Quest Journals
Journal of Education, Arts, Law and Multidisplinary
Volume 15 ~ Issue 2 (Mar.-Apr. 2025) pp: 72-77
ISSN(Online): 2347-2895
www.questjournals.org

Research Paper

Land Rights, Landlessness, and Social Justice: An Empirical Study of Land Distribution and Rural Inequality in Telangana

Deeti Ravinder
LLM Dr B.R. Ambedkar Law College, Hyderabad

Abstract
In Telangana, land is a key determinant of rural livelihoods, economic security, and social power. Ownership, access for operation and meaningful control represent agrarian inequality in different ways. The study undertakes an analysis of the relationships through a descriptive empirical analysis of published official statistics. This is enriched by legal analysis and Telangana specific research. One may appoint oneself as a judge. It is the fallacy of division. The results suggest that marginal holdings account for a high share of operational holdings but a low share of operated area. Evidence published also shows unequal landholding patterns among social groups, but interpretation is complicated by differences in quality, location and even definition of survey. It is argued in the paper that not all households without holdings are operational holders and therefore the operational-holding statistics cannot establish the degree of landlessness. Additionally, it seeks to understand how tenancy, gender relations, land records, and welfare related to ownership can mediate access to agriculture resources. Policies that are just must secure rights and recognize the actual cultivators (farmers), must ensure access to remedies, must offer productive support and must ensure distributive justice. Unlike reporting of original fieldwork, this study offers an assessment of secondary data.
Keywords: *land rights, landlessness, Telangana, rural inequality, social justice, tenancy, caste, agrarian reform*

I. Introduction

Land serves a variety of purposes in rural communities. A house is a productive asset which can also be used for setting up residence. It may provide rental income. Further, it can also serve as an instrument of security across generations. Strengthening bargaining power in labour markets, households and local institutions. As a result, unequal distribution of land opportunities can affect other things apart from agriculture.

The lack of land with rural households is not the problem. The dimensions, quality, site, legal title and actual control of that land also matter. A small irrigated holding close to a market may provide very different opportunities from a larger rainfed parcel with insecure access. Similarly, a tenant can cultivate the land without owning it, and an owner can depend mainly on non-agricultural income.

Research examines how India's agrarian institutions impact development outcomes. The work of Banerjee and Iyer demonstrates that historical land-tenure institutions matter. Besley and Burgess investigate the land reform-poverty-growth links (Banerjee and Iyer; Besley and Burgess). The research vindicates the investigation of institutional legacy but does not demonstrate the impacts of specific contemporary Telangana policies.

This paper poses three questions. What published statistics on operational holdings reveal in Telangana? How do caste and tenancy gender administrative presence affect substantive access? How can we focus on the landless without being at the mercy of smallholders?

Social Justice Requires Us to Pay Attention to Distribution, Recognition and Effective Uses While redistribution can produce an asset, its returns depend on who holds it, the support it provides, and enforceable rights. In the same way, administrative modernisation may change processes and improve services without changing the underlying distribution of resources.

II. Objectives, Data, and Methodology

The analysis in this study includes both descriptive and documentary. The goal of this is to identify different forms of land access; to examine published distributional patterns; to interpret the implications of appropriate literature; and to identify priority policies.

The primary quantitative source is Telangana's Socio Economic Outlook 2024 that reproduces Agriculture Census 2021–22 estimates. The Independent Expert Working Group report on the SEEEPC Survey provides additional evidence about social groups. The 2019 survey framework of the National Statistical Office guides the treatment of ownership, operational holdings and agricultural households.

Statistics of the Agriculture Census refer to the operational holdings and not the whole rural household. The national census report is therefore systemically referenced in methodology, as are various state published tables (India, Department of Agriculture). The NSO (National Statistical Office) survey presents a different statistical framework, and its categories cannot be substituted without checking definitions and denominators.

The examination draws on reported percentage, holding-area share comparisons, and contextual interpretation. None of the datasets for households were analysed. As a result, the paper does not attempt to estimate a Telangana land ownership Gini coefficient, carry out significance tests, or attribute changes to a programme.

The legal sources were picked based on their relevance to tenancy ceilings, assigned lands and community rights. The official population estimates shouldn't be substituted yet a supply of explanations and local comparisons.

The contribution that can be found by the empirical is a clear interpretation of published results. This is not a field survey of origin. The Paper does not resolve the question of statewide landlessness rates or connections if there is no proof.

III. Defining Land Rights and Landlessness

Distinguishing land ownership, operational access and substantive control is relevant. Having ownership refers to an interest recognised by lawstatistically. The topic of operational access relates to land used for the production of food and fibre, irrespective of who owns it. Substantive control refers to practical power over something and deciding its use.

These sizes overlap badly. A tenant without land can crop a large farm. The owner of a small tract of land may lease it out and work for wages. A woman can be recorded as an owner, meanwhile, some other member can control cultivation and earn. Consequently, classification has an impact on both measurement and policy.

According to the narrow statistical definition of the NSO, landless are households which own no land or no 0.002 hectares. Under this definition, having possession of a small residential plot can be the factor that distinguishes one household from another that owns no land, even though neither household has agricultural land. According to the National Statistical Office, agricultural wage labour households are not included in it. These differences make the denominator important.

According to Rawal, the analysis of ownership holdings highlights the importance of definitions in relation to rural land inequality. The report of a policy assessment should ideally provide several measures, these includes not having any owned land, not having any agricultural land, not having any operational land, and being an agricultural labour dependant.

The current study does not derive landlessness by analyzing marginal holding percentage. This deduction would miss out on families without properties and will confuse limited access with no access. The issues of smallholding vulnerability and landlessness are linked; however, they require different evidence.

IV. Analytical Framework: Distribution, Access, and Justice

A distributional approach looks at who owns what land and how much. An access approach considers who benefits from access to a genome. The practical access can depend on finance, labour, institutions, and social relationships beyond formal property rights – a useful theoretical point by Ribot and Peluso.

Sen's capability perspective more profoundly questions whether access means people are able to pursue secure and valued livelihoods. Practically, a title affords little benefit when the holder cannot access the parcel, get water, or defend possession.

Gender analysis is equally important. Agarwal says command over property is a central dimension of women's economic position in South Asia (Agarwal, Field). This promotes analysing decisions and benefits-sharing within the household instead of treating household ownership as evidence of equal individual control.

Examining caste requires an analysis of institutions and markets. Thorat and Newman's edited collection shows how economic discrimination works in modern India, providing a basis for enquiry into uneven forms of participation without making the assumption that no two transactions in a locale follow the same pattern (Thorat and Newman).

Finally, the land grabbing and dispossession scholarship urges closer examination of control shift and development gains distribution (Borras et al.; Levien) Such perspectives do not warrant calling every land transaction dispossession. They require proof as to consent, power, purpose and outcomes

V. Empirical Findings: Operational Holdings in Telangana

Table 1 presents the state's published distribution of operational holdings and operated area.

Table 1. Distribution of operational holdings and operated area in Telangana, 2021–22

Holding class	Standard size category	Share of holdings (%)	Share of operated area (%)
Marginal	Below 1 hectare	68.7	32.8
Small	1–2 hectares	22.7	35.4
Semi-medium	2–4 hectares	7.1	20.5
Medium	4–10 hectares	1.4	8.7
Large	10 hectares and above	0.1	2.6

Source: Telangana, Planning Department, Socio Economic Outlook 2022, 63. Figures are rounded as published.

As per this source, the average size of holdings fell from 1.00 hectare in 2015–16 to 0.89 hectares in 2021–22. Scheduled Castes accounted for 13.9 per cent of the operational holdings and 9.7 per cent of the operated area. The results related to operational distribution, not ownership of agricultural land.

Holding your shares published and rounded gives you a marginal holding of about 0.48 and Scheduled Caste holding of about 0.70. Based on average size and not useful indicators of land value, household wealth, or causal disadvantage, calculations show statewide average.

The significance of equality and its reciprocal in adjoining areas entails a number that controls area. Nonetheless, Area alone cannot determine productivity or sufficiency of livelihood. Irrigation, soil type, crop selection, and household labor demands may vary greatly within each size class.

The average operational size decreasing does not necessarily prove successful redistribution. The differences may be due to inheritance, subdivision, operational rearrangement, and enumeration. To determine the contribution of each mechanism, household histories and comparable records are required.

VI. Caste, Land Distribution, and Local Variation

The report SEEEPC expert presents more evidence of unequal landholding. As per the reported types of landholdings, the percentage of small landholding (landholding below five acres) was 90.5 for Scheduled Castes, 85.0 for Backward Classes, 80.1 for Scheduled Tribes and 69.1 for General Castes. The report recognizes a potential inaccuracy in self-reported land information (Independent Expert Working Group 98-100).

These findings should be interpreted cautiously. These should not be transformed into rural-only ownership estimates absent the necessary disaggregation. The report's below-five-acre category should not be equated with every Agriculture Census category. The coverage and denominators of survey differ.

Self-reporting raises methodological questions about omitted parcels, joint ownership, classification and differential reporting. Relative comparisons do not automatically eliminate these problems: there can be reporting error across groups and holding sizes. Conclusions would benefit from verification.

Research carried out locally offers a new point of view. In Nalgonda district, Gudivada village surveyed by Kumar and Moharaj reports changing pattern of landholdings including increase among OBCs with no growth of SCs and STs. Substantial inequality within social groups is identified (Kumar and Moharaj).

VII. Landlessness, Labour Dependence, and Tenancy

We must understand that not all forms of landlessness will result in dependence on wage employment. The consequences of landlessness vary depending on the local labour demand, public employment opportunities, chances of migrating, and the skills possessed by the household. A landless household with secure non-farm earnings may have more stable income than an indebted cultivator. Recognizing this diversity is essential for social justice as is the unequal ownership of assets.

When tenancies occur, the ownership and cultivation get altered further. Leasing is an affordability not possible with a household's buying power. The advantages are determined by rent, duration, renewal expectations, and the allocation of production risks.

An expert committee at NITI Aayog has come up with a model framework for agricultural leasing which deals with insecurity and improving the functioning of lease markets (NITI Aayog). This serves as a policy reference, and not a proof that every recommendation is law.

Study of land reform also advises against simplistic assumptions. Deininger et al and Ghatak and Roy look at linkages between reform, poverty reduction and growth, and the evidence on agricultural productivity, respectively. The significance of institutional design and implementation, as opposed to a one-size-fits-all outcome of any restriction, is established by their results.

An effective empirical agenda for Telangana would distinguish landless tenants from, owner-tenants, owners leasing out and agricultural labourers. By merging them into one category called "farmer", one does not know much about ownership of assets, incurring of cultivation costs and receiving of support.

VIII. Land Rights and the Legal Architecture

The constitution links equality with distributional obligation. Articles 14, 39(b), 39(c), and 46 contain principles relating to equal treatment, distribution of material resources, concentration of wealth and interest of weaker sections. According to Article 300A of the Indian Constitution, No person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of law.

The agrarian framework in Telangana consists of the Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950 (TALA); the Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973; and the Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Act, 1977.The two relationships addressed by these Acts cannot be treated as interchangeable instruments (Telangana, Tenancy; Land Reforms; Assigned Lands).

A legal analysis must scrutinise the specific parcel, claimant, relevant provisions and proceedings. An assertion that land can be distributed does not prove occupation. A restriction on transferring the departure does not itself yield the right to reliably cultivate.

In a dispute in Karimnagar involving G. Shankar Reddy v. Revenue Divisional Officer, the High Court reiterated that it should first be established that the land in question falls within the statutory definition before proceeding under the assigned-lands law (G. Shankar Reddy, par. 7).

The lesson is always act deliberately. Protection against illegal alienation and protection against arbitrary administrative action support one another. In order for a reform to be effective, there must be evidence, notice, reasoning and remedy.

IX. Gender and Substantive Ownership

Women's land rights can be evaluated at multiple levels including recorded ownership, claims to inheritance, participation in transactions, decision-making around cultivation, and control over proceeds. The results of the indicators vary.

A woman who is noted as an owner may still encounter practical difficulties in accessing documents or negotiating agreements on cultivation. On the other hand, women without individual titles can do a lot of farming work.

The study on the occupational choices of farmers by Agarwal and Agrawal highlights the need to ask cultivators about their conditions and choices rather assuming homogenizing aspirations. Rephrased:

Land Policy should offer expanded feasible options, including secure cultivation and suitable non-farm opportunities.To this end, research should combine administrative records with confidential individual interviews. The questions will identify who decides the leasing, borrowing, crop, and expenditure. They should further examine whether legally relevant succession interests are recognized.

Economic and legal outreach, women exporter organisation support, inheritance support and accessible mutation procedures may be included in policy response. The addition of names in record books should not be an assessment measure for their efficiency rather, actual control and income security .

X. Land Records, Digitalisation, and Welfare Distribution

When a record is accurate, it can reduce uncertainty and instil confidence in transactions . However, digitalisation will not itself make those records substantively accurate. When reference data is replicated in integrated systems, there are often strict agreements regarding scope.

Ramakumar & Ramesh's view on Telangana shows how essential contradictions and exclusions were consistent in land-record modernisation. Scott's a detailed interpretation of administrative simplification will shed light on how these standardized categories miss an interconnected local relationship (Scott). These views help towards verifying and easily correcting technology instead of rejecting it.

The welfare linked to ownership causes a distributional problem. Scholars Thomas et al. look at the earlier Rythu Bandhu scheme to look at linkage between land records and beneficiary identification. What it finds in history should not be presupposed to characterize any scheme not found in history unchanged.

The overall mechanism is still important: where eligibility is defined by recorded ownership, it may require separate policy routes for cultivating tenants and landless workers. Streamlining payment delivery won't fix a structural exclusion embedded in eligibility rule.

A trustworthy evaluation should, therefore, differentiate between failures to deliver, recording errors and exclusion for policy reasons. Every one of them requires a different remedy. Accelerated transfers solve the first issue, adjudication and correction tackle the second and redesigned coverage the third.

XI. Redistribution, Land Quality, and Livelihood Viability

Redistribution should be evaluated through continuous possession and use. Administrative acreage totals provide little information about boundaries, physical access, competing occupation, irrigation, and costs to cultivate.

Balagopal's examination of ceiling surpluses and public lands offers a regional critique germane to the investigation of these implementation queries. The Andhra Pradesh land-governance assessment undertaken by the World Bank gives a wider institutional referent, although its historical territorial coverage should not be confused automatically with the modern Telangana (World Bank).

Support that is productive is important because a beneficiary may get land. But he may not have adequate working capital. The economic usefulness of an asset can be influenced by credit, appropriate inputs, extension, and water management and marketing access.

Deininger says institutional arrangements, investment and poverty reduction are related to land policy. Nonetheless, productive viability must not be defined through acreage. A small holding's role may vary with household labour, crop suitability, integration of livestock, and non-farm income.

According to Food Security, land ownership not only supports own-production and income but also nutrition from expenditure, health care, sanitation and care practice. Receiving land should not be reported to show nutritional improvement unless measurements are taken.

XII. Tribal Rights and Community Resources

Not all forms of legitimate rural access are contained in individual agricultural titles. The use of a forest for grazing, water and community resources.

PESA acknowledges the institutional roles of Gram Sabhas and suitable Panchayats in Scheduled Areas while the Forest Rights Act provides for certain individual and community forest rights (India, Provisions; India, Scheduled Tribes). The application process depends upon your location, eligibility, and the law.

We should not assume that a community's tenure is uniformly secure or inefficient, as that is not always the case. Researchers require proof regarding access regulations, contesting assertions, resource status, and involvement.

The FAO tenure guidelines emphasize legitimate tenure interests, accessible justice and responsible governance in a comparative framework (Food and Agriculture Organization). Domestic law is not replaced but rather supplemented by this.

A fair program must avoid enhancing access for one category of person by extinguishing existing legitimate collective interests. Land availability should thus be proved by means of legal participatory study instead of mere categorization of the land as unutilized.

XIII. Policy Implications

Telangana necessitates a unified statistical framework for land access in the first place. Separate reporting is required on Ownership, operation, tenancy, agricultural labour dependence and Community-resource access. Every estimate should be accompanied by definitions, coverage and period reference.

Secondly, the parcel and beneficiary should be followed after allotment. Verification must establish delimination, occupation, access, conflict and productive use. People must refer to allocations as functioning holdings.

Third the support for agriculture should explicitly identify the policy objective. Support meant for cultivation needs a reliable mechanism for identifying cultivators; asset-based support serves a different purpose. Tenant recognition must protect lawful ownership and foster documented cultivation.

In addition, modernisation of registers should include clear correction processes, traceable alterations, access to documents supporting those changes, and assistance to illiterate claimants. Ensuring procedure fairness can't compromise digital accessibility.

Fifth, addressing women's rights; requires a household-based administration. The documentary recognition of succession assistance and participation in decisions should be monitored.

In short, land policy should work with rural employment, education, health and infrastructure. Redistribution can pull this market to increase economic security, but it cannot eliminate all disadvantages. The aim should be to increase secure livelihood options, not to determine the one occupational future for all rural households.

XIV. Limitations and Future Research

This analysis is descriptive and not causal. You can't see the full ownership picture from the published aggregate tables, while demanded rounding makes the categories more precise than they will in reality be. The coverage and classification of SEEEPC and Agriculture Census sources are different , hence their estimates are interpreted separately. A more rigorous empirical design would use representative household data, parcel verification, administrative histories, and qualitative interviews. The sample should oversample any groups who are otherwise poorly represented. Also, a proper survey weight will need to be used. The estimation of ownership

and operational inequality, the inclusion of zero-land households (where applicable) and the examination of differences in land quality are suggested for any future work. A longitudinal analysis could see whether redistribution helps retain possession, secure income, and gain bargaining power.

XV. Conclusion

According to published evidence, the operational structure in Telangana is dominated by small holdings and access varies across social groups. By itself, it does not prove the presence of agriculture landlessness throughout the state nor explains all mechanisms for inequality. A socially just response should combine redistribution and secure possession, recognition of cultivators, gender-sensitive administration, and protection of community interest. The legal entitlement is meaningful when people can use and protect it. This demonstrates that the appropriate metric of progress is better access and livelihood security. We need accurate statistics and fair institutions as well as continued evaluation to ascertain whether land reforms deliver that.

Works Cited

[1]. Agarwal, Bina. *A Field of One's Own: Gender and Land Rights in South Asia*. Cambridge UP, 1994.

[2]. Agarwal, Bina, and Ankush Agrawal. "Do Farmers Really Like Farming? Indian Farmers in Transition." *Oxford Development Studies*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2017, pp. 460–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2017.1283010.

[3]. Balagopal, K. "Land Unrest in Andhra Pradesh-I: Ceiling Surpluses and Public Lands." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 42, no. 38, 22 Sept. 2007, pp. 3829–33.

[4]. Banerjee, Abhijit, and Lakshmi Iyer. "History, Institutions, and Economic Performance: The Legacy of Colonial Land Tenure Systems in India." *American Economic Review*, vol. 95, no. 4, 2005, pp. 1190–1213. https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828054825574.

[5]. Besley, Timothy, and Robin Burgess. "Land Reform, Poverty Reduction, and Growth: Evidence from India." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 115, no. 2, 2000, pp. 389–430. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355300554809.

[6]. Borras, Saturnino M., Jr., et al. "Towards a Better Understanding of Global Land Grabbing: An Editorial Introduction." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2011, pp. 209–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.559005.

[7]. Deininger, Klaus. *Land Policies for Growth and Poverty Reduction*. World Bank and Oxford UP, 2003.

[8]. Deininger, Klaus, et al. "Land Reforms, Poverty Reduction, and Economic Growth: Evidence from India." *The Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2009, pp. 496–521. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220380902725670.

[9]. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security*. 1st revision, 2022. https://doi.org/10.4060/i2801e.

[10]. *G. Shankar Reddy v. Revenue Divisional Officer, Karimnagar, and Others*. Writ Petition no. 22810 of 2013. High Court for the State of Telangana, 28 July 2022. *Indian Kanoon*, indiankanoon.org/doc/168436598/.

[11]. Ghatak, Maitreesh, and Sanchari Roy. "Land Reform and Agricultural Productivity in India: A Review of the Evidence." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2007, pp. 251–69. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grm017.

[12]. India. *The Provisions of the Panchayats (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996*. Act no. 40 of 1996. *India Code*, www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/1973/1/A1996-40.pdf.

[13]. India. *The Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006*. Act no. 2 of 2007. *Ministry of Tribal Affairs*, tribal.nic.in/FRA.aspx.

[14]. India, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmers Welfare. *Agriculture Census 2015–16: All India Report on Number and Area of Operational Holdings*. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, 2019. *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations*, Agriculture Census report.

[15]. Kumar, K. Kiran, and Prasanta Moharaj. "Land and Asset Inequality Among Social Groups." *Social Change*, vol. 53, no. 1, 2023, pp. 51–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/00490857221110562.

[16]. Levien, Michael. *Dispossession without Development: Land Grabs in Neoliberal India*. Oxford UP, 2018.

[17]. National Statistical Office. *Situation Assessment of Agricultural Households and Land and Livestock Holdings of Households in Rural India, 2019*. NSS Report no. 587, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, 2021.

[18]. NITI Aayog. *Report of the Expert Committee and Model Law on Agricultural Land Leasing*. Government of India, 2016. digitallibrary.niti.gov.in/items/f0a13154-83e6-4e4f-bf94-2094c5e1cf78.

[19]. Ramakumar, R., and Padmini Ramesh. "Illegibly Legible: Outcomes of a Land Records Modernisation Programme in South India." *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2023, pp. 729–54. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12556.

[20]. Rawal, Vikas. "Ownership Holdings of Land in Rural India: Putting the Record Straight." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 43, no. 10, 8 Mar. 2008, pp. 43–47.

[21]. Ribot, Jesse C., and Nancy Lee Peluso. "A Theory of Access." *Rural Sociology*, vol. 68, no. 2, 2003, pp. 153–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2003.tb00133.x.

[22]. Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. Yale UP, 1998.

[23]. Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford UP, 1999.

[24]. Telangana. *The Telangana Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Act, 1977*. Act no. 9 of 1977, as amended. *India Code*, www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/8711/1/act_9_of_1977.pdf.

[25]. Telangana. *The Telangana Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973*. Act no. 1 of 1973, as amended. *Indian Kanoon*, indiankanoon.org/doc/192582082/.

[26]. Telangana. *The Telangana Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950*. Act no. 21 of 1950, as amended. *India Code*, www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/8575/1/act_21_of_1950.pdf.

[27]. Thomas, Susan, et al. *Linking Welfare Distribution to Land Records: A Case-Study of the Rythu Bandhu Scheme (RBS) in Telangana*. Finance Research Group, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mar. 2020. Finance Research Group.

[28]. Thorat, Sukhadeo, and Katherine S. Newman, editors. *Blocked by Caste: Economic Discrimination in Modern India*. Oxford UP, 2010.

[29]. World Bank. *Land Governance Assessment Framework: Andhra Pradesh—Final Report*. 2014. documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/810521504861092776.