

30/4/62
30/4/62
Bombay, Wednesday 26th March 1862.

In the Sudur



Dewanee Adaulat

N^o. 4311 Special.

Kalia Hasoocha, Munoo alias Gaus Sawarcha, Zhoojia
Soosoocha, Wajo Chambarcha, Mahadoo Kaliacha, Pedroo
Boorcoolcha, Boodia Chambarcha, Kalia Bulkiacha,
Babun Nutiacha alias Babun Mayaacha, Kushtia Damacha,
Gowar Ramacha, Pedroo Sawarcha, Ludgao Sookoorcha,
Jatos Sookoorcha, Sowar Kaliacha, Mukoond Bujiacha,
Motia Babuncha, Kalia Bhundari, Dadoo Hasoocha,
Maya Boodhiacha, Hasoo Chibacha alias Hasoo Chima
= cha, Singia Haroocha, Thashia Shingiacha, Munoo
alias Gaus Hasyaacha, Subool Bulkiacha, Silwar Hafri
= cha, Diwalia Bhoobiacha, Jyawudee Chambarcha,
Gondia Musongacha alias Gondia Moondacha, Pedroo
Boodiacha, Jao Pedroocha, Antone Doomacha, Chutoor
Moondhiacha, Dhurma Musogliacha, Boodhia Bulki
= cha, and Munia Bhambrocha, residents of Musye Malabar
Turf Malad Talooki Sashtee (original Plaintiffs)

Appellants

44

Sakool Antoocha, Sookoor Gubroocha, Ludgia Door
= dacha, Singia Lakdriidoo, Kalia Zooranacha,
Tachia Ludgiacha, Motia Haracha, Tashya Soosoocha,
Babool Gaspar Kaskur, Tandia Sowar Gajminee,
Mutais Paskol Parlekur, Boodhia Silwast, Burik
Putuncha, Kalia Kombdiacha, Goolam Gondia
Patel, Boodia Kutoocha, Singia Sowarcha Kushtia
Ludgiacha, Kushtia Ramacha, Dooma Inascha, Kalia
Bugliacha, Kalia Nuta Sanscha, Goolam Jugitach,
Furkia Beddamar Munwel Jasamar, Munia
Sowar - Choriacha, Sookoor Choriacha, Abhdia
Anacha, Goolam Lakdsee Ludkiacha, Kalia Pas
= kolcha, Boodhia Sowar Gondicha, Kalia Jugitach
Enas Venkyacha Bhatkur, Antone Padlekur Jao
ghagicha, Shrawan Bhagicheghurcha, Kalia
Digori cheghurcha Boodya Pitkacha, Goma Comadumli
= cha, Kushtoo Thondiacha ^{Kolce} residents of ^{Munore} Talooki
Sashtee (original Defendants)

Respondents

Rs 500

The claim in the original suit was to eject the Defendants from a fishing ground and to recover damages ^{caused} by the trespass of the said Defendants.

In appeal No. 22 of 1858 the Judge of the Zillah of the Konkum affirmed the decree of the Principal Sudder Ameen who threw out the claim of Kalia and the other plaintiffs with costs.

Dissatisfied Kalia and the other plaintiffs made Special Appeal in the Sudder Dewanee Adawlat urging that the Judge was wrong in ruling that no private right of fishing existed: 2^{ndly} that the Zillah Court possessed jurisdiction in the case; 3^{rdly} that all their evidence had not been taken and 4^{thly} that the Judge had misconstrued exhibits 60 and 61.

The Court confirm the decree of the Zillah Judge with costs.

Bill of costs.

By Appellants

In the Zillah

In the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court - 492 - 1 - "

In the Judge's Court - 402 - 13 - " 894 - 14 - "

In the Sudder D. Adawlat

Stamp for the memo. of Special appeal - 202 - " - "

Stamps for the copies of decrees - 10 - " - "

Stamps for five Bunkalmamas - 16 - " - "

Stamp for security bond - 4 - " - "

Batta for process - 196 - " - "

Burkeel's Fee - 170 - " - " 598 - " - "

Pupees - 1492 - 14 - "

By Respondent

In the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court - 258 - 12 - "

In the Judge's Court - 178 - 8 - " - 437 - 4 - "

Carried over 82 - 437 - 4 - "

Brought over Rupees	—————	437-4-00
In the suddur D. Adawlut		
Stamps for four Venkathramas	—————	14-0-00
Venkeel's Fee	—————	170-0-00
		<u>184-0-00</u>
		<u>Rupees-621-4-00</u>

26 April 1862.

²⁷
 W. Newton.
 Asst. Quarter Judge.

A. Phulech Forbes
 Acting Quarter Judge

मुंबई २६ सप्टेंबर १९२२

रविवार १९२२

हस्ताक्षर

४३११

१. ... २ ... ३

४. ... ५

६. ... ७

८. ... ९ १० ११ १२

१३. ... १४ १५ १६ १७

१८. ... १९ २० २१ २२

२३. ... २४ २५ २६ २७

२८. ... २९ ३० ३१ ३२

३३. ... ३४ ३५ ३६ ३७

३८. ... ३९ ४० ४१ ४२

४३. ... ४४ ४५ ४६ ४७

४८. ... ४९ ५० ५१ ५२

५३. ... ५४ ५५ ५६ ५७

५८. ... ५९ ६० ६१ ६२

६३. ... ६४ ६५ ६६ ६७

६८. ... ६९ ७० ७१ ७२

...

...

१७ १८ १९
 २० २१ २२
 २३ २४ २५
 २६ २७ २८
 २९ ३० ३१
 ३२ ३३ ३४
 ३५ ३६ ३७
 ३८ ३९ ४०

७५००

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

