

APPELLATE CIVIL.

Before Sir John Beaumont, Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Sen and Mr. Justice Norman.

1937
September 13

BAI KOYNABAI, WIDOW OF THE DECEASED SAMBHAJI BABAJI MORE (ORIGINAL APPLICANT), APPELLANT *v.* THE BOMBAY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION REPRESENTED BY THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER FOR THE CITY OF BOMBAY (ORIGINAL OPPOSITE PARTY), RESPONDENT.*

The Workmen's Compensation Act (VIII of 1923), section 2 (1) (n)—“ Workman ”—Working pipe-line—Interpretation—Schedule II, clause (x).

In order to ascertain the degree of pressure in the water mains the respondent Municipality, which was in charge of the water supply for Bombay, had to fix to the stand pipe a recording instrument, and to keep the instrument working for 24 consecutive hours. The test was started at 8 a.m. on April 16, 1936, and was continued throughout the night. Two coolies employed in their Water Department were placed on guard to watch the instrument at night. During the night an accident occurred and one of the coolies was killed. The widow of the deceased having sought to recover compensation from the respondent, a question arose whether the deceased was at the time a workman within the meaning of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923 :—

Held, (by Beaumont C. J. and Sen J., Norman J. dissenting) that the coolie, who was killed, was a person employed in the working of the pipe-line, and was therefore a workman within the meaning of the Act, and accordingly his widow was entitled to compensation.

Per Beaumont C. J. The expression “ working a pipe-line ” covers all work necessary in the view of the employer for the efficient working of the pipe-line.

Per Sen J. The expression “ working ” in clause (x) of Schedule II to the Act would include all acts or operations intended and reasonably calculated to cause the pipe-line to function in the way it is intended to function.

Per Norman J. When a person's sole duty is to prevent some external interference with the working of a pipe-line and when he has no knowledge whatever of how a pipe-line should be worked, such task cannot be considered to be included in the expression “ working of the pipe-line ”.

APPEAL from the decision of A. H. Dracup, Commissioner for Workmen's Compensation, Bombay, in application No. 327/B-26 of 1936.

Application to recover compensation.

* First Appeal No. 237 of 1936

1937

BAI KOYNABAI
v.
BOMBAY
MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION

The Water Department of the Bombay Municipality takes action from time to time to ascertain the degree of pressure in the water mains. In order to do so they attach an apparatus known as the water recorder which works automatically once it is set. When it is expedient to check the pressure in the main which serves a fire hydrant, a water recorder is attached to the stand pipe and a 24-hour test is taken. On April 16, 1936, such a test was commenced at 8 a.m. in respect of the fire hydrant connected with the 24" water main on Gibbs Road. Two coolies who were employed in the service of the Municipality were put on duty to watch the spot to see that the recording apparatus was not removed or tampered with. In the early hours of the morning of April 17, it was discovered that both watchmen were injured, and one of them, viz. Sambhaji Babaji, was dead.

Bai Koynabai, the widow of the deceased Sambhaji, applied to recover compensation from the Bombay Municipality (respondent) on account of the death of her husband. The Municipality contended that the deceased was not a workman within the meaning of section 2 (1) (n) read with Schedule II of the Workmen's Compensation Act and no claim could arise under the Act.

The learned Commissioner was of opinion that the deceased performing such duties as were allotted to him on April 16 should be excluded from the scope of clause (x) of Schedule II of the Act. He accordingly dismissed the claim.

Bai Koynabai appealed.

S. C. Joshi, with *P. S. Bakhale*, for the appellant.

P. M. Chubwalla, for the respondent.

BEAUMONT C. J. This is an appeal from the Commissioner for Workmen's Compensation. The facts found are that the Bombay Municipality, who were the employers, are in charge of the water supply for Bombay, and in order to test the

1937
 BAI KOYNABAI
 v.
 BOMBAY
 MUNICIPAL
 CORPORATION
 ———
 Beaumont C. J.

efficiency of the system it becomes necessary for them at times to ascertain the degree of pressure in the water mains. On the occasion in question when the accident occurred they were testing the pressure in the 24" water main on Gibbs Road. In order to test the pressure they had to fix to the stand pipes a recording instrument and to keep that instrument working for twenty-four consecutive hours. They started the test at 8 a.m. on April 16, and as the test had to be continued throughout the night they placed two coolies on guard to watch the instrument during the night. The coolies in question were employed in the Water Department of the Bombay Municipality. During the night an accident occurred and one of the coolies, whose representative is the claimant in this case, was killed and the other was rendered unconscious and we are told does not remember in the least how the accident occurred. The Commissioner thinks that the coolies may have been asleep and have been run into by some passing motor car, but that is only a guess. We do not know what happened, and it is at any rate possible that the coolies met with the accident in an endeavour to prevent some careless motorist from running into the apparatus, which it was their business to protect.

It is not disputed that the accident arose out of and in the course of the employment of the deceased man, and the only question is whether he was at the time a workman within the meaning of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Section 2 (1) (n) of the Act, so far as material for the present purpose, defines a "workman" as meaning any person who is employed on monthly wages not exceeding three hundred rupees in any such capacity as is specified in Schedule II. Schedule II provides that persons are workmen within the meaning of section 2 (1) (n) who are employed in any of the various forms of employment specified. A great many of the expressions employed in the schedule are capable, I think, of being given either a wider or a narrower construction.

For instance clause (viii) includes amongst workmen persons employed in the construction, repair, or demolition of any building, etc. Apart from the context one might give to the words "construction, repair or demolition" a restricted meaning, and hold that only persons who are actually employed in the work of building, repair or demolition are included. On the other hand, the expression may embrace anybody employed in work necessary to enable the work of construction, repair or demolition to be carried out, for instance, persons who are employed in erecting a temporary scaffolding to enable repairs to be done, or persons bringing to the site materials required for the work. Having regard to the scope and intention of the Act, which is to give compensation to workmen injured in particular forms of employment I am satisfied that the Court ought rather to give a wider than a narrower interpretation to the expressions used in the Act, a principle of construction which, I think, is in accordance with the construction placed on the English Act by the House of Lords in *Lysons v. Andrew Knowles and Sons, Limited : Stuart v. Nixon & Bruce.*^ω The test seems to me really to be whether when a man meets with an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment, he was in the position in which he was when the accident occurred because of the work specified in the schedule. His particular share in the work whether active or passive, skilled or unskilled, is irrelevant.

Now here the clause under which the workman is alleged to come is clause (x) of the second schedule which includes amongst workmen any person employed, otherwise than in a clerical capacity, in the construction, working, repair or demolition of any aerial ropeway, canal pipe-line, or sewer. The question is whether the workman in this case was employed in working a pipe-line. Now on the findings the employer, viz., the Bombay Municipality, was responsible for the working of this pipe-line. In order to work it

1987
 BAI KOYNABAI
 v.
 BOMBAY
 MUNICIPAL
 CORPORATION
 Beaumont C. J.

^ω [1901] A. C. 79.

1937
 BAI KOYNABAI
 v.
 BOMBAY
 MUNICIPAL
 CORPORATION
 ———
Legumont C. J.

efficiently they had to test the pressure in the main for twenty-four hours. In order to do that they had to keep a recording instrument in position during the night of April 16 and 17. Clearly if no protection was afforded to the instrument, it might be stolen or damaged, deliberately or by inadvertence by some passerby. Moreover as the instrument was raised above the level of the roadway the Municipality was bound to protect the users of the roadway from the obstruction they were placing upon it. It was for the employers to consider what steps were necessary in order to enable this test to be carried out, and they decided that for that purpose it was necessary to place on guard these two coolies. That being so, I can see no reason why these coolies were not employed in the working of the pipe-line. The learned Commissioner was impressed by the fact that in two of the paragraphs of the second schedule, viz. 2 and 5, the words used are "incidental to or connected with," but those two paragraphs are framed rather differently to the other paragraphs. They do not specify the actual work on which the workman is to be employed, but refer to work incidental to or connected with manufacturing or mining operations, and I see no reason why the special phraseology of those two paragraphs should in any way cut down the natural meaning of the words used in other paragraphs. It is not really a question of reading into paragraph 10 the words "incidental to or connected with". The question is what operations are embraced in the expression "working a pipe-line," and in my opinion, that expression covers all work necessary in the view of the employer for the efficient working of the pipe-line. In my judgment the coolie, who was killed, was a person employed in the working of the pipe-line, and was therefore a workman within the meaning of the Act and his widow is entitled to compensation.

The appeal must be allowed and the case referred back to the Commissioner to fix the amount of compensation. The appellant must get her costs of the appeal.

SEN J. I agree The expression "working" in clause (x) of the second schedule to the Act has obviously been used in the active sense of operating or causing the pipe-line to perform its appointed work or function. The expression, therefore, in my opinion, would include all acts or operations intended and reasonably calculated to cause the pipe-line to function in the way it is intended to function. All such acts or operations would thus be a part of, and not merely incidental to or connected with, the working of the pipe-line. The interpretation that the Commissioner has put on the expression has been based largely on the fact that in clauses (ii) and (v) of Schedule II the words "incidental to or connected with" have been used, but the same words have not been used in this clause. In clause (ii) those words have been used in connection with manufacturing processes in which mechanical or electrical power is used, and in clause (v) the words have been used with reference to mining operations. "Manufacturing process" has been defined in the Indian Factories Act, 1911, and "mine" has been defined in the Indian Mines Act, 1923. There is, on the other hand, no statutory definition of the words construction, working, repair and demolition used in clause (x). It would, therefore, seem that if the words "incidental to or connected with" were used with the word "working", the scope of clause (x) would have been unduly widened. It seems to me impossible, consistent with the object of the Act, to define the word "working" so as to confine its meaning to such acts as would directly involve merely physical effects on the pipe-line or its functions as such. There is no reason why, if periodical tests are essential for the proper functioning of the pipe-line, such tests should not be regarded as an essential and integral part of its working, nor why the keeping of men to watch over the apparatus used for such tests not be regarded as an essential part of the test and thus also of the working of the pipe-line. The employment of such a man would be essential to the test in the sense that the test would be

1937

BAI KOYNABAI

2.

BOMBAY
MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION

1937
 BAI KOYNABAI
 v.
 BOMBAY
 MUNICIPAL
 CORPORATION
 Sen. J.

exposed to risk of being nullified or rendered valueless unless the apparatus was guarded against being tampered with or its being removed. The question, however, may be raised, how far is such a chain of necessary connections to be carried? If, for instance, a certain thing is necessitated in order that men can be employed in the working of a pipe-line, would such a thing, again, be an essential part of the working of the pipe-line? I think that if such a thing be an act or operation intended to cause the pipe-line to function in the way in which it is intended to function or to continue so to function, then it would be within the scope of the words "working of the pipe-line"; otherwise not. Judged by this test it must, I think, be held that the deceased was employed in the working of the pipe-line. I, therefore, agree to the order proposed by my Lord the Chief Justice.

NORMAN J. With all due respect I am unable to agree with the view of my Lord the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Sen. The question is whether a person can be said to be "employed in the working of a pipe-line," when his sole duty is to prevent some external interference with the working and when he has no knowledge whatever of how a pipe-line should be worked, and would, if anything went wrong, be unable to apply any remedy. In some contexts no doubt "working" has a very wide significance, but in connection with machinery it has a more restricted significance and means doing something positive which helps to make the machine work. That a narrower sense is intended in the schedule is in my view suggested by two things. In the first place the word "working" occurs between the words "construction" on one side and "repair or demolition" on the other, all of which are words of some technical significance. Secondly, as pointed out by the learned Commissioner, in two other articles in the schedule the expression used is "in any kind of work whatsoever incidental to or connected with any such manufacturing process" or "any

mining operation." Contrasting the wording it appears to me that the Act did intend to give rather more extended protection to persons employed in factories and mines, than to persons employed in other capacities set out in the schedule.

With regard to the facts my Lord the Chief Justice has suggested that the deceased might have met his death in preventing some motor car from running into the pipe stand. It does not appear however on the evidence that it was any part of the coolies' duty to direct the traffic. Two lanterns were placed by the stand pipe to give warning to traffic car. All that the coolies had to do was to see that nobody deliberately removed the recorder. In my view this task cannot be considered to be included in the expression "working of the pipe-line," and I, therefore, think with great respect, that the appeal should be dismissed.

Appeal allowed.

Y. V. D.

APPELLATE CIVIL.

Before Sir John Beaumont, Chief Justice, and Mr. Justice Blackwell.

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX, BOMBAY PRESIDENCY, SIND AND BALUCHISTAN, REFERROR *v.* THE AHMEDABAD ADVANCE MILLS LIMITED OF BOMBAY, ASSESSEES.*

1937
September 27

Indian Income-tax Act (XI of 1922), section 4 (2)—Income received by assessee in London—Income invested in machinery and stores in England—Machinery brought into British India—Whether machinery and stores can be regarded as income liable to be taxed.

The assessee, a limited company of Bombay, received certain income amounting to Rs. 18,000 odd in London. They invested that income in the purchase of stores and machinery in England, which they shipped to Bombay. A question was raised whether the stores and machinery could be regarded as income brought into British India :

* Civil Reference No. 9 of 1937.

1937
BAY KONYABAI
n.
BOMBAY
MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION
Norman J.