

**Company:** Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

**Website:** www.courtkutchehry.com

**Printed For:** 

**Date:** 06/12/2025

## (1926) 04 AHC CK 0015 Allahabad High Court

Case No: None

Mohamed Sher Khan and Others APPELLANT

Vs

Chamman Khan and Another RESPONDENT

**Date of Decision:** April 7, 1926 **Hon'ble Judges:** Sulaiman, J

Bench: Single Bench

Final Decision: Disposed Of

## **Judgement**

## Sulaiman, J.

This appeal arises out of a suit brought to recover by way of contribution a share of the decretal amount paid by the plaintiff. The decree was a joint decree for damages against, the defendants. The amount claimed was less than Rs. 500. In my opinion no second appeal lies to the High Court, The suit was obviously one of a Small Cause Court nature, and a second appeal is barred. The learned vikil for the appellants relies on Clause 41 of Schedule 2, of the Provincial Small Cause Courts Act. That clause obviously applies to suits for contributions brought by a sharer in joint property in respect of the payment made by him of money due from a co-sharer. This is not the case here. The parties are not sharers in any joint property at all. They are co-judgment-debtors jointly liable to pay the amount of the decree. I may refer to Roshan Lal v. Ram Lal (1907) 4 ALJ 543 and Ant Ram Vs. Mithan Lal and Another,

2. It is lastly urged that this appeal should be treated as a revision. Assuming for the sake of argument that the lower appellate Court has made a mistake on a point of law which is by no means clear), the case does not fall u/s 115, Civil P.C. The Court had the jurisdiction to hear the appeal and to dispose of it; whether it has done so rightly or wrongly is immaterial. It has committed no irregularity in the exercise of its jurisdiction. The appeal is accordingly dismissed under Order 41, Rule 11 Civil P.C.