

Thankavelu Vs. Ramesh Babu

Thankavelu Vs. Ramesh Babu

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/729449

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Aug-14-2007

Reported in : AIR2007Ker292

Judge : Pius C. Kuriakose, J.

Acts : Code of Civil Procedure (CPC) - Sections 60, 60(1) and 60(12); [Constitution of India](#) - Article 227

Appeal No. : W.P. (C) No. 15883 of 2005 (N)

Appellant : Thankavelu

Respondent : Ramesh Babu

Advocate for Def. : P.R. Venketesh and; P.R. Raja, Advs.

Advocate for Pet/Ap. : U. Muhammed Musthapa and; K. Abdul Jawad, Advs.

Judgement :

ORDER

Pius C. Kuriakose, J.

1. Whether the petitioner who makes bread and other bakery products, all by himself, for distribution/sale will qualify as a labourer for the purposes of Section 60(12){c) of the Code of Civil Procedure is the question which arises for

consideration in this writ petition under Article 227 of the Constitution.

2. The learned Munsiff under Ext. p6 order repelled the claim of the petitioner that he is a labourer and therefore his immovable property under personal occupation is exempt from attachment and sale. In his evidence as P.W.1, the petitioner-Sri. Thankavelu conceded that he owns a bakery by name 'Thankavelu Bakery' at Velanthavalam and distributes the products, bread and biscuits to other bakeries and shops in the locality. It became evident in the case that manual labour is put in by the petitioner in his bakery and that he does not have anybody else to assist him in his work. The learned Munsiff obviously thought that the property of a person who makes bakery items in a fairly large scale and supplies his products to other bakeries cannot be given immunity from attachment and sale which is intended by the Legislature to be given only for labourers who labour for wages.

3. I do not find any infirmity in the view taken by the learned Munsiff. The petitioner may be putting in manual labour. But he labours for profit and not for wages or remuneration. In order that a person shall qualify as a labourer for the purposes of Section 60(1)(c) of the Code, he has to work for wages or remuneration and not for profit. There is sufficient support in Section 60 itself for the view that labourers and domes-tie servants who are bracketed along with agriculturists in the Section 60 should be persons drawing wages, whether it be in money or in kind. (See Section 60(1)(h) and also Explanations and VI to the proviso to Section 60(1).

4. A baker who makes bread and biscuits for being supplied to other bakeries and shops, works for profit. A self-employed labourer, however hard he labours, will not qualify as labourer for the purposes of Section 60 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

5. The challenge against Ext. P3 there-fore fails. At the same time I notice that the petitioner is not in very affluent circumstances. Accordingly, I am of the view that he should be granted the facility of discharging the balance decree-debt in instalments. In fact, this Court while extending the stay imposed a condition that the petitioner shall pay Rs. 5,000/- on or before 11-2-2006. Counsel for the decree-holder submits that the above condition has not been complied with.

6. Nevertheless, even as I dismiss the writ petition, I direct the learned Munsiff to keep Ext. P3 in abeyance on condition that the petitioner pays every month commencing from 15-9-2007 at the rate of Rs. 5000/- till such time as the entire decree debt is wiped off. In the event of any single default in the matter of payment of instalments, the petitioner will forfeit the above benefit in which case the impugned order will become operative.

The writ Petition is dismissed the above directions.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com