

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 28/10/2025

Srikanta Mandal and Others Vs Rani Jotirmoyi Devi and Others

None

Court: Calcutta High Court

Date of Decision: Nov. 24, 1925

Citation: 94 Ind. Cas. 253

Hon'ble Judges: Cuming, J; B.B. Ghose, J

Bench: Division Bench

Judgement

1. In the suit out of which this appeal has arisen the plaintiffs sued for recovery of possession with mesne profits from 32 defendants. Their case

was that they had taken settlement of some 98 bighas odd of land from defendant No. 32 or rather his predecessors-in-interest. Out of this area of

98 bighas they were only in possession of some 63 bighas odd and their case was that defendant No. 32 in collusion with the other defendants had

dispossessed them from these 35 bighas. The suit was decreed by the first Court. On appeal to the District Court a part of the claim was

disallowed. The plaintiffs appealed to the High Court and the High Court allowed the appeal in part and the decision of the learned District Judge

so far as he dismissed the claim for the lands of schedule (ga) was set aside and the case was remitted to him so that he might re-consider the

question of the land of schedule (ga).

2. The learned District Judge allowed the Appeal No. 28 in part and the judgment of the Subordinate Judge was modified to a certain extent which

is unnecessary to specify. The plaintiffs have appealed to this Court.

3. The respondents have raised a preliminary objection that the appeal is incompetent for want of necessary parties. They point out that four

persons Abdul Hossain, Gudath Biswas, Abdul Aziz and Gooljan Bibi who were appellants in the lower Court and who were also respondents in

the present appeal have died and their heirs have not been brought on the record. This is admitted by the appellants themselves. It is clear that the

appeal cannot proceed in their absence. The case of the plaintiffs if as that all the defendants jointly dispossessed them from the land in collusion

with each other and they sued for mesne profits from them all. The claim of the plaintiffs is not divisible. The appeal is, therefore, in competent for

want of necessary parties and must fails.

4. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed with costs.