

STUDYING IMPACT OF LAND REFORMS IN BANASKANTHA DISTRICT

STUDY CONDUCTED BY BSC RESEARCH TEAM

*BSC RESEARCH TEAM
ANITA PARMAR, ANKUR BARUAH
BIPIN PARMAR, FRANKLIN CHRISTIAN, SHEETAL
SHUKLA, VARSHA GANGULY*

DECEMBER 2006

BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCE CENTRE
St. Xavier's Non formal Education Society
St. Xavier's college campus
Ahmedabad.

List of contents

| Contents | Page no. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Chapter1: Understanding Land Reform Measures In India | 1-6 |
| Land reforms in India | 1 |
| Present issue pertaining to land in Gujarat state | 3 |
| Objectives of the study | 4 |
| <i>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</i> | 4 |
| STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT | 5 |
| Chapter 2: Analysis Of Primary Data On Land Reform In Banaskantha District | 6-30 |
| Section 1: Overview Of Primary Data (Official And Survey) | 6-15 |
| PROFILE OF BENEFICIARIES (BDS DATA) | 6 |
| Land allocation and possession | 8 |
| <i>PROFILE OF THE BENEFICIARIES (SURVEY)</i> | 9 |
| Taluka-wise distribution of the respondents | 11 |
| Area of land allotment | 11 |
| Types of lands allotted | 12 |
| Location of land allotted | 13 |
| Land measurement | 13 |
| Group allotment | 13 |
| Holding Land Documents | 14 |
| Possession over land | 14 |
| Summery of Section 1 | 14 |
| Section 2: Possession Over Land | 16-24 |
| Profile of the beneficiaries possessing allotted land | 16 |
| Possession as per area allotted | 18 |
| Possession as per type of land | 18 |
| Land allotted in Group and possession | 19 |
| Location of allotted land and possession | 19 |
| Having official documents and possession over land | 19 |
| Area and year of land allotment | 20 |
| Caste and land allotment | 20 |
| Occupation and land allotment | 21 |
| Taluka and land allotment: 1981-2004 | 21 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Types of allotted land across castes | 21 |
| Distance of land allotted from native village and possession | 22 |
| Land measurement and possession | 24 |
| Summery of section 2 | 24 |
| Section 3: No Possession Over Land | 25-28 |
| Year of allotment of land and possession over land | 25 |
| Caste and occupation of original landholders | 26 |
| Action taken for land possession after allotment | 27 |
| Reasons of not attempting for land possession | 27 |
| Assistance required for possessing allotted land | 28 |
| Summery of Section 3 | 28 |
| Chapter 3: Major Findings Of The Study And Plan For Advocacy | 29 |

Abbreviations

| | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------------|
| APL | : | Above Poverty Line |
| BDS | : | Banaskantha Jilla Dalit Sangathan |
| BPL | : | Below Poverty Line |
| IRD | : | Integrated Rural Development |
| LCA | : | Land Ceiling Act |
| OBC | : | Other Backward Classes |
| SC | : | Schedule Caste |
| ST | : | Schedule Tribe |

Glossary

- 1 Bhoodaan : Land donation movement led by Vinoba Bhave
- 2 Telangana : A
- 3 Kisan Sabha : Organization of peasants
- 4 Banaskantha Jilla Dalit Sangathan : A peoples' Organization working for Dalit rights
- 5 Taluka : Development Block
- 6 Land Hukam : Land ownership order Revenue Department
- 7 Haqpatrak/ panipatrak :
- 8 Khedutpothi /Khatawahi :
- 9 Jarayat Land :
- 10 Bagayat Land :

Executive Summery

Land reform in India has been seen as a state's historic and direct action for eradication of poverty, reduction in unemployment and inequality in the society. One of the underlying principles of land reform was to identify large landholding and distribute surplus to poor, landless and families that belong to marginalized sections of the society like dalits, adivasis and other backward classes (OBC).

THE SCENARIO IN RURAL ECONOMY MUCH HAS NOT BEEN CHANGED IN GUJARAT, ESPECIALLY FOR THE MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES, FOR WHOM LANDHOLDING DEFINES THEIR SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITION AND POSITION IN SOCIETY. THIS STUDY EXPLORES HOW MUCH LANDS HAVE BEEN ACTUALLY TRANSFERRED TO THE DALIT COMMUNITIES IN BANASKANTHA DISTRICT THROUGH LAND REFORMS IN GUJARAT. THE OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY IS TO CREATING DATABASE ON LAND REFORM IN BANASKANTHA

DISTRICT; TO KNOW EXTENT OF LAND HOLDING / POSSESSION OVER ALLOTTED LAND UNDER LCA; AND TO PLAN ADVOCACY MEASURES FOR EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF LCA THAT LEADS TO GREATER AND EFFECTIVE LANDHOLDING.

THE STUDY INITIALLY WAS STARTED WITH DATA COLLECTED BY COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATION, BANASKANTHA DALIT SANGATHAN (BDS). LATER THE RESEARCH TEAM OF BSC COMBINED DATA FROM BDS AND THE GOVERNMENT AND STARTED VISITING SELECTED VILLAGES IN ORDER TO CHECK POSSESSION OVER LAND. ACCORDING TO BDS DATA,

LAND WAS ALLOCATED TO 797 PERSONS IN BANASKANTHA DISTRICT DURING THE YEAR 1981 AND 2005. OF THEM, THERE IS NO INFORMATION ABOUT 106 THUS THE DATA ANALYSED FURTHER IS OF TOTAL 691 BENEFICIARIES. 25% OF THE TOTAL BENEFICIARIES HAS BEEN TAKEN AS SAMPLE AND HENCE, PRIMARY DATA COLLECTED FROM 186 RESPONDENTS.

The study found that more than half (55%) of beneficiaries received allotment of 3-6 acre of land, one third (30%) received 1-3 acres of land, and 11% received allotment of 6-9 acre of land. Only 7 (4%) received allotment of more than 9 acre of land. Majority (82%) of the beneficiaries received allotment of Jarayat lands. Completely irrigated land was allotted only to 4 (2%) beneficiaries. Seasonally irrigated lands to 6 (3%) beneficiaries, dry land was allotted to 9 (4%), and Bagayat land allotted 10 (5%). In all three-fourth (75%) beneficiaries received land within the village where they have been living. About a fourth (25%) of beneficiaries has received land in groups. Almost 65% of the beneficiaries received all types of documents of landholding from government.

Of total 186 beneficiaries, 72 (39%) possess land and cultivate. The average possession over land is 37% by each social category. Only 2 out of 11 female (18%) has possession over lands.

The possession over land is in greater proportion in Dhanera (43%) and Tharad (45%) taluka. Only 2 out of 11 female (18%) has possession over lands. In all 40% of

males reported possession over land. The average possession over land is 37% by SC and ST while the possession varies between 25 to 35% among OBCs. Occupationally, among casual labourers, only 8 (10%) beneficiaries reported possession while among cultivation cum labour category, a large number (69%) reported possession over land. In all 36% of IRDP list holder and 42% among non-IRDP list reported possession over lands. Inversely, 43% BPL cardholders and 36% APL cardholders has possession over lands. As the size of the land grows bigger, the proportion of possession is also increasing. Around one-third (33-35%) of beneficiaries have possession who received allotment of 1-3 acre (19 out of 56) and 3-6 acre (34 out of 103) of lands. More than 65% possess land which is >6 acres. The large number of beneficiaries (153 out of 186) was given Jarayat land; about 42% possess lands. Surprisingly, 4 beneficiaries were allotted totally irrigated land but they do not possess land. Among those with seasonally irrigated land, the possession is 50% (3 out of 6). Those having Bagayat land, the possession is very little, i.e. 10% (1 out of 10) and 2 out of 9 (22%) reported possession over dry land. Of total 39 beneficiaries, who were allotted land in group, 14 (36%) has possession over lands; 58 out of 142 (41%) has possession over land who received allotment as individual (not in group). If the land is allotted within the villages, instances of possessing it are higher. Of total 46 (land outside own village), 7 (15%) have possession over land, but of 140 (land within the village), 65 (46%) reported possession over land. The land allotted after 1990 is 1-3 acres. Mostly 3-6 acre and 6-9 acre land was allotted mainly during 1981-2000; of that, 64% of 3-6 acre land was allotted in 1981-1990 and 92% of 6-9 of land allotted in the 1981-1990. Of total 72 beneficiaries, land has been measured by the government of 38 (53%). This indicates irregularity of land records.

More than two-thirds (77%) of beneficiaries do not have possession since the land allotted, mostly over 20 years ago. While, of total 114, 26 (23%) beneficiaries once possessed lands but later left the possession. The largest number of original landholders belongs to mainly three castes - Patel (33%), Rajput (25%) and Darbar (24%); they belong to so-called 'upper caste' and hold half of the total lands redistributed under LCA. Of total 114, 64 (56%) beneficiaries did not take any action for possession of the land while 50 (44%) did act to possess allotted land. A third (30%) knew that they should approach the government office and submit written application for possession over land. The rest did not know 'what action should be taken'. Lack of information about action to be taken is one of the major reasons for not possessing allotted land under LCA. 43 (68%) informed that 'they were confused and did not know what action should be taken'. Total 12 (19%) beneficiaries reported that 'they were scared of original landowner'. In all 66 (92%) said that 'if land has been given happily by the original landowner, they would have taken it.'

The study concludes that mere official formalities cannot make land reform meaningful and successful. This needs a commitment and rigorous follow up actions to fight the vested interests. The social dynamics in an unequal society must be taken into consideration to make the land reform effective.

CHAPTER 1

UNDERSTANDING LAND REFORM MEASURES IN INDIA

Land reforms in India

In post-independence era, land is largely seen as a productive asset and therefore control over land and its utilization is considered as a key factor in socio-economic condition of the landholder. Land reform occupies a centre-stage in the context of eradication of poverty, reduction in unemployment and inequality in the society.

The process of land reform started soon after independence. It focuses on surplus land to the tillers, landless. Two laws are specifically enacted to support the process: (i) Land Tenancy Act, 1956; and (ii) Land Ceiling Act, 1960, which have undergone revisions.

One of the underlying **principles of land reform** is to identify large landholding and distribute surplus to poor, landless and families that belong to marginalized sections of the society like dalits, adivasis and other backward classes (OBC). This principle is expected to bear positive consequences, such as, reducing inequality and social conflicts, improving economic status through land cultivation and meaningful employment of the landholder and its family for agriculture produce. In this mode of operation, other principles and consequences have been undermined, such as, abolishing various tenure systems and intermediaries for bringing in uniformity in landholding and promoting raiyatwari (small landholding) system.

Any reform should be understood in its time-frame, social, political and economic situation and environment that enhance desired changes. In Indian scenario, land reform was mainly associated with cultivation and agriculture produce; the Indian National Congress party therefore appointed committee and established land office as a mechanism to implement land reform. No other political party or civil society organizations could go beyond this defined scope of land reform in India.

There are mainly **three approaches to land reforms**:

- a) Gandhian approach: Gandhiji believed in principle of trusteeship, he inspired large landholders to donate their land to tillers and Vinoba Bhave in post-independence era continued till almost late 1960s. This effort is also known as *bhoodaan* movement. This is also viewed and described as the beginning of social movement for land.
- b) Radical approach: This approach is largely inspired by Marxist analysis, therefore, the land as productive asset should be owned by those who tilled it. This ideology motivated many peasants to get organized and fight against the state for demanding equal distribution of land. Telangana movement in eastern part of south India in which women participated in large numbers for their rights over land is one of the illustrations of this approach. Operation Barga in West Bengal is another example where drive to record tenants for legal rights were achieved.

- c) Nationalist approach: This is by and large government's initiative for land distribution among the tillers. It has been taken up as agrarian reforms and a committee was formed in 1946 to look into agrarian issues and agriculture production through small landholding and cropping pattern. This committee is known by its chairperson's name, as 'Kumarappa committee' and its recommendations are often quoted in many text that describe land reforms, agriculture related issues and improvement of land, its tenure and tax as well as revenue system. **The land reform was seen as redistribution of land rather than abolishing different tenure systems and bringing uniformity.**

Land reform has undergone **different phases with time and utility of land** in given economy and economic reforms in India.

- (i) First phase (mid-1940s to 1970): Institutional reforms and Rate of growth through agrarian economy

Initially, the focus was on to abolish the intermediaries. After independence, Congress Economic Programme Committee (1948) and the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee (1949), popularly known as 'Kumarappa Committee' laid basic framework in which our agrarian relations were to be remoulded. The early 1950s witnessed the abolition of intermediaries and land reforms aimed at eradicating tenancy, especially sharecropping. securing land rights of erstwhile *ryots*. In 1972, meet of Chief Ministers provided positive thrust to the distributive aspect of the 'social justice' programme. Accordingly, land ceiling legislations were amended in major states of India and related aspects of social justice, such as, tenancy reforms, rehabilitation of bonded labour, provision of house sites and housing for rural poor etc. were also undertaken.

- (ii) Second phase (1980s to 1990s) : Laws and policies related to agriculture along with re-distribution of land

Abolition of tenancy was focused in this phase as 'land to tillers' has been one of the major components of land reforms and distributive aspects of land reforms have continued to occupy the centre-stage in land reform policies. As agriculture is a state subject, it is the responsibility of the state government to pass legislation related to land rights, revenue and other aspects of agriculture. The laws and policies focused on land holding and then ceiling for re-distribution of land to landless. Despite state's responsibility, least concern was shown for the social matrix that follows land distribution, such as, quality of distributed land, supply of necessary inputs to make productive use of land, linkages with institutional credit, coping of the beneficiaries with new role as well as interface with the market, impact of labour processes in the market, allocation of land based earnings at household levels to meet basic needs and so on.

- (iii) Third phase (1990s onwards): After New Economic Policy

Economic reforms brought unknown outcomes and introduced processes hitherto unknown. The demand of land for different purposes increased with pressures from business organizations and multi-national corporations. These enterprises also demanded changes in related laws for a make-shift: from rural sector to agro-based and agro-forestry industries and its expansion with bio-technology and other technological inventions. The issue of 'social justice' took backseat with an argument that whatever had to be done in the field of land reforms has been accomplished and land reforms legislations now become infrastructural and institutional constraints to the growth process.

Formation of *Kisan Sabha* (organization of peasants) has been initiated since 1930 but after independence, Congress party tried to strengthen it through various activities. There have been instances of peasants' protest over state policy regarding tax and revenue, availability of electricity and its charges for agriculture and so on but they are scattered and piecemeal.

The land reform has been criticized as a failure, since it was mainly a responsibility of the government agencies and there were many lacuna at implementation level, maintaining land records, revenue collection and other transactions related to land tenure (ownership, tenancy, on lease, sharecropping, etc).

Present issue pertaining to land in Gujarat state

Earlier with a major focus on agriculture, good irrigation system prevailed and most of the land used by people was chiefly for agriculture purpose. But with increasing globalization, land use pattern is under going major change. The land scenario in Gujarat and specific problems observed in last 5 decades related to land are as follow:

- Earlier studies have shown that under the Land Ceiling Act (LCA), the surplus land given to the downtrodden or poor people is not actually controlled or owned by them due to the pressure of the dominant castes (so called upper castes). Unfortunately, about 60% of beneficiaries do not have possession of the land.
- Regarding inheritance, the piece of land was shared among the widow of the deceased and the sons in equal proportion. With recent amendment in Hindu succession Bill, 1956, the share of the widow is shred with the daughters and sons and is been reduced.
- With agro-based industries, large-scale mechanization was introduced, which has replaced farm labourers to considerable extent or the wages and extent of workdays are reduced. *Kisan Sabha* and such peasant forum have very limited understanding and impact on land related issues on the state and its policies. Therefore, with changing times, they could not provide solutions to the affecting livelihoods of the poor, landless labourers.
- With rapid urbanization and industrialization, land use pattern is greatly (3-5% every year in highly industrialized states) affected – about 80% due to industrialization, as state promotes economic development and about 20% due to housing industry.
- With increasing population, issues of forestland and common property land in rural & urban areas are intensified.
- There are many problems due to outdated land records; land mapping has not been done after independence.

Some such problems directly or indirectly affect the process of land reform. Therefore, we need to understand these issues with two categories - 'government driven' and 'social action driven'. Our actions are in fact in response to the existing

laws, legal provisions and procedures and therefore changing existing policy or evolving a new policy, amendments in existing laws and / or procedural flaws at implementation level should be addressed effectively.

Objectives of the study

In light of above discussion, the study aims at the following:

- (i) Creating database on land reform in Banaskantha district;
- (ii) To know extent of land holding / possession over allotted land under LCA;
and
- (iii) To plan advocacy measures for effective implementation of LCA that leads to greater and effective landholding.

Research methodology

The study initially was started with data collected by community based organization, Banaskantha Dalit Sangathan (BDS). Gradually we found out discrepancy in data, for example, name and number of persons to whom land was allotted under LCA, whether the person possess the land or not. Unfortunately, the government data on land allotment under LCA is not available in comprehensive manner. Moreover, the Land Office of Banaskantha informed that it has passed on data to BDS w

In order to create sound database, the research team of BSC combined data from BDS and the government and started visiting selected villages in order to check possession over land. With such field visits, the research team decided to carry out a sample survey for further details on land reforms related aspects, such (i) land possession, (ii) year of land allotment, (iii) type of land allotted, (iv) whether land allotted in the village or away from village, (v) whether allotted in group, (vi) reasons for not possessing land, and (vii) impact of land possession.

Land allotted under LCA in Banaskantha district: BDS data (June 2006)

| No. | Possession | Taluka | | | | Total |
|-----|----------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | Dantiwada | Dhanera | Tharad | Vav | |
| 1. | Yes | 05 | 23 | 53 | 171 | 252 |
| 2. | No | - | 23 | 56 | 360 | 439 |
| 3. | No information | - | - | 08 | 98 | 106 |
| | Total | 05 | 46 | 117 | 629 | 797 |

According to BDS data, land was allocated to 797 persons in Banaskantha district during the year 1981 and 2005. Of them, there is no information about 106; thus the data analysed further is of total 691 beneficiaries.

- ⇒ Of total 691 beneficiaries, 252 (36.5%) have possession over lands,
- ⇒ In all 439 (63.5%) did not possess lands.

We decided to cover at least 25% of families under the survey of total 797 beneficiaries and a schedule was prepared to get details on land reforms. Based on the following table, we charted representative sample of 25% respondents, covering each taluka, caste, type of land and whether the beneficiary possess the land.

The data was collected during July and September 2006 after pre-testing of questionnaire. In all 186 schedules were filled for further analysis.

Structure of the report

The report aims to identify policy level issues and charting action plan for advocacy based on primary data. It also elaborates concerns like landholding among women, reasons for possessing or not possessing allotted land and its consequences and strategic points such as whether the land should be allotted in groups, away from villages in light of prevalent situation.

The report is presented in three chapters: the first chapter introduces land reforms and related issues. The second chapter is based on primary data and its analysis and divided in three sections: section 1 provides an overview of primary data; section 2 provides details of beneficiaries that possess land and section 3 describes details of beneficiaries that do not possess land. The third chapter concludes with action plan for advocacy based on findings of the study.

All the three sections cover details like number of beneficiaries under LCA in Banaskantha, profile (sex, age, caste, education, occupation, IRD list and ration cardholding) of beneficiaries, type of land allotted, year of land allotment, location of land allotted, whether allotted in group, reasons for possessing or not possessing land and its consequences, whether any follow up actions taken for possession of land. Some points are elaborated with qualitative data collected during field work and collecting primary data.

**CHAPTER 2: ANALYSIS OF PRIMARY DATA ON LAND REFORM IN
BANASKANTHA DISTRICT**

This chapter is based on primary data and its analysis. It is divided in three sections:

- Section 1 provides an overview of primary data;**
- Section 2 provides details of beneficiaries that possess land; and**
- Section 3 describes details of beneficiaries that do not possess land.**

**SECTION 1: OVERVIEW OF
PRIMARY DATA (OFFICIAL AND
SURVEY)**

The official data provided to BDS reported total 797 beneficiaries in

Banaskantha district during the year 1981 and 2005. Of them, there is no information about 106; thus the data analysed further is of total 691 beneficiaries.

Profile of beneficiaries (BDS data)

| No. | Profile | Details | Taluka | | | | Total (n=691) (%) |
|--------|-----------------|------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| | | | Dantiwada (n=5) | Dhanera (n=46) | <i>Thara</i> <i>d</i> (n=117) | Vav (n=629) | |
| 1. | Sex | Female | 01 | 02 | 02 | 11 | 16 (2.3) |
| | | Male | 04 | 44 | 107 | 520 | 675 (97.7) |
| 2. | Caste | Bhangi | | 01 | 07 | 17 | 25 (3.6) |
| | | Chamar | 05 | 31 | 67 | 429 | 532 (77) |
| | | Pandya | - | - | - | 32 | 32 (4.6) |
| | | Sadhu-Bava | - | - | - | 01 | 1 (0.1) |
| | | Turi | - | - | 02 | 03 | 5 (0.7) |
| | | Bhil | - | 13 | 30 | 15 | 58 (8.4) |
| | | Gauswami | - | - | - | 03 | 3 (0.4) |
| | | Koli | - | - | - | 13 | 13 (1.9) |
| | | Kumbhar | - | - | - | 02 | 2 (0.3) |
| | | Luhar | - | - | - | 02 | 2 (0.3) |
| | | Mochi | - | - | - | 03 | 3 (0.4) |
| | | Patel | - | - | - | 01 | 1 (0.1) |
| | | Rabari | - | 01 | - | 05 | 6 (0.9) |
| | | Suthar | - | - | - | 03 | 3 (0.4) |
| Vajir | - | - | - | 02 | 2 (0.3) | | |
| Vankar | - | - | 03 | - | 3 (0.4) | | |
| 3. | Social category | SC | 5 | 32 | 79 | 480 | 596 (86.3) |
| | | ST | - | 13 | 30 | 15 | 58 (8.4) |
| | | OBC | - | 1 | - | 36 | 37 (5.4) |

Sex

Of total 691 beneficiaries, land has been allotted to only 11 (2%) female-headed households while 98% has been allotted to male-headed households.

Social category

Of total 691 beneficiaries, land has been allotted to 596 (86.3%) Scheduled Caste (Chamar, Garo, Turi and Vankar) families, 58 (8.4) Scheduled Tribe (Bhil) and 37 (5.4) belong to OBC (Gauswamin, Koli, Kumbhar, Luhar, Mochi, Patel, Rabari, Sadhu-bava, Suthar and Vajir).

It is important to overview situation in terms of 'land possessed' and 'land not possessed', as about 36% reported possession over land.

Possession over land allotted under LCA: Profile - social category, extent of land

| No. | | Possession | | Total (n= 691) |
|-----|-----------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | | Yes (n=252) | No (n= 439) | |
| 1. | Social category | | | |
| | SC | 226 | 370 | 596 |
| | ST | 23 | 35 | 58 |
| | OBC | 3 | 34 | 37 |
| 2. | Extent of land allocation (acre) | | | |
| | < 1 acre | 23 | 01 | 24 |
| | 1 - 2 acre | 19 | 38 | 57 |
| | 2 - 3 acre | 48 | 105 | 153 |
| | 3 - 5 acre | 78 | 173 | 251 |
| | 5 - 10 acre | 37 | 82 | 119 |
| | > 11 acre | 04 | 01 | 05 |
| | No information | 43 | 39 | 82 |

Social category

Of total 691 beneficiaries, 596 (86%) belong to Scheduled Castes, 58 (8%) belong to Scheduled Tribe

and the rest 37 (5%) belong to Other Backward Class (OBC).

- ⇒ **Among Scheduled Castes, the possession over land varies: Chamar (38%), Bhangi (56%) and among Pandya or Garo (19%).**
- ⇒ **Among Scheduled Tribe, Bhil reported 40% possession.**
- ⇒ **Among OBCs, not more than 1 beneficiary from each has possession over the lands allotted to them.**

Land allocation and possession

Of total 691 beneficiaries, information is not available of 82 beneficiaries; thus of total 609 beneficiaries,

- ⇒ In all 24 (39%) received land <1 acre and of them, only one does not possess land.
- ⇒ Total 57 (9.4%) received 1-2 acre and of them only 19 (33.3%) possess lands.
- ⇒ In all 153 (25.4%) received 2-3 acres and of them only 48 (31.3%) possess lands.
- ⇒ Total 251 (41.6%) received 3-5 acres and of them only 78 (31.1%) possess lands.
- ⇒ In all 119 (19.7%) received 5-10 acres and of them only 37 (31%) possess lands.
- ⇒ Only 5 beneficiaries received land > 11 acres and 4 of them possess land.

Thus on an average, possession over land is about 31%, which means only one out of three beneficiaries possess land while two do not possess lands allotted to them under LCA.

Possession over land allotted under LCA: Profile - Gender, taluka

| No. | Taluka | Gender and possession | | | | Total |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | Female | | Male | | |
| | | Yes | No | Yes | No | |
| 1. | Dantiwada | 01 | - | 04 | - | 05 |
| 2. | Dhanera | 01 | 01 | 22 | 22 | 46 |
| 3. | Tharad | - | 02 | 53 | 54 | 109 |
| 4. | Vav | 04 | 07 | 167 | 353 | 531 |
| | Total | 06 | 10 | 246 | 429 | 691 |

⇒ Of total 16 female beneficiaries, 6 (37.5%) possess land; in comparison to female, possession among males is at par, as 246 (36%) out of 675 possess lands.

⇒ Possession in Dantiwada is 20%, 50% in Dhanera, 49% in Tharad and 48% in Vav.

Profile of the beneficiaries covered under survey

| No. | Profile | Details | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) |
|-----|---------|------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| | | | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | <i>Tharad</i> (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |
| 1. | Age | 18 - 25 | - | - | - | 03 | 03 (1.6) |
| | | 26 - 40 | - | 01 | 07 | 40 | 48 (26) |
| | | 41 - 60 | 01 | 12 | 29 | 81 | 123 (66) |
| | | > 61 | 02 | 01 | 02 | 07 | 12 (6.4) |
| 2. | Sex | Female | 01 | 02 | 02 | 06 | 11 (6) |
| | | Male | 02 | 12 | 36 | 125 | 175 (94) |
| 3. | Caste | Bhangi | - | 01 | 02 | 06 | 09 (4.8) |
| | | Chamar | 03 | 08 | 24 | 100 | 135 (72.56) |
| | | Pandya | - | - | - | 08 | 08 (4.3) |
| | | Sadhu-Bava | - | - | - | 01 | 01 |
| | | Turi | - | - | 02 | 01 | 03 |
| | | Bhil | - | 04 | 10 | 05 | 19 |
| | | Gauswami | - | - | - | 02 | 02 |

| No. | Profile | Details | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) |
|-----|---------|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| | | | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | <i>Tharad</i> (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------|---|----|---|----|----|
| 3. | Caste | Koli | - | - | - | 03 | 03 |
| | | Mochi | - | - | - | 02 | 02 |
| | | Patel | - | - | - | 01 | 01 |
| | | Rabari | - | 01 | - | 01 | 02 |
| | | Vajir | - | - | - | 01 | 01 |

Age

Of total 186 beneficiaries, major proportion (66%) reported to be between 41 and 60 years and about a fourth (26%) belong to age group of 26-40 and rest (3) is above 60 years of age. However, if we consider that the land is allotted a decade or two ago, all received at the age when they are able to cultivate the land.

Sex

Of total 186, 175 (94%) are male beneficiaries, only 11 (6%) are female. This shows that the government has not prioritized for

women cultivator, especially single women.

Caste and social category

The beneficiaries belong to a wide range of caste categories; however,

- **More than 72% belong to the Chamar caste (scheduled caste); among other scheduled castes, Valmiki and Garo have received land.**
- **Of the rest, Sadhu-bava, Vajir, Koli, Rabari and Gauswami are the recipients belong to 'other backward castes' (OBC).**

Thus scenario dominates with 156
(84%) scheduled castes
beneficiaries, only 10% belong to

scheduled tribe (mainly Majirana Bhil) and 6% belong to OBC category.

This implies that the government seemed to prioritise for scheduled castes for redistribution of land under Land Ceiling Act.

Education

Of total 186 beneficiaries, 135 are (72%) illiterate; 15% are educated up to primary school while 6% completed secondary education and only one respondent completed higher secondary level. The beneficiaries represent mainly illiterate section.

| No. | Profile | Details | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) |
|-----|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | | | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | <i>Thar ad</i> (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |
| 1. | Social category | SC | 03 | 09 | 28 | 116 | 156 (84) |
| | | ST | - | 04 | 10 | 05 | 19 (10) |
| | | OBC | - | 01 | - | 10 | 11 (6) |
| 2. | Education | Illiterate | 03 | 11 | 29 | 101 | 144 (77.4) |
| | | Primary | - | 02 | 09 | 18 | 29 (15.6) |
| | | Secondary | - | 01 | - | 11 | 12 (6.4) |
| | | Higher secondary | - | - | - | 01 | 01 (0.5) |
| 3. | Occupation | Cultivator | 01 | 03 | 02 | 05 | 11 (5.9) |
| | | Private job | - | 01 | - | 02 | 03 (1.6) |
| | | Shopkeeper, labour | - | 01 | 01 | 04 | 06 (3.2) |
| | | Begging | - | - | - | 05 | 05 (2.7) |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|----|----|----|-----|------------|
| | Farm/Casual labour | 02 | 07 | 35 | 112 | 156 (82.9) |
| | Govt. job, Cultivator | - | 02 | - | 01 | 03 (1.6) |

Occupation

Even though the respondents reported combination of different economic activities,

- **The large number of them (83%) is engaged farm and casual labour.**
- **Among the rest, 11 (6%) beneficiaries reported cultivation and others are engaged in other types of occupation like private jobs, shop keeping and government job.**

| No. | Profile | Details | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) |
|-----|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| | | | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | <i>Tharad</i> (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |
| 1. | Annual income (in Rs.) | < 11,000 | 01 | 04 | 10 | 105 | 120 (64.5) |
| | | 11,001 - 35,000 | 02 | 09 | 28 | 25 | 64 (34) |
| | | > 60,001 | - | 01 | - | 01 | 02 (1.0) |
| 2. | IRD list | Yes | 02 | 14 | 27 | 113 | 156 (84) |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|------------|----|----|----|----|----------|
| | | No | 01 | - | 11 | 14 | 26 (14) |
| | | Don't know | - | - | - | 04 | 04 (2.0) |
| 3. | Ration card | APL | 01 | - | 29 | 32 | 62 (32) |
| | | BPL | 02 | 14 | 09 | 96 | 121 (65) |
| | | Antyoday | - | - | - | 03 | 03 (1.6) |

IRD enlistment

Of total beneficiaries, 156 (84%) are enlisted to IRD list while and 14% are not enlisted to IRD and the rest do not know whether they are enlisted under IRD or not.

Ration cardholding

Of total beneficiaries, 121 (65%) are BPL cardholders, 62 (32%) are APL cardholders and 3 have *antoday* card.

Taluka-wise distribution of the respondents

The respondents are mainly from Vav and Tharad taluka; 131 are of Vav taluka and 38 are of Tharad taluka, while 14 belongs to Dhanera and 3 to Dantiwada taluka.

Area of land allotment

| Land allocation (in Acre) | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | Tharad (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |
| 1 - 3 Acre | - | 09 | 03 | 44 | 56 (30.1) |
| 3 - 6 Acre | 02 | 03 | 34 | 64 | 103 (55.4) |
| 6 - 9 Acre | 01 | 02 | 01 | 16 | 20 (10.7) |
| > 9 Acre | - | - | - | 07 | 7 (3.7) |

Area of land allotment

- **More than half (55%) of beneficiaries received allotment of 3-6 acre of land,**
- **Around one third (30%) received 1-3 acres of land, and**
- **11% received allotment of 6-9 acre of land.**
- **Only 7 (4%) received allotment of more than 9 acre of land.**

⇒ Within talukas:

- . **Out of 3 beneficiaries in Dantiwada, 2 received allotment**

of 3-6 acres and one received allotment of 6-9 acre of lands.

- . In Dhanera taluka, of total 14 beneficiaries, 9 (64%) received allotment of 1-3 acre, 3 (21%) received allotment of 3-6 acre and 2 (14%) received allotment of 6-9 acres.
- . In Tharad taluka, of total 38 beneficiaries, majority of them (89%) received allotment 3-6 acre, 3 (8%) received 1-3 acre and one (2%) received allotment of 6-9 acres of land.
- . In Vav, of total 131 beneficiaries, around half (49%) received allotment of 3-6 acre, one third (34%) received allotment of 1-3 acre, 12% received allotment of 6-9 acre and 5% (7) received

allotment of more than 9 acre of land.

The comparison between taluka shows that the proportion of respondents who received 3-6 acre of land is largest in Tharad while the respondents of only Vav taluka received allotment of land more than 9 acres.

Types of lands allotted

| Type of Land | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) (%) |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | Tharad (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |
| Irrigated Land | - | 01 | 03 | - | 4 (2.1) |
| Seasonally Irrigated Land | - | 01 | 05 | - | 6 (3.2) |
| Dry Land | - | - | 06 | 03 | 9 (4.8) |
| Jarayat Land | 03 | 08 | 24 | 118 | 153 (82.3) |
| Bagayat Land | - | - | - | 10 | 10 (5.4) |
| Other | - | 04 | - | - | 4 (2.1) |

Types of lands allotted

- **Majority (82%) of the beneficiaries received allotment of Jarayat lands.**
- **Completely irrigated land was allotted only to 4 (2%) beneficiaries.**
- **Seasonally irrigated lands to 6 (3%) beneficiaries,**
- **Dry land was allotted to 9 (4%), and**
- **Bagayat land allotted 10 (5%).**

⇒ **Within the talukas:**

- . In Dantiwada taluka, all the 3 beneficiaries received Jarayat lands.**
- . In Tharad taluka, out of 14 beneficiaries, 8 received Jarayat land while one each received completely irrigated land and seasonally irrigated land.**
- . In Tharad taluka, almost two-thirds (63%) received Jarayat lands, 6 (16%) received dry land, 5 (13%) received allotment of seasonally irrigated lands and 3 (8%) received allotment of completely irrigated lands.**
- . In Vav taluka, majority 90% received Jarayat lands, 10 (8%) received Bagayat lands and 3 (2%) received dry lands.**

Details of land allotment: location, whether measured, allotted in group

| Details of land allotment | | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) (%) |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| | | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | Tharad (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |
| Location | Own Village | 03 | 13 | 25 | 99 | 140 (75.3) |
| | Other Village | - | 01 | 13 | 32 | 46 (24.7) |
| Measurement done | Yes | 03 | 11 | 11 | 42 | 67 (36) |
| | No | - | 03 | 27 | 89 | 119 (64) |
| In Group | Yes | - | 07 | 09 | 23 | 39 (21) |
| | No | 03 | 07 | 29 | 103 | 142 (76.3) |
| | Don't Know | - | - | - | 05 | 05 (2.7) |

Location of land allotted

- In all three-fourth (75%) beneficiaries received land within the village where they have been living, and
 - Remaining one-fourth received land outside the village.
- ⇒ Within the talukas: All the 3 respondents in Dantiwada and except 1 in Dhanera received allotment of land within the village. In all 66% in Tharad and 76% in Vav taluka have received allotment of lands within the village.

Land measurement

- Only 36% of lands were measured officially. Of these, land of 79% of beneficiaries in Dhanera while 29% in Tharad and 32% in Vav taluka was measured officially. This shows that Dhanera taluka land office is efficient in comparison to other taluka.
- Land measurement was done of all the 3 respondents in Dantiwada taluka.

Group allotment

- About a fourth (25%) of beneficiaries has received land in groups.
- This is one of the considerations for policy measures, as it is a dual edged sword. If the beneficiary receives land in the village, sometimes, s/he is not able to fight against vested interests within the village and therefore prefers land outside the village. Some beneficiaries want the land within village so that they can cultivate land in known environment.

- ⇒ Within the talukas:
- Of total 14, 7 (50%) received in group in Dhanera taluka,
 - Of total 38, in all 13 (34%) Tharad taluka, and

- In all 32 (24%) in Vav received land in groups.
- None of the respondents in Dantiwada taluka received lands in groups.

Holding Land Documents

| Details of land allotment | | Taluka | | | | Total (n=186) (%) |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|
| | | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=14) | Tharad (n=38) | Vav (n=131) | |
| Land Hukam | Yes | 03 | 08 | 18 | 84 | 113 (60.7) |
| | No | - | 06 | 20 | 47 | 73 (39.2) |
| 7/12 | Yes | 03 | 13 | 25 | 90 | 131 (70.4) |
| | No | - | 01 | 13 | 41 | 55 (29.6) |
| 8-A | Yes | 03 | 13 | 25 | 87 | 128 (68.8) |
| | No | - | 01 | 13 | 44 | 58 (31.2) |
| 6-Haqpatrak/ panipatrak | Yes | - | 08 | 23 | 48 | 79 (42.5) |
| | No | 03 | 06 | 15 | 83 | 107 (57.5) |
| Khedutpothi /Khatawahi | Yes | 03 | 12 | 25 | 110 | 150 (80.6) |
| | No | - | 02 | 13 | 21 | 36 (19.4) |
| | No | - | 03 | 11 | 54 | 68 (36.6) |

Holding Land Documents

Holding of different land related documents help in proving possession and ownership of land at family level, village level and at land revenue office as well as for cultivation. For example, 'land hukam' is a proof of land allotment by the government, 7/12 certificate is a proof for possession over land, 'panipatrak' maintains records at village level and the allotted in the village is identified and regularized and 'khedupothi' means that the land holder is a cultivator and eligible for credit provided by the government in terms of seeds, fertilizers and agricultural implements.

- Land Hukam (intimation for land allotment): of total 186, 113 (61%) beneficiaries has received land-hukam;
- 7/12 certificates: of total, little more than one-third (39%) have this certificate, which is a document to prove land holding and possession over it.
- 8-A certificate / Panipatrak s: In all 128 (69%) has this certificate.
- 6-Haqpatarak: Of total, 79 (42%) hold this document.
- Khedutpothi: Majority of them (81%) received this document.

The discrepancy in holding document indicates lack of efficiency of the government officials in delivering certificates or documents, as well as callousness of land holder.

While comparing taluka, almost 2/3rd of the beneficiaries received all types of documents. Land-Hukam which considered as essential document for land allotment was received by more than 2/3rd of respondents.

Status of land: Under possession or not possessing

| Details | Possession | | Total (n=186) |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Yes (%) (n=72) | No (%) (n=114) | |
| Taluka | | | |
| Dantiwada | 3 (100) | - | 3 |
| Dhanera | 6 (42.8) | 8 (57.1) | 14 |
| Tharad | 17 (44.7) | 21 (55.3) | 38 |
| Vav | 46 (35.1) | 85 (64.9) | 131 |

Possession over land

Of total 186 beneficiaries, 72 (39%) possess land and cultivate while 114 (61%) do not possess land.

SUMMARIZING SECTION 1

- **Sex:** Of total 186, 175 (94%) are male beneficiaries, only 11 (6%) are female.
- **Social category:** Majority of land allotted to 156 (84%) scheduled castes, followed by scheduled tribe (10%) and in marginal numbers (6%) to those belong to OBC category.
- **Education:** The beneficiaries represent mainly illiterate (72%) section, only one reporting higher secondary education.
- **Occupation:** The large number of beneficiaries (83%) is engaged farm and casual labour.
- **IRD list and Ration cardholding:** Of total beneficiaries, 156 (84%) are enlisted to IRD list and 121 (65%) are BPL cardholders, 62 (32%) are APL cardholders and 3 have *antoday* card.
- **Extent of land allotted:** More than half (55%) of beneficiaries received allotment of 3-6 acre of land, one third (30%) received 1-3 acres of land, and 11% received allotment of 6-9 acre of land. Only 7 (4%) received allotment of more than 9 acre of land.
- **Type of land allotted:** Majority (82%) of the beneficiaries received allotment of Jarayat lands. Completely irrigated land was allotted only to 4 (2%) beneficiaries. Seasonally irrigated lands to 6 (3%) beneficiaries, dry land was allotted to 9 (4%), and Bagayat land allotted 10 (5%).
- **Location of land allotted:** In all three-fourth (75%) beneficiaries received land within the village where they have been living.
- **Group allotment:** About a fourth (25%) of beneficiaries has received land in groups.
- **Holding land related documents:** Almost 65% of the beneficiaries received all types of documents.
- **Possession over land:** Of total 186 beneficiaries, 72 (39%) possess land and cultivate. The average possession over land is 37% by each social category. Only 2 out of 11 female (18%) has possession over lands.

SECTION 2: POSSESSION OVER LAND

Of total 186 beneficiaries, 72 (39%) possess land and cultivate while 114 (61%) do not possess land.

Profile of the beneficiaries possessing allotted land under LCA

| Details | Possession | | Total (n=186) |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Yes (%) (n=72) | No (%) (n=114) | |
| Taluka | | | |
| Dantiwada | 3 (100) | - | 3 |
| Dhanera | 6 (42.8) | 8 (57.1) | 14 |
| Tharad | 17 (44.7) | 21 (55.3) | 38 |
| Vav | 46 (35.1) | 85 (64.9) | 131 |
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 2 (18.2) | 9 (81.8) | 11 |
| Male | 70 (40) | 105 (60) | 175 |
| Caste | | | |
| Bhangi | 3 (33.3) | 6 (66.7) | 9 |
| Chamar | 54 (40) | 81 (60) | 135 |
| Pandya | 2 (25) | 6 (75) | 8 |
| Sadhu-Bava | 1 | - | 1 |
| Turi | 1 (33.3) | 2 (66.7) | 3 |
| Bhil | 7 (36.8) | 12 (63.2) | 19 |
| Gauswami | - | 2 | 2 |
| Koli | 1 (33.3) | 2 (66.7) | 3 |
| Mochi | - | 2 | 2 |
| Patel | 1 | - | 1 |
| Rabari | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Vajir | 1 | - | 1 |
| Social category | | | |
| SC | 61 (39.1) | 95 (60.9) | 156 |
| ST | 7 (36.8) | 12 (63.2) | 19 |
| OBC | 4 (36.4) | 7 (63.6) | 11 |

Taluka

Even though land is allotted to greater number of families in Vav taluka, the possession over land is in greater proportion in Dhanera (43%) and Tharad (45%) taluka.

Sex: Only 2 out of 11 female (18%) has possession over lands. In all 40% of males reported possession over land.

Caste & social category: The average possession over land is 37% by each social category.

- ⇒ Among the two larger cast groups Chamar and Bhil, 40% of Chamar and 37% of Bhils has possession over lands.
- ⇒ Among other castes, the possession varies between 25 to 35%.

Education: In all 72% are illiterate, among them, 38% beneficiaries possess land. The single graduate has possession over lands.

Occupation

Cultivation and labour, and casual labour are two major groups that would look forward to possession over land for livelihood.

- ⇒ Among them, there is a wide difference observed. Among casual labourers, only 8 (10%) beneficiaries reported possession while among other category, a large number (69%) reported possession over land.

Profile of the beneficiaries possessing allotted land under LCA

| Details | Possession | | Total (n=186) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Yes (%) (n=72) | No (%) (n=114) | |
| Occupation | | | |
| Cultivation | 8 (72.7) | 3 (27.2) | 11 |
| Labour | 8 (10.1) | 71 (89.9) | 79 |
| Shop-keeper | - | 04 | 04 |
| Private job | - | 03 | 03 |
| Govt. job/ Cultivation | 02 | 02 | 04 |
| Cultivation/ Shop keeper | 02 | 02 | 04 |
| Cultivation/Labour | 52 (69.3) | 23 (30.7) | 75 |
| Begging | - | 06 | 06 |
| Are you beneficiary of IRDP | | | |
| Yes | 57 (36.5) | 99 (63.5) | 156 |
| No | 11 (42.3) | 15 (57.7) | 26 |
| Don't know | 04 | - | 04 |
| Ration card | | | |
| APL | 27 (43.5) | 35 (56.5) | 62 |
| BPL | 44 (36.4) | 77 (63.6) | 121 |
| Antyoday | 01 | 02 | 03 |

- ⇒ Among 11 cultivators, 8 (73%) reported possession over land.
- ⇒ Those engage in cultivation with either government job or shopper, the possession is 50% each.
- ⇒ None of the shopkeeper and private job holder has possession over lands.

IRD list and Ration cardholder

- ⇒ The number of beneficiaries belong to non-IRD list is bigger than those belong to IRD list. Among them, 36% of IRD list and 42% among non-IRD list reported possession over lands.
- ⇒ Similarly among BPL cardholders 43% and among APL cardholders 36% has possession over lands.

Possession as per area allotted

Possession over larger area of lands (6-9 acres and more) is more than on the smaller area of lands (3-6 acres).

- ⇒ In all 6 out of 7 (85%) of beneficiaries have possession over lands with area more than 9 acre.
- ⇒ Similarly, 13 out of 20 (65%) beneficiaries reported possession over lands with area 6-9 acre.
- ⇒ Around one-third of beneficiaries have possession who received allotment of 1-3 acre (19 out of 56) and 3-6 acre (34 out of 103) of lands.

This shows that the beneficiaries having smaller lands are not interested in taking possession over land. As the size of the land grows bigger, the proportion of possession is also increasing.

Possession as per type of land

The large number of beneficiaries (153 out of 186) was given Jarayat land and therefore the number of these beneficiaries is higher among those who possess land.

- ⇒ **In all 66 out of 153 (43%) reported possession over Jarayat land.**
- ⇒ **Surprisingly, 4 beneficiaries were allotted totally irrigated land but**

the do not possess land. Among those with seasonally irrigated land, the possession is 50% (3 out of 6). Those having Bagayat land, the possession is very little, i.e. 10% (1 out of 10).

⇒ It is hailing that 2 out of 9 (22%) reported possession over dry land.

Details of land allotted: Whether in Group, location of land

| Details | Possession over land | | Total (n=186) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Yes (%) (n=72) | No (%) (n=114) | |
| Land allotted in Group | | | |
| Yes | 14 (35.9) | 25 (64.1) | 39 |
| No | 58 (40.8) | 84 (59.2) | 142 |
| Don't Know | - | 05 | 05 |
| Location of allotted land | | | |
| Own Village | 65 (46.4) | 75 (53.6) | 140 |
| Other Village | 07 (15.2) | 39 (84.8) | 46 |

Land allotted in Group and possession

- ⇒ **Of total 39 beneficiaries, who were allotted land in group, 14 (36%) has possession over lands.**
- ⇒ **Those who received allotment as individual (not in group), 58 out of 142 (41%) has possession over land.**

Location of allotted land and possession

- ⇒ **In all 46 beneficiaries were allotted land outside own village. Of them, only 7 (15%) have possession over land.**
- ⇒ **In comparison to that, 140 beneficiaries, who received land within the village, 65 (46%) reported possession over land.**

This clearly shows that if the land is allotted within the villages,

instances of possessing it are higher.

Official documents with landholders

| Details | Possession over land | | Total (n=186) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Yes (%) (n=72) | No (%) (n=114) | |
| Having official documents | | | |
| Land Hukam | 41 (36.3) | 72 (63.7) | 113 |
| 7/12 | 54 (41.2) | 77 (57.8) | 131 |
| 8-A | 54 (42.2) | 74 (57.8) | 128 |
| 6-Haqqpatrak / Panipattrak | 26 (32.9) | 53 (67.1) | 79 |
| Khedutpothi/ Khatawahi | 69 (46) | 81 (54) | 150 |

Having official documents and possession over land

Land possession varies between 32% to 46% within different document holders.

⇒ The highest number of document the landholders report is 'khedutpothi' or 'khatavahi' (46%) followed by 8-A, 7/12 certificate and 'panipattrak' (41-42%) and least among '6-haqqpatrak' (33%).

Area and year of land allotment

| Land allocation | Year in which land was allotted (Row %) | | | | Total (N=72) (Col %) |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| | 1981 -1990 | 1991 - 2000 | After 2001 | Don't know | |
| 1 - 3 acre | 4 (21.1) | 13 (68.4) | 02 (10.5) | - | 19 (26.4) |
| 3 - 6 acre | 22 (64.7) | 10 (29.4) | - | 02 (5.9) | 34 (47.2) |
| 6 - 9 acre | 12 (92.3) | 01 (7.7) | - | - | 13 (18.1) |
| > 9 acre | 06 | - | - | - | 06 (8.3) |
| Total | 44 (61.1) | 24 (33.3) | 02 (2.8) | 02 (2.8) | 72 (100) |

Area and year of land allotment

⇒ Around half of the respondents (47.2%) got allotment of 3-6 acre of land while one fourth (26%) got allotment of 1-3 acre, 18% of respondents got allotment of 6-9 acre of land while 6 respondents (8%) got allotment of more than 9 acre.

However 3-6 acre and 6-9 acre land was allotted mainly during 1981-2000; of that, 64% of 3-6 acre land was allotted in 1981-1990 and 92% of 6-9 of land allotted in the 1981-1990. The land allotted after 1990 is 1-3 acres.

Caste and land allotment

| Caste | Land allocation (in acre) | | | | Total |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | 1 - 3 | 3 - 6 | 6 - 9 | > 9 | |
| Bhangi | 03 | 06 | | | 09 |
| Chamar | 43 | 70 | 17 | 05 | 135 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Pandya/Ga ro | 04 | 04 | - | - | 08 |
| Sadhu-Bava | 01 | - | - | - | 01 |
| Turi | - | 03 | - | - | 03 |
| Bhil | 02 | 14 | 03 | | 19 |
| Gauswami | - | 02 | - | - | 02 |
| Koli | - | 01 | - | 02 | 03 |
| Mochi | - | 02 | - | - | 02 |
| Patel | - | 01 | - | - | 01 |
| Rabari | 02 | - | - | - | 02 |
| Vajir | 01 | - | - | - | 01 |
| Total | 56 | 103 | 20 | 07 | 186 |

Caste and land allotment

In all 103 (55%) beneficiaries received 3-6 acres of land, 56 (30%) received of 1-3 acre, 20 (11%) received 6-9 acre while only 7 (4%) received allotment of more than 9 acres of land.

- ⇒ Among 9 respondents of Valmiki caste, 3 received 1-3 acres and 6 received 3-6 acres of lands.
- ⇒ Among 135 Chamaras, 70 (52%) received 3-6 acre, 42 (32%) received 1-3 acre, 17 (13%) received 6-9 acre and rest 5 (4%) received allotment of more than 9 acre of land.
- ⇒ Among 19 Bhils, 14 (74%) received 3-6 acres, 2 (10.5%) received 1-3 acre and 3 (16%) received 6-9 acre of land.
- ⇒ Out of 3 Koli beneficiaries, one received 3-6 acre and two received more than 9 acre of land.
- ⇒ Other beneficiaries like Rabari and Vajir received 1-3 acre of land while Mochi, Patel, Gauswami and Turi received 3-6 acre of land.

Among these castes, larger proportion of Valmiki and Bhil received 3-6 acre of lands while only Chamar and Koli beneficiaries received more than 9 acre of lands.

Occupation and land allotment

Casual labourer and cultivator cum casual labourer form the two major categories among occupational group.

- ⇒ Among 80 casual labourers, 53 (66%) and among 75 cultivator cum casual labourer, 36 (48%) received allotment of 3-6 acres of land.
- ⇒ Among 11 cultivators, 4 (36%) received 3-6 acres and 4 (36%) received 6-9 acre of land and rest 3 (27%) received 1-3 acre of land.
- ⇒ Among 6 beggars, 5 received allotment of 3-6 acre and 1 received allotment of 1-3 acre of land.
- ⇒ Out of 7 respondents who received more than 9 acre of land, 5 are cultivator cum labourer and 1 government jobholder cum cultivator.

- ⇒ Among private jobholders all have received allotment of 3-6 acre of land and among 4 shopkeepers 3 received allotment of 1-3 acre and 1 received allotment of 3-6 acre of land.

Thus the maximum average area of land i.e. 3-6 acre was allotted mainly to casual labourer, cultivator cum labourer, beggars and cultivators.

Taluka and land allotment: 1981-2004

- ⇒ All the respondents in Dantiwada and Tharad taluka received allotment during 1981-1990. Similarly 12 out of 14 (85%) respondents in Dhanera taluka also received allotment during 1981-1990
- ⇒ Only 2 beneficiaries received land during 1991-2000 in Dhanera taluka.
- ⇒ **The beneficiaries of only of Vav taluka received lands after 2001.** Of total 131 beneficiaries, 41% received lands during 1981-1990, 42% during 1991-2000 and 10% after 2001 and 7% are unaware about the year of allotment.

Types of allotted land across castes

- ⇒ **About 92% of the beneficiaries received Jarayat (barren) land, 3% received dry lands and only 3 (4%) received seasonally irrigable lands.**

This shows that irrespective time of allotment, majority (>85%) of the beneficiaries received only Jarayat land.

- ⇒ **Only Chamar and Bhils received different types of land while other castes received Jarayat land.**
- ⇒ **Completely irrigable lands are allotted to Chamar, Bhil and Rabari while seasonally irrigable land was allotted to Valmiki, Chamar, Bhil and Rabari beneficiaries.**

Distance of land allotted from native village

| Status of land | Location of land allotted | | Total (n=186) |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| | Own village (n=140) | Outside village (n=46) | |
| Land possessed | | | |
| a. Yes | 65 (46.4) | 07 (15.2) | |
| b. No | 75 (53.6) | 39 (84.8) | |
| Distance (km) | | | |
| 1 - 3 km | - | 14 (4 possess) | 14 |
| 3 - 6 km | - | 16 (2 possess) | 16 |
| 6 - 9 km | - | 10 | 10 |
| 9 -12 km | - | 04 (1 possess) | 04 |
| 12 - 15 km | - | 01 | 01 |
| > 16 km | - | 01 | 01 |
| Total | 140 | 46 | 186 |

Distance of land allotted from native village and possession

- ⇒ Of total 186, 140 beneficiaries received land at their village while 46 (25%) received land outside village.
- ⇒ Of 46 beneficiaries, majority (30) of them received land within 5-6 kilometers. In all 10 (22%) within 6-9 km and 4 (9%) received allotment within 9-12 km from their village. Only two beneficiaries were allotted land beyond 12 kms.

⇒ Of total 46 beneficiaries that received land outside village, only 7 of them reported possession over land, which is within 12 kms. This could mean that the beneficiaries prefer to have land within village or very close to village where they stay.

Land Allotted in Group and have possession

| | | Which location has land allocated | | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|
| | | Own village | Other village | Count |
| | | Count | Count | |
| Is allotted land in-group? | Yes | 13 | 1 | 14 |
| Caste of the respondents | Chamar | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| | Pandya | 1 | | 1 |
| | Bhil | 1 | | 1 |
| | Rabari | 1 | | 1 |
| In which year the land is allotted | 1981 - 1990 | 1 | | 1 |
| | 1991 - 2000 | 12 | 1 | 13 |

Group allotment and possession: 11 Chamar (8%), 1 Bhil (5%) 1 Pandya(12.5%) 1 Rabari (50%) are the receiver of land allotment in group as well as has possession.

⇒ 17% respondents were allotted in group during 1981-1990 and 1% of them has possession. 30% respondents were allotted land in group during 1991-2000 and 22% has possession. 31% were allotted after 2001 and none of them has possession.

⇒ Among the two larger caste groups, 20% of Chamar and 37% of Bhil received lands in groups, while among others castes, the allotment of lands in group varies between 25-35%.

Land measured by the government after allotment

| Land measured | Taluka | | | | Total (n=72) (%) |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|------------|------------------|
| | Dantiwada (n=3) | Dhanera (n=6) | Tharad (n=17) | Vav (n=46) | |
| Yes | 03 | 06 | 02 | 27 | 38 (52.8) |
| No | - | - | 15 | 19 | 34 (47.2) |

Land measurement and possession
Of total 72 beneficiaries that possess land, 38 (53%) reported that their land has been measured by the government; of the rest (47%). The land is not measured, which is crucial for identification of land and as part of village level documents (6-hakpatrak) as well as 7/12 certificate at individual level to prove ownership of the land.

This indicates irregularity of land records or possible loopholes for malpractices for land ownership and selling.

SUMMARIZING SECTION 2

- Of total 186 beneficiaries, 72 (39%) possess land and cultivate while 114 (61%) do not possess land.
- **Taluka:** The possession over land is in greater proportion in Dhanera (43%) and Tharad (45%) taluka.
- **Sex:** Only 2 out of 11 female (18%) has possession over lands. In all 40% of males reported possession over land.
- **Caste & social category:** The average possession over land is 37% by SC and ST while the possession varies between 25 to 35% among OBCs.
- **Education:** In all 72% are illiterate, among them, 38% beneficiaries possess land. The single graduate has possession over land allotted.
- **Occupation:** Among casual labourers, only 8 (10%) beneficiaries reported possession while among cultivation cum labour category, a large number (69%) reported possession over land.
- **IRD list and Ration cardholder:** In all 36% of IRD list holder and 42% among non-IRDP list reported possession over lands. Inversely, 43% BPL cardholders and 36% APL cardholders has possession over lands.
- **Possession as per area allotted:** As the size of the land grows bigger, the proportion of possession is also increasing. Around one-third (33-35%) of beneficiaries have possession who received allotment of 1-3 acre (19 out of 56) and 3-6 acre (34 out of 103) of lands. More than 65% possess land which is >6 acres.
- **Possession as per type of land:** The large number of beneficiaries (153 out of 186) was given Jarayat land; about 42% possess lands. Surprisingly, 4 beneficiaries were allotted totally irrigated land but they do not possess land. Among those with seasonally irrigated land, the possession is 50% (3 out of 6). Those having Bagayat land, the possession is very little, i.e. 10% (1 out of 10) and 2 out of 9 (22%) reported possession over dry land.
- **Land allotted in Group:** Of total 39 beneficiaries, who were allotted land in group, 14 (36%) has possession over lands; 58 out of 142 (41%) has possession over land who received allotment as individual (not in group).
- **Location of allotted land and possession:** If the land is allotted within the villages, instances of possessing it are higher. Of total 46 (land outside own village), 7 (15%) have possession over land, but of 140 (land within the village), 65 (46%) reported possession over land.
- **Area and year of land allotment:** The land allotted after 1990 is 1-3 acres. Mostly 3-6 acre and 6-9 acre land was allotted mainly during 1981-2000; of that, 64% of 3-6 acre land was allotted in 1981-1990 and 92% of 6-9 of land allotted in the 1981-1990.
- **Land measurement:** Of total 72 beneficiaries, land has been measured by the government of 38 (53%). This indicates irregularity of land records.

SECTION 3 NO POSSESSION OVER LAND

This section mainly deals with factors contributing to 'no possession' over allotted lands under LCA. This includes the following:

- ⇒ Since how long not possessing land
- ⇒ Whether occupied by original landholder and his socio-economic situation
- ⇒ Actions taken for possessing allotted land
- ⇒ Support received from the government in possessing land
- ⇒ Reasons for no possession over land

In all 114 do not possess land. This is not applicable to Dantiwada taluka as all the beneficiaries possess land.

Details: Year of allotment of land and possession over land

| No possession on land | Taluka | | | Total (n=114) (%) |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|----------------------|
| | Dhanera (n=8) | Tharad (n=21) | Vav (n=85) | |
| Year of land allotment | | | | |
| 1981 - 1990 | 08 | 21 | 34 | 63 (55.3) |
| 1991 - 2000 | - | - | 33 | 33 (28.9) |
| After 2001 | - | - | 11 | 11 (9.6) |
| Don't know | - | - | 7 | 7 (6.1) |
| No possession | | | | |
| From beginning | 05 | 13 | 70 | 88 (77) |
| Once possessed than left | 03 | 08 | 15 | 26 (23) |

Year of land allotment

- ⇒ **More than half (55%) of the beneficiaries do not possess lands, which was allotted during 1981-1990, a third (33%) were allotted land during 1991-2000 and 10% after 2001 and rest are not aware about the year.**

- ⇒ All the respondents of Dhanera and Tharad taluka who do not have possession are allotted land during 1981-1990.
- ⇒ While in Vav 63% are allotted during 1981-1990, 39% during 1991-2000, 13% after 2001 and rest (8%) is not aware about the period of allotment.

No possession over allotted land

- ⇒ A large number (77%) of beneficiaries do not have possession since the land allotted.
- ⇒ Of total 114, 26 (23%) beneficiaries once possessed lands but later left the possession. Among them, 3 out of 8 of Dhanera taluka and 8 out of 21 of Tharad taluka (38%) but in Vav taluka, 15 out of 85 (18%) beneficiaries left possession.

This means that in Vav taluka, the beneficiaries are scared or threatened more while possessing allotted land compare to Dhanera and Tharad taluka.

Details of present possession: Caste and occupation of land holders

| Details of present possession | Taluka | | | Total (n=114) (%) |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|----------------------|
| | Dhanera (n=8) | Tharad (n=21) | Vav (n=85) | |
| Caste of landholder | | | | |
| Gadhvi | - | - | 01 | 1 (0.9) |
| Mali | - | 04 | - | 4 (3.5) |
| Patel | 01 | 04 | 33 | 38 (33.3) |
| Rabari | 03 | - | 04 | 7 (6.1) |
| Sadhu-Bava | - | 02 | 01 | 3 (2.6) |
| Barot | - | - | 01 | 1 (0.9) |
| Darbar | 01 | 08 | 18 | 27 (23.7) |
| Rajput | 03 | 03 | 22 | 28 (24.6) |
| Don't know | | | 05 | 5 (4.4) |

| Occupation of landholder | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|----|----|------------|
| Cultivator | 08 | 21 | 80 | 109 (95.6) |
| Don't know | - | - | 05 | 5 (4.4) |

Caste and occupation of original landholders

The largest number of landholders belongs to mainly three castes – Patel (33%), Rajput (25%) and Darbar (24%); they belong to so-called ‘upper caste’ and hold half of the total lands. The rest are in single number like Rabarai (7%), Mali (4%), Sadhubava (3%), Barot and others, who belong to OBCs and hold other half of the total lands.

- ⇒ In Dhanera taluka lands are mainly owned by Rabari and Rajput (3 each out of total 8).
- ⇒ In Tharad taluka, lands are mainly owned by Darbar, Mali, Patel and Rajput.
- ⇒ In Vav taluka, land is owned by Patel, Rajput and Darbar.

Around 96% of the beneficiaries informed that the land is presently owned by cultivators, that is, the original landholders.

Action taken for land possession after allotment

| Action taken for land possession | Taluka | | | Total (n=114) (%) |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| | Dhanera (n=8) | Tharad (n=21) | Vav (n=85) | |
| Action taken | | | | |
| Yes | 03 | 10 | 37 | 50 (44) |
| No | 05 | 11 | 48 | 64 (56) |

Type of action taken for land possession

| Action taken for land possession | Taluka | | | Total (n=114) (%) |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| | Dhanera (n=8) | Tharad (n=21) | Vav (n=85) | |
| Oral presentation at land office | 01 | 01 | 03 | 05 (10) |
| Talked to original land owner | 01 | 02 | 04 | 07 (14) |
| Written application to land office | 01 | 04 | 07 | 12 (24) |
| Visited to Prant officer / Circle inspector | - | 02 | 01 | 03 (6) |
| Oral / written presentation at BDS office | - | 01 | 22 | 23 (46) |

Action taken for land possession after allotment

Of total 114, 64 (56%) beneficiaries did not take any action for possession of the land while 50 (44%) did act to possess allotted land.

The various action actions taken were:

- ⇒ Around half the beneficiaries (46%) orally / in written requested BDS staff.
- ⇒ About a fourth (24%) submitted written application at land office.

⇒ Of the rest, 7 (14%) approached the original landowners, 5 (10%) orally informed the government officer and 3 (6%) approached the Circle Inspector.

This means that about a third (30%) knew that they should approach the government office and submit written application for possession over land. The rest did not know 'what action should be taken' and of them, a very small portion, that is, 7 beneficiaries approached the original landowners to negotiate or to get further information or try to solve the problem socially.

Reasons of not attempting for land possession

| Reasons for no action taken for land possession | Taluka | | | Total (n=64) |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| | Dhanera (n=5) | Tharad (n=11) | Vav (n=48) | |
| Confused | 05 | 06 | 32 | 43 (68.3) |
| Scared / threatened | - | 04 | 08 | 12 (19) |
| Waited for measurement of land | - | - | 01 | 01 (1.6) |
| No specific reason | - | 01 | 08 | 09 (14) |

In all 64 beneficiaries did not take any action for possession of lands.

⇒ **Of them, 43 (68%) informed that 'they were confused and did not know what action should be taken'. This confirms that lack of information about action to be taken is one of the major reasons for not possessing allotted land under LCA.**

- ⇒ **Total 12 (19%) beneficiaries reported that ‘they were scared of original landowner’.**
- ⇒ **Only one informed that ‘s/he waited for measurement of land’.**
- ⇒ **No specific reasons were shared by the rest of the beneficiaries.**

Assistance required for possessing allotted land

Of total 114, 72 (63%) shared their views about assistance required for possessing allotted land. They are as follow:

- ⇒ In all 66 (92%) said that ‘if land has been given happily by the original landowner, they would have taken it.’ In tune to this, one beneficiary said that ‘s/he would have given money to the landowner.’
- ⇒ One said that ‘The government officials should help in possessing allotted land.’

SUMMARIZING SECTION 3

- **No possession over allotted land:** More than two-thirds (77%) of beneficiaries do not have possession since the land allotted, mostly over 20 years ago. While, of total 114, 26 (23%) beneficiaries once possessed lands but later left the possession.
- **Ownership on non-possessed land:** The largest number of original landholders belongs to mainly three castes – Patel (33%), Rajput (25%) and Darbar (24%); they belong to so-called ‘upper caste’ and hold half of the total lands redistributed under LCA.
- **Action taken for land possession after allotment:** Of total 114, 64 (56%) beneficiaries did not take any action for possession of the land while 50 (44%) did act to possess allotted land.
- **Awareness about what action to be taken for land possession:** A third (30%) knew that they should approach the government office and submit written

application for possession over land. The rest did not know 'what action should be taken'.

- **Reasons of not attempting for land possession:** Lack of information about action to be taken is one of the major reasons for not possessing allotted land under LCA.43 (68%) informed that 'they were confused and did not know what action should be taken'. Total 12 (19%) beneficiaries reported that 'they were scared of original landowner'
- **Assistance required for possessing allotted land:** In all 66 (92%) said that 'if land has been given happily by the original landowner, they would have taken it.'

CHAPTER 3

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY AND PLAN FOR ADVOCACY

The study reveals that of total beneficiaries, not more than 37% possess land allotted under Land Ceiling Act. This means that land reform is as successful as it is expected to be. One of the major reasons is that it has failed to mobilize number of tillers and tenants to take over possession. The non-cooperation of bureaucrats, administrative red-tapism, social controversy and vested interests are known negative factors in carrying out land reforms effectively.

The reasons behind not possessing land seemed to be difficult and complex, as various factors are contributing to its success. In case of Banaskantha district, very large number of beneficiaries belongs to Scheduled Castes (86%) and facing feudal mindset in taking over possession of land allotted to them. There is no supportive measure taken by the government or the civil society to further the cause of land reform.

- Rarely seen that a beneficiary has taken possession over land by confronting the original landowner.
- Role of government officials remain passive in handing over lands to the beneficiaries, that is, restricted to paper work only.
- Although the beneficiaries identified are suitable, such as, large number of them is cultivators cum casual labourers or labourers, but the follow up actions are weaker from the government office, e.g. measuring and identification process for the land. The survey revealed that only 36% lands were officially measured. Similarly, a nominal number has possession over the lands and the government officials have not reported any dynamic action for possession or cultivation of such lands.

The land distribution seems to be a major constraint; among the other reasons type, size and distance of location are major problems.

- More than 80% have been allotted Jarayat land.
- The process of land redistribution was paced up in 1980 and 1990s but has been drastically slowed down since the year 2000.
- Of total, 25% beneficiaries were allotted land in group and about 10 kms away from native village. Among them, 75% do not possess lands.

Lack of awareness and absence of guidance are a major hurdles in taking over the possession of the allotted land under LCA.

- Only one out of 114 beneficiaries has given written application to land office, reporting problems faced by him in taking possession. Most of the beneficiaries (>80%) informed that they were confused about the action to be taken. Only few (about 20%) beneficiaries approached the government officials and orally shared their problems in taking possession over allotted lands.

- The agent of changes like government offices (land office, social welfare office, and department of agriculture), social activists or non-government organizations need to support the beneficiaries for the possession, entitlement, cultivation and poverty alleviation through meaningful use of allotted lands.

The study reveals that mere official formalities cannot make land reform meaningful and successful. This need a commitment, rigourous follow up actions to fight the vested interests, thorough monitoring, updating land records and coordination with various institutions. The social dynamics in an unequal society must be taken in to consideration to make the land reform effective.

This study recommends certain matters must be taken into consideration in implementing any program on land reform. They are:

- ⇒ The social dynamics like caste, power-relation between original landowners and the beneficiaries should be handled in favour of land reform.
- ⇒ The socio-economic and informational preparedness of the beneficiaries for land possession is must.
- ⇒ Economic and physical viability for the beneficiaries to cultivate the land has to be ensured through various programmes like land improvement, credit for agricultural activities and produce. The size, type, distance of lands allotted to the beneficiaries are major consideration for its viability.
- ⇒ Role, response, will and interest of the government officials (Talati, Land office, Mamlatdar) at various levels such as thorough monitoring, updating land records and coordination with various institutions are essential.

Bibliography

1. Ghanshayam Shah, 2002, Land Reform In India, Sage Publication, New Delhi, Thousand Oaks London
2. Klaus Deiniger 2002, Land Policies For Growth And Poverty Reduction, A Copublication Of The World Bank And Oxford University Press.
3. Pranab K. Bardham, 1984, Land Reform In India, Performance And Challenges In Gujarat And Maharashtra, Delhi, Oxford University Press, Bombay Calcutta Madras
4. B.N. Ganguly P.S. Datta, 1995 Land Reform In India Rajasthan Feudalism And Change, Sage Publication, India Pvt. Ltd, M-32 Greater Kailash Market, Part I, New Delhi
5. Ronald J. Herring, 1983, Land To The Tiller, The Political Economy Of Agrarian Reform In South Asia, Delhi Oxford University Press, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras.
6. Paramjit S Judge, 1999, Social Change Through Land Reforms, Rawant Publications, New Delhi,
7. P. Eashvariah, 1985, Political Dimension Of Land Reform In India, Ashish Publishing House New Delhi.