possess the required implements and the draught cattle. Majority of the allottees were required to hire agricultural implements and bullocks required for different operations. We therefore found that a substantial amount of cash was expended for this purpose by the allottees in the four districts. It may be seen from the tables that in Solapur and Aurangabad districts nearly three-fourths of the total cash expenses incurred by the allottees was on tillage alone. In Thane district, however, most of the tillage operations were carried out by the family labour only and cash expenditures as such were reported by a very small number of allottees. They had paid the hire charges particularly of bullock labour in the form of foodgrains



**Table 5.9 : Out of pocket expenses required for the crops grown on the allotted land in Aurangabad district for the year 1978-79**

Taluka	Self cultivat- ing grantees	Cropped area (Hec- tares)	Fallow area (Hec- tares)	Cost of tillage Rs.	Seeds and manures Rs.	Fertilizers Rs.	Wages to hired labour Rs.	Total expenditure Rs.	Value of produc- tion Rs.	Surplus over expendi- ture Rs.
Ambad	130	215.48	18.79	19585.00	5392.00	745.00	-	25522.00	75706.00	50184.00
Jalna Bhokardan Jafrabad	96	145.68	37.31	14371.30	4340.00	160.00	60.00	18931.30	49263.00	30331.70
Silled Seegaon	45	74.01	11.84	8535.00	4683.00	535.00	-	13753.00	39622.00	25869.00
Paithan	40	54.43	4.31	5480.00	1681.00	476.00	-	7637.00	20616.00	12979.00
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	62	104.81	6.49	10670.00	1690.00	560.00	-	12920.00	39683.00	26763.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>594.41</b>	<b>78.74</b>	<b>58441.30</b>	<b>17786.00</b>	<b>2476.00</b>	<b>60.00</b>	<b>78763.30</b>	<b>224890.00</b>	<b>146126.70</b>

**Table 5.11 : Out of pocket expenses required for the crops grown on the allotted lands in Thane district for the year 1978-79**

(Figures in the bracket indicate the number of allottees incurring the expenditure)

Taluka	No. of allottees cultivating allotted land	Seed Rs.	Manure Rs.	Fertiliser Rs.	Insecticide Rs.	Labour Rs.	Expenditure over hiring bullocks Rs.	Total Rs.
Talasari	123	126.0 (7)	-	195.0 (3)	3.0 (1)	-	175.0 (6)	499.0 (12)
Dahanu	109	277.0 (11)	400.0 (2)	600.0 (4)	-	800.0 (3)	835.0 (27)	2912.0 (31)
Palghar	58	270.0 (4)	60.0 (1)	1323.0 (12)	-	1585.0 (14)	905.0 (14)	4143.0 (21)
Jawhar	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shahapur	45	-	-	-	-	-	250.0 (4)	250.0 (4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>673.0 (22)</b>	<b>460.0 (3)</b>	<b>2118.0 (19)</b>	<b>3.0 (1)</b>	<b>2385.0 (17)</b>	<b>2165.0 (51)</b>	<b>7804.0 (68)</b>

**Table 5.12 : Out of pocket expenses required for the crops grown on the allotted lands in Yavatmal district for the year 1977-78**

Taluka	No. of grantees	Cultivated area (Hectares)	Fallow (Hectares)	Tillage cost Rs.	Fertilizer cost Rs.	Other costs Rs.	Total cost Rs.	Value of produce Rs.
Yavatmal	168	268.11	42.95	16528	7787	16785	41100	152936
Darwaha	124	176.46	60.27	16378	14883	10546	41807	101887
Pusad	241	394.65	83.13	17695	8851	17818	44364	179981
Wani	107	183.14	29.69	4601	2917	16615	24133	110613
Kelapur	180	313.94	29.11	10552	14159	24705	49416	209187
<b>Total</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>1336.30</b>	<b>245.15</b>	<b>65754</b>	<b>48597</b>	<b>86469</b>	<b>200820</b>	<b>754604</b>

after the harvest of the crop or served as labourers for a certain number of days on the bullock owner's farm in exchange for the tillage. In Yavatmal district cash expenses on tillage were not separately available. It may be seen from Table 5.10 that in Solapur district, the total amount of cash spent on tillage was as large as Rs.78,820. The average amount spent on tillage per hectare came to Rs.114.07. In Aurangabad district the average cash expenditure on tillage came to Rs.98.31 per hectare. In these two districts the average amount of cash spent on tillage per hectare was substantially large in comparison with the other items of cash expenditure. This was mainly because, most of the allottees were required to undertake operations like ploughing and harrowing of the allotted lands several times to bring the lands under cultivation. Ploughing in particular, was such an important and costly operation that, it alone had accounted for more than half of the average cash expenditure on tillage per hectare. It was reported that tillage and particularly the pre-sowing operations were of the utmost importance in the case of the allotted lands, as large portion of them were brought under cultivation for the first time.

It is important to note that some of the allottees in all the four districts had reported cash expenditures on manure and fertilizers applied to the crops grown on their allotted lands. The number of such allottees, however, was small. It was observed from the data that manure and fertilizers were applied to the selected crops like cotton, hybrid jowar, hybrid bajra and high yielding wheat. The average amount of

cash expenses reported on manure and fertilizers varied between Rs.3 to Rs.15 per hectare. The cash expenses, particularly on fertilizers were low, mainly because most of the allottees had received fertilizers from the cooperative societies under the crop loan scheme and had bought only the additional quantities of fertilizers required by them from the market. As against this, there were other allottees who did not use for their crops, even the fertilizers received under the crop-loan scheme and preferred to sell it for cash to other cultivators in their village.

It may be seen from the tables that the total cash expenditures incurred by the allottees on all the crops grown by them was Rs.78,763 in Aurangabad district; Rs.1,01,662 in Solapur district, Rs.7,804 in Thane district; and Rs.2,00,820 in Yavatmal district. The average total cash spent on all the crops came to Rs.132.5 per hectare in Aurangabad district; Rs.147 per hectare in Solapur district; Rs.36.55 per hectare in Thane district; and Rs.150.28 per hectare in Yavatmal district. As noted earlier, more than three-fourths of the total average cash expenditure was incurred on tillage alone and the rest on inputs like seeds, manure and fertilizers. We calculated the value of produce reported by the allottees at the harvest prices prevailing in their villages. It may be seen from the tables that the total value of produce reported by all the allottees was more than Rs.2.24 lakhs for the year 1978-79 in Aurangabad district; Rs.1.71 lakhs in Solapur district; Rs.81,708 in Thane district; and Rs.7.54 lakhs in Yavatmal district. The average value of produce per hectare come to Rs.378 in

Aurangabad district; Rs.247 in Solapur district; Rs.383 in Thane district; and Rs.565 in Yavatmal district. This means, on the aggregate level, the average surplus, over and above the cash expenditures incurred by the allottees, came to Rs.246 per hectare in Aurangabad district; Rs.100 per hectare in Solapur district; Rs.346 per hectare in Thane district; and Rs.415 per hectare in Yavatmal district.

The average cash expenses of cultivation, value of production, and the surplus over and above the cash expenditures depended on a number of factors, about which we did not have adequate data. However, it would be wrong to consider the average surplus as average profit and as such the income of the allottees from the allotted lands. This average surplus might come nearer to the "farm business income" for the allottees but even that will have to be considered with great reservations. The essential reason for this was that we had not covered all the items of cultivation costs borne by the allottees. Our data about cost of cultivation were limited only to out-of-pocket expenses actually paid by the allottees. To calculate the total cost of production we did not have data about the value of family labour, hired human and bullock labour, home-collected manure, depreciation on implements, etc., interest paid on crop loans and miscellaneous other expenses. Despite these limitations, the surplus earned per allottee indicated broadly that given the proper management and the necessary inputs the allotted lands could deliver a farm business income. Whether this would be commensurate with the income from the alternate employment in which the allottee and other earners in the family were previously engaged, is difficult to say.

#### 5.4 Crop Loans and Crop Assistance

Under Circular No. ICH 1376/5993-L-7, dated 29th January 1976, the Government of Maharashtra, issued instructions to the concerned officials that each allottee of surplus land should immediately be enlisted as a member of the village society, so that he could obtain crop loan to meet his immediate requirements of seeds, fertilizers, and cash expenses of cultivation. As per the instructions from the Government, almost all the allottees in the four districts were enrolled as members of the primary Credit Society in their respective village and a majority of them were given crop loans for cultivation of the surplus lands allotted to them. In Tables 5.13 to 5.16, we give the number of such allottees and the amounts of crop-loans granted to them in the four districts. It may be noted that the relevant data of crop loans was available for three years (1976-77 to 1978-79) in the case of Aurangabad and Solapur districts; for two years (1976-77 and 1977-78) in the case of Yavatmal district and only for one year (1977-78) in the case of Thane district. It may be observed from the Tables 5.13 that in Aurangabad district the number of borrowing allottees had gone down from year to year during the three year period. In the first year 1976-77, the borrowing allottees were around 67 per cent of the total sample with an average borrowing of Rs.582 per allottee. In the subsequent two years 1977-78 and 1978-79, the borrowing allottees of the total sample were 47 per cent and 27 per cent with an average borrowing per allottee of Rs.490 and Rs.424 in the two respective years. In Solapur district, the borrowing allottees were about 64 per cent of the total in the first year 1976-77 and

Table 5.13 : Crop loan distributed, repayment, subsidy and outstanding of loanee all

	1976-77				1977-78						
	No. of borro- wing alot- tees	Cash	Rate- repa- ment value	Sub- sidy Prin- cipal	No. of borro- wing alot- tees	Cash	Rate- Repay- ment value	Sub- sidy Prin- cipal			
Ambad	104	39629	13208	43987	40210	8850	27405	11785	22756	20	
Jaina Bhokardan Jafrahad	63	22450	25121	28393	23460	19178	10130	5537	7015	61	
Sillod Soegaon	44	14720	12157	24525	17760	2453	16124	8705	19685	168	
Palchan	16	4335	5091	6250	5563	3176	3570	3940	5294	41	
Veljapur Gangapur Kanned	35	12962	2875	1020	1020	14817	2610	-	575	-	
Total	262	94096	58452	104175	88013	48474	163	59839	29967	55325	476

\* Includes Rs. 101/- Interest outstanding



**Table 5.14 : Crop-loans received by the allottees in Solapur district for 1976 to 1979**

Taluka	1976-77			1977-78			1978-79		
	Allottees receiving crop loans	Total amount of crop loans	Average amount of crop loans	Allottees receiving crop loans	Total amount of crop loans	Average amount of crop loans	Allottees receiving crop loans	Total amount of crop loans	Average amount of crop loans
North Solapur	58	18,295	315.45	69	22,390	324.49	46	17,830	371.46
South Solapur	75	22,060	294.13	61	17,840	292.46	51	14,095	276.37
Barshi	65	20,815	320.23	82	25,900	315.85	76	29,760	391.58
Akkalkot	39	9,200	235.90	42	13,800	328.57	45	18,270	406.00
Madha	17	5,320	312.94	21	4,500	214.29	9	2,930	325.56
Malsiras	46	13,950	303.26	40	18,600	465.00	5	1,820	364.00
Karmala	39	12,130	311.03	42	18,855	448.93	19	11,660	613.68
Sangola	27	9,135	338.33	29	14,737	508.17	18	9,620	534.44
<b>Total</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>1,10,905</b>	<b>303.02</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>1,36,622</b>	<b>353.94</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>1,05,985</b>	<b>391.09</b>

**Table 5.15 : Crop-loans received by the allottees in Thane district for the year 1978-79**

Taluka	No. of allottees receiving crop loan	Amount of the crop loan Rs.	Amount of the crop loan per allottee Rs.	No. of allottees who repaid the crop loan	Amount repaid Rs.	Per cent of crop loan repaid
Talasari	11	3,304	300.3	5	1,212	36.9
Dahanu	38	6,554	172.5	32	4,502	68.6
Falghar	28	6,291	224.7	10	1,404	22.3
Jawhar	23	4,100	178.3	4	203	5.0
Shahapur	4	500	125.0	—	—	—
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>20,749</b>	<b>199.5</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>7,321</b>	<b>35.3</b>

**Table 5.16 : Crop loans received by the allottees in Yavatmal district for 1976-77 and 1977-78**

Taluka	1976-77		1977-78	
	Number of allottees	Total amount of crop loans	Number of allottees	Total amount of crop loans
Yavatmal	139	51,665	99	36,249
Darwaha	116	43,502	92	33,005
Fusad	168	64,813	140	28,305
Wani	104	40,747	87	16,275
Kelapur	203	59,608	152	56,451
<b>Total</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>2,60,132</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>1,70,285</b>

their average amount of crop-loan stood at Rs.303 per allottee. In the following year 1977-78, the proportion of the borrowing allottees had gone upto 67 per cent and their average amount of borrowing to Rs.354 per allottee. In the third year, however, the proportion of allottees securing crop-loans dwindled to 47 per cent; while the average amount of crop-loan per allottee had increased to Rs.391. In Yavatmal district the proportion of the allottees getting crop-loans was around 72 per cent in the first year 1976-77 and their average amount of crop-loan came to Rs.356. In the following year (1977-78) the proportion of borrowing allottees and their average amount of borrowing had both declined to 56 per cent and Rs.299 respectively. In general it may be observed that in the three districts the proportion of borrowing allottees had declined from the first year to the second and third years. The average amount of crop-loan per allottee also showed the same trend. This was mainly because many of the allottees who had borrowed in the first and the second years could not repay their crop loans and had become defaulters. They, therefore, were not eligible to borrow any crop loan in the following year. Looking to the average amount borrowed per allottee in the years 1977-78 and 1978-79 and the cropping pattern for the year 1977-78 (Yavatmal district) and 1978-79 (Aurangabad and Solapur districts), it is clear that the amount granted as crop loan was sufficient to meet the input requirement of the allottees and non-availability of crop-loan from the cooperative societies was not because of nonavailability of funds but on account of default in repayment by the borrowing allottees.

~~difficult to repayments by the borrowing allottees.~~

In Thane district the total number of allottees securing crop-loans in 1977-78 was 104 or 22.17 per cent of the total sample allottees and their average amount of crop-loan came to Rs.200 per allottee. As pointed out earlier, the Central Scheme of Assistance was not applicable to Thane district as it was under the Small Farmers' Development Agency. The SFDA does not operate a subsidy or give any assistance on crop-loans. The allottees in Thane district, therefore, could not receive the same facilities in the matter of cropping, as were available to the allottees in the other districts. However, in Thane district the facility of securing consumption loan was available and we observed that a number of allottees had received such loans through the Growth Centres under the Adivasi Sub-Plan. <sup>(See Table 5-17)</sup> The Consumption loans had a special significance in this area. These loans were given to the Adivasis at the beginning of the rains when they had exhausted their stock of foodgrains from the crop grown in the previous year. This helped to maintain their expenditure on the purchase of foodgrains during the monsoon and encouraged them to work on their allotted lands instead of seeking employment elsewhere. Such consumption loans were received by 128 or about 27.29 per cent of the total allottees in 1978-79. It may be observed that the financial assistance made available to the allottees in Thane district under the schemes of consumption loan, crop-loan, SFDA, etc., was much short of the crop assistance and crop-loans given to the allottees in the other districts under the Central Assistance Scheme.

Table 5.12 : Village-wise number of allottees getting consumption loans and crop loans in Thane district for the year 1978-79

Taluka and Village	Number of allottees	No. of allottees getting consumption loan	No. of allottees getting crop loan
<u>Talassari</u>			
Kurse	19	3	-
Varuvade	58	25	1
Vadavale	43	11	1
Vaveoji	1	-	-
Zai	9	-	9
Total	130	39	11
<u>Dahanu</u>			
Modgaon	3	3	-
Ambersari	44	21	-
Chari	10	-	2
Jamshet	56	2	36
Kolavelli	5	-	-
Total	118	26	38
<u>Palghar</u>			
Akkarpatti	24	-	-
Alyali	11	-	-
Shrugaon	11	-	-
Umbarpada	2	-	-
Tembhoda	2	-	-
Durvas	60	27	28
Total	110	27	28
<u>Jawhar</u>			
Kale	9	7	2
Kyuhale	21	15	21
Total	30	22	23
<u>Shahapur</u>			
Atgaon	29	9	-
Dhamant	29	-	-
Musal	2	1	-
Shirvanjo	2	-	-
Sakurli	4	-	4
Birwadi	15	4	-
Total	81	14	4
Grand Total	469	128	104

As mentioned in the first chapter, the Government of India formulated a Central Sector Plan Scheme to provide financial assistance to the allottees so that they could take to efficient cultivation of the surplus lands assigned to them. The Government of Maharashtra decided to avail of the Central Scheme to the maximum extent possible and accordingly issued instructions to the concerned officials under the Resolution No. ICH-3276/51225-L-7, dated 1st November 1976, as regards the procedure to be adopted for providing financial assistance to the allottees and the extent of assistance payable to each of them. The instructions were as follows :

"Allottees of surplus land to whom crop-loan had actually been granted by primary credit society should be held eligible to get crop-assistance. The Collector should obtain from the District Deputy Registrars of Cooperative Societies villagewise lists of allottees to whom crop loan has been sanctioned by primary credit society, giving names, addresses, extent of land actually allotted, and the amount of crop loan actually granted in each case. The amount payable to each such allottee should then be arrived at by first dividing the amount placed at the disposal of the Collector by the number of eligible allottees. Each allottee would be eligible to get crop assistance of the amount so arrived at subject to the outside limit of Rs.250 per hectare per person for two seasons. The amount so payable to the allottee by way of subsidy or grant for crop assistance should be placed at the disposal of the District Central Cooperative Bank or the concerned financing agency.

On receipt of the amount and the above particulars,

**Table 5.18: Crop loan disbursed, repayment, subsidy and outstanding of loanee grantees in**

Taluka	No. of borrow- ing grant- ees	1976-77 Loan Lifted			No. of borrow- ing grant- ees			
		Cash	Materials value	Repayment principal		Subsidy	Outstand- ing	
Ambad	104	39629.00	13208.00	43987.00	40210.00	8850.00	89	
Jalna Bhokardan Jafraabad	63	22450.00	25121.00	28393.00	23460.00	19178.00	30	
Sillod Soegaon	44	14720.00	12157.00	24525.00	17760.00	2453.00	39	
Palthan	16	4335.00	5091.00	6250.00	5563.00	3176.00	15	
Valjapur Gangapur Kannad	35	12962.00	2875.00	1020.00	1020.00	14817.00	10	
Taluka		No. of borrowing grantees			Cash			Materials value
Ambad	51	15850.00			5720.00			
Jalna Bhokardan Jafraabad	9	3170.00			285.00			
Sillod Soegaon	28	9960.00			5200.00			
Palthan	9	1890.00			1996.00			
Valjapur Gangapur Kannad	11	1775.00			-			



Table 5.2: Crop assistance received by the allottees in Yavatmal District for 1976-77 and 1977-78

Taluka	1976-77				1977-78			
	No. of allottees	Amount of crop loans	Amount of subsidy	Proportion	No. of allottees	Amount of crop loans	Amount of subsidy	Proportion
Yavatmal	139	51,665	49,540	95.89	99	36,249	20,459	56.44
Darwaha	116	43,502	40,225	92.47	92	33,005	14,225	43.10
Pusad	168	64,813	55,750	86.02	140	28,305	13,650	48.22
Wani	104	40,747	35,850	87.91	87	16,275	7,665	47.10
Kelapur	203	59,608	51,509	86.41	152	56,451	29,375	52.04
<b>Total</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>2,60,132</b>	<b>2,32,874</b>	<b>89.52</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>1,70,285</b>	<b>85,374</b>	<b>50.14</b>

**Table 5.20 : Proportion of overdues to the crop loans received by the sample allottees in Solapur district for 1976 to 1979**

Taluka	1976-77						1977-78					
	Amount of crop loans	Amount of subsidy	Amount repaid	Total	Amount overdue	Proportion of dues to total loan	Amount of crop loans	Amount of subsidy	Amount repaid	Total	Amount overdue	Proportion of dues to total loan
North Solapur	18,295	-	482	482	17,813	97.37	22,390	-	63	63	22,327	99.72
South Solapur	22,060	1,350	210	1,560	20,500	92.93	17,840	300	91	391	17,449	97.81
Barshi	20,815	9,935	2,843	12,778	8,037	38.61	25,900	19,120	3,365	22,485	3,415	13.19
Akkalkot	9,200	5,750	736	6,486	2,714	29.50	13,800	9,565	1,682	11,247	2,553	18.50
Nadha	5,320	4,220	614	4,834	486	9.14	4,500	-	465	465	4,035	89.67
Malsiras	13,950	9,964	2,106	12,070	1,880	13.48	18,600	1,800	773	2,573	16,027	86.17
Karmala	12,130	9,290	1,225	10,515	1,615	13.31	18,855	3,055	5,224	8,279	10,576	56.09
Sangola	9,135	7,819	867	8,686	449	4.92	14,737	10,675	1,936	12,611	2,126	14.43
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,10,905</b>	<b>48,328</b>	<b>9,083</b>	<b>57,411</b>	<b>53,494</b>	<b>48.23</b>	<b>1,36,622</b>	<b>44,515</b>	<b>13,599</b>	<b>58,114</b>	<b>78,508</b>	<b>57.46</b>

Contd.

**Table 5.20 : Contd.**

Taluka	1978-79					
	Amount of crop loans	Amount of subsidy	Amount repaid	Total	Amount overdue	Proportion of dues to total loan
North Solapur	17,830	-	63	63	17,676	99.14
South Solapur	14,095	750	-	750	13,345	94.68
Barshi	29,760	965	-	965	28,795	96.76
Akkaikot	18,270	2,737	1,372	4,109	14,161	77.51
Nadha	2,930	-	-	-	2,930	100.00
Malsiras	1,830	-	-	-	1,830	100.00
Karnala	11,660	-	-	-	11,660	100.00
Sangola	9,620	-	-	-	9,620	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,05,985</b>	<b>4,452</b>	<b>1,435</b>	<b>5,887</b>	<b>1,00,098</b>	<b>94.45</b>

1978-79 most of the sample allottees in the three districts had completed their two seasons of receiving crop assistance and were not entitled to get it any further. They were, therefore, dropped from the Central Scheme of financial assistance. In 1978-79, therefore, crop assistance was provided only to those who had not yet completed the course of two seasons.

It is interesting to note that in 1977-78/1978-79, when the Central Scheme of providing crop-assistance was almost over, the proportion of overdues to the total amount of crop-loans was the highest in all the three districts. In Solapur district, for example, the proportion of overdues to the total amount of crop-loans was as high as 94.45 per cent in 1978-79. In four of the eight sample talukas in this district, the crop-loans taken in 1978-79 were not repaid at all and the entire amount was overdue. All the borrowing allottees in the four talukas had become defaulters. In Aurangabad district also the proportion of the defaulter allottees was as high as 72 per cent in 1978-79 and the amount overdue from them was around 87 per cent of the total amount of crop-loans. Similar was the case in Yavatmal district for the year 1977-78. As against this, the proportions of the defaulter allottees and their overdues in all the three districts were considerably low in the first two years (1976-77 and 1977-78) when crop-assistance under the Central Scheme was available. It, therefore, appears obvious that the recovery of crop-loans shown in these two years was mostly the result of adjustment of the crop-assistance towards the repayment of crop loans.

It may be concluded from the above discussion

that the allottees in the three districts, without any such external non-repayable crop-assistance, were not in a position to continue cultivation of the allotted lands on their own. Presumably this was due to the poor quality of lands allotted to them.

#### 5.5 Measures to Improve the Allotted Lands

During the course of our investigation the sample allottees in the four districts were asked as to what further land development was necessary to cultivate the allotted lands better and what was the nature of development they wished to undertake. Most of the allottees in each district aspired to bring their allotted lands under well irrigation and none of them had any other development in view such as land levelling, bunding, etc. These aspirations were to an extent quite natural looking to the cultivators with their own irrigation facility. It was observed from the data that nearly one-fourth to one-third of the sample allottees in each of the four districts wished to have a well for irrigation purposes. A few of them, however, had moved in the matter and had approached the Land Development Bank/Nationalized Banks for loans to sink new wells in their allotted lands. In the remaining cases no efforts or enquiries were made by them whether any loan facility was available from any financing agency and under the circumstances having a irrigation well might be more of wishful thinking than a positive intention.

It was, however, observed from the data that a good scope for introducing well irrigation on some of the allotted lands, existed in all the four districts. But

the size of allotted holding and the cultivable area thereon were the major constraints which almost prohibited sinking new wells for irrigation purposes. Under the circumstances community wells could be a solution to the problem if the allottees of the neighbouring holdings and also the cultivators intervening between their lands, could make use of such wells, sunk entirely at the cost of the Government. It would be more economical from the point of view of the Society to give free community wells to groups of four to five allottees with contiguous allotted lands or to groups of four to five cultivators including some allottees. Such wells would have to be completed entirely at the cost of the Government and through Government Agencies. This might ensure their completion and avoid misutilisation of the loans on the part of the small landholders and the allottees.

Community wells were feasible where the allotted lands were more or less contiguous, which meant that only a small number of allottees having such areas would be benefited. Other measures of improvements in order to increase productivity of the allotted lands have, therefore, to be thought out to benefit all the allottees. Introduction of the hybrid and high yielding varieties of seeds will be such a measure which may improve productivity of the allotted lands. As we have seen earlier, most of the allottees in the four districts had grown traditional varieties of food crops like jowar, bajara, wheat and paddy. Only a small number of them had ventured to grow hybrid jowar, hybrid bajara and high yielding varieties of paddy and wheat on small plots of their allotted lands. In Thane district, 22

we observed that the 'Zilla Parishad' had undertaken a programme of distributing improved varieties of paddy free of charge to the allottees of the surplus lands in 1976-77. Some of the sample allottees in the district did take advantage of the scheme and grew the improved varieties of paddy on their allotted lands. But the Thane Zilla Parishad did not repeat the programme in subsequent years and as a result the allottees discontinued to grow the improved varieties of paddy and had gone back to the traditional varieties of the crop. It appears from this experiment that the Government of Maharashtra should undertake a programme of free distribution of hybrid and high yielding varieties of seeds to the allottees of surplus lands and continue it over a definite period of some years at least so that the allottees should get used to those varieties and continue to grow them on their own.

In Thane district it was observed that some of the allottees were given the seeds of superior varieties of paddy like Jaya, Ratna, and Taichung which were not suited to the type of lands allotted to them. Hardly a few allottees had received the seeds of Karjat-184, and Ratnagiri-24 varieties, which were suited to the inferior soils. Many of the allottees in the district reported that the improved early varieties of paddy like Karjat-184, Ratnagiri-24, Ratnagiri-711-4-1, Palghar-60, E.K.-70, etc., which were suited to inferior soils, should have been distributed to them instead of the high yielding varieties like Jaya and Ratna, which were suited only to the superior soils.

Another important measure to improve productivity

of the allotted lands is to encourage the use of fertilizers and insecticides. As we noticed earlier, fertilizers were largely applied to the cash crops like cotton and groundnut. The food crops like jowar, bajara, paddy, etc., were mostly not given any dose of fertilizers, even though the fertilizers were supplied to the allottees under the crop-loan scheme. It was observed that some of the allottees preferred to sell the fertilizers supplied under crop-loans to other cultivators. Such cases might not occur if the scheme of consumption loans, as introduced in the Thane district, is made applicable to other districts as well, and the needy allottees are helped to meet the family food requirements, particularly in the rainy season.

Thus, introduction of well irrigation wherever possible, free distribution of hybrid and high yielding varieties of seeds, and liberal use of fertilizers and insecticides were the three important measures which should be taken by the Government in order to raise productivity of the distributed surplus lands and to render cultivation of such lands profitable to the allottees.



CHAPTER VIALLOTMENT OF SURPLUS LAND AND ECONOMIC  
CONDITIONS OF ALLOTTEES

In this chapter we propose to deal with the last objective of the study viz. "to assess the overall success of the programme particularly with reference to whether there is any marked improvement in the economic conditions of the allottees." In this context we analyse the data about the annual income accrued to the allottees from cultivation of the surplus lands allotted to them in the four districts, and the annual income received from other occupations pursued by them during the year 1977-78 (Yavatmal) and 1978-79 (other three districts). The income accrued from cultivation of the allotted lands could be an important measure of the improvement in the economic conditions of the allottees achieved through the distribution of surplus lands. We, therefore, attempt to examine what proportion of the total annual income of the allottees was received from cultivation of the surplus lands allotted to them. Before going on to the agricultural income, and the total annual income, we will see the occupational pattern followed by the allottees.

As we have seen earlier, majority of the allottees in the four districts, cultivated their allotted lands themselves. The remaining allottees, however, had either left their allotted lands uncultivated since allotment or leased-out to other cultivators in their village. While analysing the income data we have to treat these two groups of allottees separately in order to bring out specifically the impact of allotment of surplus land on

the economic conditions of the allottees. It is obvious that the allottees who did not cultivate the allotted lands were not at all affected by the programme of distribution of surplus land. The allottees who leased-out their allotted lands to other cultivators for cultivation were benefited only to the extent of cash/kind rent which they received. The allottees who cultivated the allotted lands themselves were the ones who would show the impact of the programme of distribution of surplus lands on their economic conditions. It may, however, be noted that the income data of the allottees, classified into two above mentioned groups, were available only in the case of Solapur district and in our following analysis we have to depend heavily on this district alone. In the other three districts, the income data of all the allottees were treated together and therefore, the impact of the distribution of surplus lands could not be clearly shown.

#### 6.1 Allottees Cultivating the Allotted Lands

(1) Occupational Pattern : In Table 6.1 we present the distribution of the allottees in the Solapur district, who were cultivating their allotted lands, according to their main occupation as reported by them. It may be seen from the table that majority of the allottees reported casual agricultural labour as their main occupation. The proportion of such allottees (201) was as high as 41.45 per cent of the total allottees reporting cultivation of their allotted lands. The second largest group was of 163 allottees who reported agriculture as their main occupation. They were one-third (33.60 per cent) of the total allottees who had taken to cultivation of the

**Table 6.1 : Distribution of the allottees who were cultivating the allotted surplus land according to their main occupation in Solapur district**

Taluka	Agri- cul- ture	Agri- cultu- ral labour	Non- agri- cultu- ral labour	Trade	Sala- ria- tes	Bull- ock cart trans- port	Car- pen- try	Black- smithy	Tail- oring	Shee- making	Poul- try keep- ing	Dairy- ing	Total
North Solapur	52	6	-	-	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86
South Solapur	57	18	3	3	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	112
Barshi	16	70	-	6	7	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	102
Akkalkot	4	31	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	42
Wadha	16	14	1	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	35
Malsiras	5	22	-	1	5	5	1	-	-	1	-	-	40
Karmala	6	32	-	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47
Sangola	7	8	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	3	1	-	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>485</b>

allotted lands. These two groups of allottees taken together covered three-fourths (75.05 per cent) of the allottees cultivating the allotted lands. The rest of the allottees (121) were mainly engaged in varied activities like trade, bullock-cart transport, carpentry, blacksmithy and salaried jobs. Amongst these allottees, the group of salarieds was rather large compared to other occupations. It may be seen from the table that as many as 31 allottees reported salaried jobs as their main occupation. Many of them were employed as peons and clerks in the cooperative credit societies and the grampanchayat offices.

(2) Annual Income : We may now examine the annual total income received by these allottee families from the varied activities pursued by their members as the main or subsidiary occupations. It may be noted that the incomes received by the allottees from different occupations except agriculture, were those reported by the allottees themselves. Agricultural income, if we may call it, was, however, different. It was not reported by the allottees; but has been derived on the basis of the data available to us. In fact it was the surplus over cash expenditures paid out for cultivation of the surplus lands and as such it could not be treated as net income or even farm business income. Farm business income will have to be arrived at after deducting the costs which would include value of family and hired labour, value of family and hired bullock labour, value of farm-produced and for purchased seeds, value of home-collected and for purchased manure, depreciation on implements, etc., land revenue, cess and taxes, etc., and interest on crop-loans. Of these items of cost, we

had data only on a few items, such as value of purchased seeds, manure and fertilizers and tillage expenses. We, therefore, could not arrive at a reasonable estimate of farm business income of the allottees. The agricultural income of the allottees in Solapur district, presented in Tables 6.2 and 6.3 was thus the surplus over and above the cash expenses incurred by the allottees for cultivation of their allotted lands.

It may be noted from Table 6.2 that, on the aggregate level, the average annual income per allottee family, came to Rs.2,790 from all sources. Amongst different sources of income, casual agricultural labour was the major source contributing nearly 35 per cent of the average annual income per allottee family. Casual agricultural labour was distantly followed by salaried income (26 per cent) while, contribution from agriculture (17 per cent) took the third place. The shares of contribution to the average annual income from other sources like trade, bullock-cart transport, independent occupations, etc., were less than 5 per cent individually. On the whole, it appears that income from agriculture was too meagre to provide a reasonable living to the allottee families in the district. Most of the allottee families, therefore, continued to depend, as before receiving the surplus lands, mainly on agricultural labour work or on other occupations available in the village.

(3) Agricultural Income : The agricultural income received by the allottees from cultivation of the allotted lands and its proportion to the total annual income from all sources are presented in Table 6.3. It

**Table 6.2: Annual income of the allottees who were cultivating the allotted land in Solapur District**

Taluka	Agriculture			Agricultural Labour			Non-agricultural Labour		
	Amount	Percentage	Average income	Amount	Percentage	Average income	Amount	Percentage	Average income
North Solapur	44,445	19.28	529	66,880	29.02	1,194	3,700	1.61	1,740
South Solapur	42,895	14.43	383	85,655	28.83	1,158	10,190	3.43	1,926
Barshi	55,158	20.91	541	1,12,550	42.67	1,309	15,000	1.90	774
Akkalkot	7,216	7.18	172	64,590	64.31	1,318	1,160	1.15	290
Madha	21,975	27.51	628	32,640	40.85	1,255	7,850	9.82	1,308
Malsiras	67,815	42.69	1,695	45,125	28.41	1,074	14,920	9.39	995
Karmala	28,764	30.15	612	37,875	39.70	773	5,920	6.20	846
Sangola	14,403	11.32	626	23,770	18.68	820	2,800	2.20	467
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,82,671</b>	<b>20.89</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>4,69,085</b>	<b>34.66</b>	<b>1,141</b>	<b>51,540</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>845</b>

Contd...

Table 6.2: (Continued)

Taluka	Trade			Salaried Employment			Independent Occupations		
	Amount	Percentage	Average income	Amount	Percentage	Average income	Amount	Percentage	Average
North Solapur	-	-	-	97,720	42.39	3,152	4,310	1.87	1,078
South Solapur	6,000	2.02	2,000	1,29,030	43.42	3,308	7,300	2.46	1,217
Barshi	13,000	4.93	2,167	48,090	18.23	1,658	12,270	4.65	767
Akkalkot	7,200	7.17	2,400	3,200	3.19	800	3,850	3.83	770
Madha	-	-	-	7,885	9.87	3,943	1,950	2.44	488
Malsiras	1,700	1.07	1,700	16,370	10.31	1,819	8,190	5.16	745
Karmala	5,250	5.50	1,313	4,600	4.82	1,533	4,800	5.03	1,200
Sangola	6,890	5.41	1,723	50,210	39.45	3,138	7,450	5.85	745
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,040</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>1,907</b>	<b>3,57,105</b>	<b>26.39</b>	<b>2,685</b>	<b>50,120</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>835</b>

Contd...

**Table 6.2: (Continued)** Increase from 1957-58 in the total income of the agricultural households in the Solapur District

Taluka	Bullock cart Transport etc.			Sale of milk and milk products			Unearned Income			Total		
	Amount	Per-centage	Ave-rage income	Amount	Per-centage	Ave-rage income	Amount	Per-centage	Ave-rage income	Amount	Per-centage	Ave-rage income
North Solapur	2,180	0.95	273	7,740	3.36	310	3,500	1.52	1,167	2,30,475	100.00	2,744
South Solapur	-	-	-	11,890	4.00	305	4,200	1.41	1,400	2,97,160	100.00	2,653
Barshi	400	0.15	400	6,380	2.42	398	10,920	4.14	1,820	2,63,768	100.00	2,586
Akkalkot	500	0.50	500	5,400	5.38	450	7,320	7.29	2,440	1,00,436	100.00	2,391
Madha	-	-	-	1,000	1.25	200	6,600	8.26	2,200	79,900	100.00	2,283
Malsiras	2,800	1.76	560	600	0.38	600	1,320	0.83	1,320	1,58,840	100.00	3,971
Karmala	-	-	-	800	0.84	400	7,400	7.76	925	95,409	100.00	2,030
Sangola	-	-	-	2,300	1.81	767	19,450	15.28	1,621	1,27,273	100.00	5,534
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,880</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>36,110</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>60,710</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>1,557</b>	<b>13,53,261</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,790</b>

Taluka



**Table 6.3: Proportion of income from allotted land in the total income of the allottees cultivating the allotted land in Solapur District**

Taluka	No. of allottees cultivating the allotted land	Cultivated area of the allotted land	Total income from all sources	Average total income	Income from the cultivated area of the allotted land	Average income from the cultivated area of the allotted land	Proportion of income from the allotted land to the total income
North Solapur	84	105.80	2,30,475	2,744	29,525	351.49	12.81
South Solapur	112	125.61	2,97,160	2,653	36,525	326.12	12.29
Barshi	102	124.38	2,63,768	2,586	52,188	511.65	19.79
Akkalkot	42	34.82	1,00,436	2,391	6,026	143.48	6.00
Madha	35	56.75	79,900	2,283	17,215	491.86	21.55
Malsiras	40	48.60	1,58,840	3,971	52,965	1324.13	33.34
Karmala	47	101.17	95,409	2,030	27,884	593.28	29.23
Sangola	23	43.52	1,27,273	5,534	9,223	401.00	7.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>640.65</b>	<b>13,53,261</b>	<b>2,790</b>	<b>2,31,551</b>	<b>477.42</b>	<b>17.11</b>

may be seen from the table that on the aggregate level, the average income per allottee from cultivation of the allotted land came to Rs.477 for the year 1978-79. Its proportion to the average annual income from all sources was around 17.11 per cent. In some of the individual talukas in Solapur district this proportion was as low as 6 to 7 per cent. These proportions indicated that the allottees could not depend wholly on the allotted land for their livelihood and they would have to pursue other occupations, as before getting the surplus land. The proportion of the agricultural income to the total was so low when we take it only as the surplus over the cash expenses incurred by the allottees for cultivation. If we consider all the items of the farm business account listed earlier, the agricultural income from the allotted land would almost be negative. However, the surplus which we have calculated over the out of pocket expenses required for cultivation, indicated broadly that given proper management and the necessary inputs, the allotted land could be improved in the long run and could deliver a reasonable farm income.

## 6.2 Allottees Not Cultivating the Allotted Land

(1) Occupational Pattern : As mentioned earlier 86 allottees in the Solapur district did not cultivate the surplus land allotted to them till 1978-79. The distribution of such allottees according to the main occupation followed by them is given in Table 6.4. It may be seen from the table that more than half of these allottees (51 out of 86 or 59 per cent) reported casual agricultural labour as their main occupation. The second

**Table 6.4: Distribution of the allottees who were not cultivating the allotted land according to their main occupation in Solapur District**

Taluka	Agricultural labour	Trade	Salaries	Tailoring	Pottery	Non-agricultural labour	Total
North Solapur	6		2	-			8
South Solapur	2		-	-			2
Barghi	5	1	1	-			7
Akkalkot	4		3	1		3	11
Madha	-		-	-			-
Malsiras	12	2	4	-	2	2	22
Karwala	7		1	1	1	1	11
Sangola	15	2	4	-		4	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>86</b>

largest group of such allottees was that of 15 allottees who reported services as their principal occupation. Most of these allottees were employed in the Army as "jawans" or as peons in the Tahasildar's office in the Solapur city. Non-agricultural labour was the main occupation of ten other allottees, who were engaged as helpers to masons and carpenters, etc., in their villages. The remaining ten allottees reported independent occupations like tailoring, pottery and trade as their main occupation. Of these, five allottees reporting trade as their main occupation had petty shops of bottle leaves and vegetables, etc., in their respective village.

(2) Annual Income : In Table 6.5 we give the annual total income of the allottee families which did not cultivate the lands allotted to them. It may be seen from the table that the average annual income per allottee family under this category came to Rs.1,274 from all sources. On the aggregate <sup>level</sup> casual agricultural labour was the major source of income of such allottee families in all the sample talukas. Its contribution to the average total income per allottee family was as high as 44 per cent. Casual agricultural labour was followed by the salaried income which contributed about 30 per cent of the average annual income. Contribution from the remaining occupations like non-agricultural labour, trade, and other independent occupations was relatively small and varied between 4 and 12 per cent totalling the remaining 26 per cent. It appears from Table 6.2 and 6.5 that the average annual income of the allottee families who were cultivating the allotted lands was much higher than that of the allottee families

**Table 6.5: Annual Income of the allottees who were not cultivating the allotted land in Solapur District**

Taluka	Agricultural Labour			Non-agricultural Labour			Salarieds		
	Amount	Percentage	Average income	Amount	Percentage	Average income	Amount	Percentage	Average income
North Solapur	6,294	36.70	1,049	1,685	9.83	337	6,650	38.78	3,325
South Solapur	1,970	62.78	985	1,168	37.22	292	-	-	-
Barshi	4,790	37.00	958	3,480	26.89	435	3,109	24.02	3,109
Akkalkot	4,332	35.49	1,083	384	3.15	192	5,055	41.41	1,685
Madha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malsiras	11,688	46.83	974	1,374	5.50	229	7,756	31.07	1,939
Karmala	5,859	55.83	837	1,730	16.49	346	1,335	12.72	1,335
Sangola	12,945	45.15	863	1,684	5.87	421	9,216	32.15	2,304
<b>Total</b>	<b>47,878</b>	<b>43.71</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>11,505</b>	<b>10.50</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>33,121</b>	<b>30.23</b>	<b>2,208</b>

Contd...

Table 6.5: (Continued)

Taluka	Trade			Independent Occupations			Total		
	Amount	Percentage	Average income	Amount	Percentage	Average	Amount	Percentage	Average income
North Solapur	2,520	14.69	1,260	-	-	-	17,149	100.00	2,144
South Solapur	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,138	100.00	1,569
Barshi	1,565	12.09	1,565	-	-	-	12,944	100.00	1,849
Akkalkot	1,680	13.76	1,680	756	6.19	756	12,207	100.00	1,110
Madha	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malsiras	2,466	9.88	1,233	1,678	6.72	839	24,962	100.00	1,135
Karwala	-	-	-	1,570	14.96	785	10,494	100.00	954
Sangola	4,824	16.83	2,412	-	-	-	28,669	100.00	1,147
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,055</b>	<b>11.91</b>	<b>1,632</b>	<b>4,004</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>1,001</b>	<b>1,09,563</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>1,274</b>

who did not cultivate the allotted lands. This could mean that the allottee families who cultivated their allotted lands were economically better placed than those who did not cultivate the lands allotted to them.

6.3 Occupational Pattern of the  
Allottees in the Other  
Three Districts

Besides cultivation of their owned and allotted lands, the allottees in the remaining districts, viz., Aurangabad, Thane and Yavatmal, were engaged mainly as casual labourers in agriculture. Many of them in Thane district in particular, were employed in forestry, road construction and other works undertaken by the State Government under the Employment Guarantee Scheme. Some of the allottees or their family members had salaried jobs in the village itself. They were employed as peons and clerks in the cooperative societies and the grampanchayat offices. In Tables 6.6 to 6.8 we give the occupational distribution of the allottee families (Thane district) and the earner members of the allottee families (Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts). The occupational distribution of the allottee families as such, was not available for Aurangabad and Yavatmal districts. However, the occupational pattern followed by the allottee families was obvious from the occupations pursued by their members.

It may be seen from the tables that majority of the allottee families were mainly engaged in cultivation of the surplus lands allotted to them. Another important occupation in all the three districts was casual agricultural labour. Nearly three-fourths of the allottee

**Table 6.6: Occupational distribution of earners in the allottee families in the Aurangabad District**

Taluka	No. of families	Agriculture only	Male Adults						
			Wage labour only	Permanent farm servant	Salaried service	Other occupation	Agriculture & wage labour	Agriculture & salaried	Agriculture and other occupation
Ambad	132	9	36	22	1	10	112	1	11
Jalna ) Bhokardan ) Jafrabad )	98	11	18	13	10	11	65	7	22
Sillod ) Soegaon )	48	1	4	6	5	5	30	5	14
Paithan	40	4	3	5	-	4	25	5	12
Vaijapur ) Gangapur ) Kannad )	70	6	13	8	9	11	49	3	7
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>66</b>

Contd...



Table 6.6: (Continued)

Taluka	No. of families	Female Adults					Male Non-adult				Female non-adult wage labour only
		Agriculture only	Wage labour only	Other occupation	Agriculture & wage labour	Agriculture & other occupation	Wage labour only	Permanent farm servant	Salaried service	Other occupation	
Ambad	132	4	85	-	55	1	5	2	-	4	3
Jalna ) Bhokardan ) Jafrabad )	98	13	59	1	40	2	5	2	-	6	5
Sillod ) Soegaon )	48	7	6	-	44	2	-	-	-	-	-
Paithan	40	1	8	-	38	-	1	-	-	1	1
Vaijapur ) Gangapur ) Kannad )	70	1	31	1	43	2	1	1	-	3	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>

**Table 6.7: Occupational distribution of the allottee families in Thane District**

(Figures in the table indicate the number of allottee families)

Taluka	No. of allottee families	Agriculture	Agricultural labour	Forest labour	Other labour	Carting & renting out bullocks	Salaries	Independent occupation	Dairy-keeping	Poultry keeping
Talasari	117	110	91	5	9	17	42	2	1	39
Dahanu	117	108	90	7	4	19	19	8	-	-
Palghar	110	58	72	1	2	13	21	13	1	-
Jawhar	30	26	27	-	3	1	2	-	1	-
Solapur	81	47	55	2	29	2	27	8	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>39</b>

**Table 6.8: Occupational distribution of earners in the allottee families in the Yavatmal District**

Taluka	No. of families	Male Adults				Female Adults						
		Agri- cul- ture	Wage labour	Perma- nent farm servant	Other occu- pation	Agri- cul- ture & wage labour	Agri- cul- ture & other occu- pation	Agri- cul- ture	Wage labour	Other occu- pation	Agri- cul- ture & wage labour	Agri- cul- ture & other occu- pation
Yavatmal	205	47	15	7	17	173	27	35	13	1	160	4
Darwaha	167	10	38	-	5	160	6	3	52	-	126	-
Pusad	275	24	96	-	12	225	19	2	129	-	173	1
Wani	138	50	29	-	14	88	26	52	1	2	107	5
Kelapur	229	48	33	-	20	202	40	40	12	-	228	5
<b>District total</b>	<b>1014</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>15</b>

Contd...

Table 6.8: (Continued)

Taluka	No. of families	Male Non-adults						Female Non-adults				
		Agriculture	Wage labour	Permanent farm servant	Other occupation	Agriculture & wage labour	Agriculture & other occupation	Agriculture	Wage labour	Other occupation	Agriculture & wage labour	Agriculture & other occupation
Yavatmal	205	9	8	-	-	4	6	10	4	-	17	-
Darwaha	167	1	16	-	-	9	-	1	32	-	5	-
Pusad	275	2	35	-	-	4	3	-	28	-	2	-
Wani	138	13	4	-	-	4	2	10	1	-	5	-
Kelapur	229	22	1	-	-	21	8	23	4	-	26	3
District total	1014	47	64	-	-	42	19	44	69	-	55	3

families in each district had reported it as their subsidiary occupation. Salaried services ranked third particularly in the Thane district where nearly one-fourth of the allottee families had reported salaried employment either in the village or outside. Many of the earner members of these families were employed at the salt pans, brick kilns and on fishing boats. Some of them were employed as watchmen at the Bhatsa Dam and in the factories of the Bombay Metropolitan Area. Independent professions like trading, bullock-cart transport, basket-making, collecting grass, fire weed and 'Tendu' leaves, etc. from the nearby forests, were also reported by some of the members of the allottee families.

#### Annual Income from Different Sources

In Tables 6.9 and 6.10, we give the total annual income received by the allottee families in Thane and Aurangabad districts. Such income data were not available for the allottee families from Yavatmal district. It may be noted from the tables that, on the aggregate level, the average annual income per allottee family came to Rs.1,654 from all sources in Thane district and Rs.4,569 in Aurangabad district. Of the varied sources of income reported in the two districts, casual labour engaged in agriculture, forestry and other allied works was the major source, which had contributed nearly 30 to 40 per cent of the average annual income per allottee family. Salaried employment was another important source contributing 30 to 35 per cent of the average annual income. These two major sources of income taken together accounted for about three-fourths of the average annual income per family in both the districts.

**Table 6.9: Income earned by the allottee families from different sources in Thane District**

(Figures in the bracket indicate percent to the total income) (Rs.)

Taluka	Cultiva- tion of land	Agricul- tural labour	Forest labour	Other labour	Bullock cart trans- port & renting out bul- locks	Sale of milk & milk pro- ducts	Sale of poul- try & eggs	Income from trees and grass	Income from sa- laried employ- ment	Income from in- depen- dent occupa- tions	Un- earned income	Total income
Talasari	49,918 (21.13)	67,457 (28.55)	2,065 (0.87)	4,030 (1.71)	3,565 (1.51)	7,200 (3.05)	1,005 (0.42)	2,777 (1.17)	95,110 (40.25)	3,160 (1.34)	-	2,36,287 (100.00)
Dahanu	17,855 (9.24)	67,035 (34.70)	2,400 (1.24)	23,930 (12.39)	3,560 (1.84)	-	-	1,730 (0.90)	70,710 (36.60)	4,165* (2.15)	1,818 (0.94)	1,93,203 (100.00)
Palghar	24,985 (14.18)	62,000 (35.19)	260 (0.15)	550 (0.31)	2,840 (1.61)	100 (0.06)	-	3,076 (1.74)	58,625 (33.28)	23,650 (13.42)	100 (0.06)	1,76,186 (100.00)
Jawhar	11,847 (28.90)	21,790 (53.15)	-	2,910 (7.10)	150 (0.37)	100 (0.24)	-	-	4,200 (10.24)	-	-	40,997 (100.00)
Shahapur	12,923 (12.20)	26,945 (25.45)	650 (0.61)	17,230 (16.27)	60 (0.06)	-	-	-	44,400 (41.92)	3,700 (3.49)	-	1,05,908 (100.00)
Total	1,17,528 (15.63)	2,45,227 (32.58)	5,375 (0.71)	48,650 (6.46)	10,175 (1.35)	7,400 (0.98)	1,005 (0.13)	7,583 (1.01)	2,73,045 (36.28)	34,675 (4.62)	1,918 (0.25)	7,52,581 (100.00)

\* This does not include the income of an allottee (who was given land as a freedom-fighter) from his grocery and general shop at Kalavali. His family income from this source may exceed even Rs.30,000 per annum.

**Table 6.10 : Annual income of the allottees in the Aurangabad district from different sources in 1978-79**

Taluka	Self culti- vating Gran- tees	Income by sources							Total Income
		Wage labour	Per farm servant	Agricul- ture	Salaried	Trade & Business	Artisans & service occupat- ions	Other Income	
Ambad	130	110865	22550	50184	1014	3500	1300	10100	208639
Jalna Bhokardan Jaffrabad	96	73235	21230	30332	31913	3200	5810	8460	174180
Sillod Soegaon	45	42110	5420	25869	13800	1500	12900	7818	109417
Paithan	40	29780	5160	12979	16320	-	4250	8890	77379
Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	62	50585	6260	26763	39150	5400	4450	2090	134698

We found that the share of contribution to the average annual income from cultivation of the allotted surplus lands was very small in both the districts. It was around 15 per cent in Thane district, and 18 per cent in Aurangabad district. On the whole, the income from cultivation of the surplus lands was too meagre to provide reasonable living to the allottee families. Most of the allottee families, therefore, were required to depend mainly on agricultural labour work or other non-agricultural activity available in the village. Some of them were fortunate to get salaried jobs either in the village or outside.

#### 6.4 Summary and Conclusions

Distribution of land, declared surplus under the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1960, was started in 1962, but had not progressed much till 1975. In 1975, the Principal Act, was therefore, amended by "Maharashtra 21 of 1975", with the objective of lowering the maximum limit for ceiling on the holdings of the agricultural land in the State. Now as per the Revised Act the agricultural land in the State is classified into five categories and the ceiling limit is fixed for each of them. Thus, for dry crop lands the ceiling limit on landholdings was lowered to 54 acres, and for different types of the irrigated land, it was between 18 and 36 acres. The Revised Act also prescribed a lower maximum allocable area to an allottee at not more than 7.5 acres or 3 hectares. As a result of these two major amendments to the Principal Act, not only the declared land showed a greater surplus, but it was distributed to a larger number of landless persons.



Obviously, the average surplus area allotted to each allottee was comparatively smaller under the Revised Act than that under the Principal Act. Thus, declaration of larger area as surplus land, its distribution to larger number of allottees, and small average area of surplus land per allottee, formed the three major features of the Revised Act and all of them indicated that the Revised Act was certainly an improvement over the Principal Act. This was evident from the data analysed for the four districts. The areas of surplus lands declared surplus under the Revised Act in the four districts was three to five times bigger than the surplus areas declared under the Principal Act. The total number of allottees under the Revised Act was more than four to six times greater than that of the allottees under the Principal Act. The average area of surplus land per allottees was obviously smaller (1.15 to 1.66 hectares) under the Revised Act than that (2.35 to 7.25 hectares) under the Principal Act.

Another distinguishing feature of the Revised Act refers to reservation of 50 per cent of the surplus land for distribution to persons belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Castes, etc. We analysed the data in the four districts from the view of point of such reservation and found that nearly three-fourths of the total number of allottees in each district were from the Backward Castes. In Thane district, it being a coastal area and dominated by the Scheduled Tribes, we found that the proportion of allottees from the Scheduled Tribes was as high as 90 per cent. Thus, the data in the four districts evidently

point out that the Backward Castes had received a fair share of the distribution and more than what was reserved for them.

Most of the distribution of the surplus land under the Revised Act was done in the year 1976-77. The possession of the allotted land was also handed over to most of the allottees in the same year. As regards quality of the allotted lands in the four districts, we found that major proportion (41 to 63 per cent of the total area) was of inferior type having low fertility and low capacity to retain moisture. The proportion of lands having medium-black and deep-black soils was very low. This was expected as the choice of land to be surrendered as surplus area to the Government was entirely left to surplus landholders and naturally they surrendered such lands which were of the lowest quality in their total landholdings. Some of the surplus landholders had taken full advantage of the provision in the Act and had surrendered even uncultivable lands as surplus. Such uncultivable lands which could not be brought under cultivation even by the surplus landholders, were distributed to the landless families and the Government expected that they should bring these uncultivable lands under cultivation. It may be mentioned that the expectation itself was basically unrealistic and almost impossible to achieve. There is no wonder therefore that the programme of distribution of such surplus lands had failed. The data in the four districts evidently show that such lands were not brought under cultivation by the allottees since their allotment.

We observed from the data that the majority of the allottees in the four districts had brought their allotted lands under cultivation, wholly or partially. Thus, more than three-fourths of the total surplus lands distributed in each district was brought under cultivation. The number of allottees who did not bring under cultivation any portion of their allotted holdings was quite small in all the four districts. The proportion of their areas to the total surplus lands varied between 25 and 30 per cent. The most important reason for keeping the allotted lands uncultivated since their allotment was that these lands were all rocky and mostly uncultivable. The allottees, therefore, did not venture to bring such lands under cultivation for obvious losses that they would suffer. We feel that such lands should not have been distributed at all.

As regards the allotted lands brought under cultivation, it was observed that majority of the allottees had done this in the very year of getting possession of the land. This meant that most of the allottees were keen to put their allotted lands under cultivation and had done it immediately after getting its possession. However, all the allotted land could not be put under cultivation immediately and the allottees were required to develop the allotted lands to bring them under cultivation. They were required to incur cash expenditure in addition to their own labour, to bring their allotted lands under cultivation. The major items of expenditure for development of land were ploughing, bunding, levelling and clearing the lands of stones, pebbles, shrubs, etc. It was observed that on an average, each of the allottees

undertaking developmental work on the allotted lands, had to spend Rs.225 to Rs.460 in order to bring the allotted lands under cultivation. It appears that most of the allottees in the four districts had taken benefit of the Central Assistance Scheme for development of the allotted lands. Nearly two-thirds of the total amount spent on land development was provided by the Cooperatives and was from the Central Assistance Scheme.

The total area of the allotted land cultivated by the allottees themselves in 1977-78 and 1978-79, varied between 52 and 66 per cent of the total allotted lands in the four districts. Almost all the cultivated areas were dry lands depending mainly on rains for their cultivation. Besides the allotted lands, some of the allottees had leased-in other lands for cultivation, while some had leased-out their allotted lands to other cultivators in the village. Thus, the total area actually cultivated by the allottees was 577 hectares in Aurangabad district; 656 hectares in Solapur district; 417 hectares in Thane district; and 1431 hectares in Yavatmal district. The gross cropped area was slightly larger in each district as double cropping was reported on some portion of the cultivated land.

The cropping pattern followed by the allottees in the four districts showed that jowar, either kharif or rabi, was the most preferred crop in Aurangabad, Solapur and Yavatmal districts. In Thane district, however, paddy was the main crop grown by almost all the allottees. It was observed that more than 75 per cent of the gross cropped area in 1977-78 and 1978-79 was put

under food crops like jowar, bajara, paddy, wheat, etc. in all the four districts. This was to be expected as most of the allottees were from the lower income strata and naturally they wished to get as much foodgrains as possible to meet the <sup>cereal</sup> ~~santra~~ requirements of their families, from the lands allotted to them.

The average total cash expenses incurred by the allottees, on cultivation of the crops, grown in 1977-78 and 1978-79 came to Rs.132 per hectare in Aurangabad district; Rs.147 per hectare in Solapur district; Rs.36 per hectare in Thane district; and Rs.150 per hectare in Yavatmal district. This meant that on an average, the surplus over and above the actual cash expenditure incurred by the allottees, came to Rs.246 per hectare in Aurangabad district; Rs.100 per hectare in Solapur district; Rs.346 per hectare in Thane district; and Rs.415 per hectare in Yavatmal district.

The share of agricultural income from the allotted land in the total annual income from all sources received by the allottees in the four districts, varied between 11 and 18 per cent. It was evidently too small to provide a reasonable living to the allottee families in the districts. This was so when we defined the agricultural income as the surplus over the cash expenditure incurred by the allottees for cultivation. If we consider all the cost items on farm business account, the agricultural income from the allotted lands would be almost negative. Under such conditions, it appeared that most of the allottee families had no other alternative, but to continue their dependence either on agricultural labour work or on non-agricultural occupations available in the village.

However the surplus which we calculated over the cash expenditures required for cultivation, broadly indicated that given proper management skills and the necessary inputs, the allotted lands could be improved in the long-run so as to give a reasonable farm income to the allottees. In this connection we feel that the Central Assistance Scheme of providing development loans should not have been discontinued after two seasons. Such loans are essential for the programme of surplus land distribution to succeed and these should be made available to the allottees for some years at least so that the allotted lands could be fully developed. As regards the crop loan scheme as well, we feel that such loans should be given more on a subsidy basis till the allotted lands achieve average level of fertility and start yielding a reasonable farm income to the allottees. In order to insure the proper use of the crop loans we feel that the scheme of consumption loans, as introduced in Thane district, should be made applicable to all the districts in the State and the needy allottees should be helped to meet their family food requirements, particularly in the rainy season.

In addition to the above mentioned financial assistance provided by the Central and State Governments, other measures of improvements of the allotted lands have to be thought out to benefit all the allottees in the State. In this regard we feel that community wells should be provided wherever feasible, to irrigate the allotted lands and to improve their productivity. Such community wells should be sunk entirely at the cost of the Government and through Government Agencies. This might ensure their completion and avoid misutilization of funds by the allottees.

Hybrid and high yielding varieties of seeds should be distributed free to the allottee families for some years so that they could replace by stages the local varieties of crops and improve their yield from the surplus lands allotted to them. The Zilla Parishad in each district should undertake such programmes for some years till the allottees get used to the improved varieties of crops and continue to grow them on their own. Along with the hybrid and the high yielding varieties of crops, the need for use of fertilizers and insecticides has to be progressively emphasized.

It may be realised from the present study of the four districts that the distribution of surplus land to the landless along with Central Assistance for two seasons is not adequate enough to achieve the objective of instituting the landless on the land on a permanent basis. Notwithstanding its economic non-feasibility, the programme will have to be improved by adopting positive welfare measures such as continuation of Central Assistance Scheme for a few more years till these lands acquire the average productivity level as obtainable in the region; fully subsidized crop-loan assistance with a known consumption component; making available, free of cost, irrigation facilities from community wells, intensive extension services, etc., in order to facilitate the agriculture to acquire its rightful place in the day to day life of the landless. The need for efforts to diversify their occupation pattern by undertaking allied economic activities like dairy farming, livestock breeding, poultry farming, bullock-cart transport, etc., has already been indicated. It need not be repeated here that the welfare activities

suggested above will become meaningful only after the removal of the malpractices in the implementation itself of the programme. The fact must not be lost sight of that if the above mentioned welfare measures are not adopted, the programme will end up by adding to the ranks of the "Small Farmers."