



General principle is that every Hindu family is presumed to be joint unless the contrary is proved; but this presumption can be rebutted by direct evidence or by course of conduct.

Court examined the principles of Hindu Law and principles of [hindu joint family](#).

In paragraph 16, it was held that the general principle is that every Hindu family is presumed to be joint unless the contrary is proved; but this presumption can be rebutted by direct [evidence](#) or by course of [conduct](#). In the above case, one of the questions was as to whether there was reunion between members of the Joint Family after [partition](#).

Court quoted with approval the judgments of Privy Council in **Palani Ammal (Palani Ammal v. Muthuvenkatacharla Moniagar and Ors., AIR 1925 PC 49)** and laid down following in paragraph 22:-

“22. For the correct approach to this question, it would be convenient to [quote](#) at the outset the observations of the Judicial Committee in **Palani Ammal v. Muthuvenkatacharla Moniagar [(1924) LR 52 IA 83, 86]** :

“It is also quite clear that if a joint Hindu family separates, the family or any members of it may agree to reunite as a joint Hindu family, but such a reuniting is for obvious [reasons](#), which would apply in many cases under the law of the Mitakshara, of very rare occurrence, and when it happens it must be strictly proved as any other disputed fact is proved. The leading authority for that last proposition is **Baldbux Ladhuram v. Rukhmabai [(1903) LR 30 IA 190]** .”

Bhagwan Dayal v. Reoti Devi, AIR 1962 SC 287

Tags: [Hindu Joint Family](#), [Hindu Joint Family - Reunion](#)