BLOGS

Case Analysis: State of Rajasthan v. Vidyawati

Khushi Malviya · 27 Jul 2024

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Facts of the Case Issues of the Case Related Provisions in the Arguments Presented Arguments Advanced Judgement of State of Rajasthan v. Vidyawati Analysis of the Judgement

Facts of the Case

In February 1952, Lokumal, an employee of the Rajasthan State working as a motor driver, was driving a government jeep car for necessary repairs. After repairs, while driving the car back along a public road, he accidentally struck and caused fatal injuries to Jagdishlal, who was walking on the footpath in Udaipur city.

Jagdishlal succumbed to his injuries three days later. The widow, Vidyawati, and their three-year-old daughter sued Lokumal and the State of Rajasthan for damages, seeking Rs. 25,000 in compensation. The first defendant (Lokumal) remained ex-parte, and the trial court decreed the suit against him. However, the second defendant (State of Rajasthan) contested the suit, leading to the trial court dismissing it without costs.

The High Court later passed a decree in favor of the plaintiffs, awarding Rs. 15,000 in compensation against the State of Rajasthan. On appeal, the High Court decreed the suit against Lokumal as well, with costs in both courts. The State of Rajasthan is now appealing this decision in the Supreme Court.

Issues of the Case

1. Liability under Article 300: The primary issue at hand is whether the state can be held accountable under Article 300 of the constitution for the tortious acts committed by its servants.
2. Nature of the Suit: A critical consideration is whether the suit is being maintained in the exercise of sovereign powers or if it is an integral part of any commercial activity undertaken by the State.

Related Provisions in the Arguments Presented

1. Certificate under Article 133(1)(c): The State of Rajasthan applied for and obtained a certificate indicating that the case fulfills the requirements of Art. 133(1)(c) of the Constitution of India.
2. Counsel's Raised Questionsa.(1st Question) Article 300 Liability: The appellant's counsel contends that, according to Article 300 of the Constitution, the State of Rajasthan is not liable, arguing that the state's liability should align with the circumstances that would have existed before the Constitution came into force. b. (2nd Question) Sovereign Powers: The more critical of the two questions raised is whether the retention of the Jeep car, subject to claims of rash and negligent driving, falls under the "exercise of sovereign powers.
3. Plaintiffs-Respondents' Argument: The plaintiffs-respondents argue that Chapter III of Part XII of the Constitution, titled "Property, Contracts, Rights, Liabilities, Obligations and Suits," encompasses other Articles (namely Arts. 294 and 295) dealing with rights and liabilities. They contend that Article 300 is limited to determining in whose name suits and proceedings may be commenced.

Arguments Advanced

Defendant-Appellants' Submissions:

1. The liability of the State must be determined under Article 300(1) of the Constitution.
2. The State of Rajasthan cannot be held liable under Article 300, as the corresponding Indian State would not have been liable before the Constitution came into force.

3. To establish liability, the respondent-plaintiff must prove that the State of Udaipur (corresponding state) would have been liable pre-Constitution.
4. The maintenance of the jeep car is asserted to be in the exercise of sovereign functions, not as part of any commercial activity.

Judgement of State of Rajasthan v. Vidyawati

The Supreme Court of India decided to hear this appeal following the certification by the Rajasthan High Court under Article 133. The case involved a substantial legal question regarding the interpretation of Article 300. Notably, the court acknowledged the government's suability, citing the precedent set in the case of **State of Bihar v. Abdul Majid**.

The Supreme Court examined the state's liability under the Government of India Act, 1935, and other statutes. It concluded that the state's liability after independence mirrors that of the East India Company, as established in the case of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. v. The Secretary of State for India. The central issue addressed was the extent of the government's vicarious liability for the wrongful actions of its employees during their official duties.

Analysis of the Judgement

In the case of State of Rajasthan v. Vidhyawati, the Supreme Court conducted a thorough analysis to determine the State's liability for the wrongful acts committed by its servants. Referring to the Peninsular & Oriental Steam Navigation Company case, the court emphasized the distinction between acts done in the exercise of sovereign power and those conducted in the realm of activities that could be carried out by private individuals.

The court held that immunity applies only to acts performed in the exercise of sovereign power. Despite finding no legal provisions absolving the State from liability, the court rejected the outdated notion of 'the king can do no wrong,' highlighting its obsolescence in the UK with the Crown Proceedings Act, 1947. The court clarified that even before this act, the rule of absolute sovereign immunity was never applicable in India.

This landmark decision established that the State is not immune in all cases, especially when its employees are involved in activities outside sovereign functions. The judgment underscored the need to hold the State liable for its employees' actions, aligning with the principles applicable to an ordinary employer.