

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd. **Website:** www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 01/11/2025

15 Ind. Cas. 601

Calcutta High Court

Case No: None

Mahiraja Sir Bijoy

Chand Mahatap

APPELLANT

Vs

Rakhad Chattoraj and

Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: May 20, 1912

Acts Referred:

Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (CPC) â€" Section 2(2)

Citation: 15 Ind. Cas. 601

Hon'ble Judges: Mookerjee, J; Beachcroft, J

Bench: Division Bench

Judgement

1. The question of law raised in this Rule is, whether a decree under Rule 8 of Order IX of the Code of 1908, is an order of dismissal for default

within the meaning of Sub-section 2 of Section 2 of the Code. It appears that the petitioner was the plaintiff in a suit for rent. ""When the suit came

on for trial, an application was made on his behalf for adjournment. That application was refused, whereupon his Pleader stated that he had no

materials in support of the claim. The Court did not dismiss the suit, as the defendants had admitted a part of the claim: and a decree was. made in

terms of Rule 8 of Order IX of the Code. That decree is to the effect that the portion of the claim admitted by the defendant be decreed and that

the remainder of the claim be dismissed. In oar opinion, this decree is not an order of dismissal for default within the meaning of Sub-section 2 of

Section 2. Consequently; an appeal against the decree was competent. Such an appeal was preferred, but the Subordinate-Judge erroneously

declined to entertain it on the ground that the decree was really an order of dismissal for default and was consequently con-appealable.

2. The result is that this Rule is made absolute, the order of the Subordinate Judge set aside, and the case remitted to him in order that the appeal

may be heard on the merits. As the Rule has not been opposed, there will be no order for costs.