

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

Printed For:

Date: 08/11/2025

(1869) 04 CAL CK 0031

Calcutta High Court

Case No: Special Appeal No. 2795 of 1868

Nahagun Maiti APPELLANT

Vs

Sabo Bewa and RESPONDENT

Another

Date of Decision: April 17, 1869

Judgement

L.S. Jackson, J.

The decision of the lower Appellate Court seems to me to be a correct and sensible decision. I think no ground of special appeal has been made out. I quite agree with the Judge in thinking that when there is satisfactory evidence showing a party to have been given and received in adoption and when the adoption has been continuously recognized for a series of years, and the party adopted is shown to have had possession, either in person or through his guardian, of property which would devolve upon him by reason of such adoption, in such a case, after the lapse of 20 years, the Court may very well dispense with formal proof of the performance of the ceremonies, and unless it were distinctly shown, on the part of the person contending against the adoption, that ceremonies had not been performed, the party adopted would be entitled to enforce all his rights as adopted son. I think, therefore, that the plaintiff in this case is fully entitled to have judgment in his favour, and that the decision of the lower Appellate Court must be affirmed with costs.

Markby, J.

I am of the same opinion. I think it ought not to be forgotten in this case that there is this circumstance that it was agreed on all hands that there had been an adoption, but the question was, who was the really adopted person; and whereas the plaintiff had proved that he had been recognized as the adopted son, and that possession had been held on his behalf by the widow after the death of Bhagwan, the person adopting, the other party whom the defendants set up wholly failed to prove anything of the kind, that is, either that he was recognized, or that he had ever held possession.