

In the High Court of Judicature, Bombay.

Tues day, the ~~twelfth~~ day of July 1864.

SPECIAL APPEAL No. 128 of 1864.

Hurri bin Apa Patil of
the Honkum District.

Appellant

(Original Defendant)

versus

Dinkar Bulal Pete of the
Honkum District.

Respondent

(Original Plaintiff)

Rs. 9-11-6

The claim in the Original Suit was to recover possession of 2 fields

In Appeal No. 401 of 1861 the Acting Judge of the District of The Concan at Tanua affirmed the Decree of the Plaintiff who decreed for Plaintiff

A Special Appeal was preferred in the High Court on the grounds that a substantial error in law in the investigation of the case has been made which has produced error in the decision of the case

upon its merits in that the Acting Judge was in error in holding that a tenant cannot dispute his landlord's title after the tenancy has expired.

2. That the Acting Judge was in error in declining to enquire into Appellant's rights to the property in question and directing him to bring a fresh suit but should have determined the same before ousting him from his possession.

The Court affirm the Decree of the District Judge with costs in Special Appellants.

Joseph Arnold
Att. Gen.

Bill of Costs.

By the Appellant.

In the District.

In the Munsiff's Court (including Vukil's Fee)	}	= 8.13.11
D ^o . Judge's Court		
		<u>2.11.8</u>
		<u>11.12.7</u>

In this Court

Stamp for memo of Sp ^l app ^t	1
Stamps for copies of Decree & Judgt.	3
Stamp for Vukalutname	2
Batta for process & postage	1
Sectioner's Fee	1 19
Vukil's Fee	48
	<u>8.6.5</u>

Rupces. 20.3.11

By the Respondent.

In the District.

In the Mousaffi Court — 3.12.8

In the Judges' Court — 1.4.8 5.1.10

In this Court.

Stamp for Vatalutram 2.0.0

Vatili Fee — 4.8 2.10.8
7.6.0



Channe
Acting Registrar

Channe

Sealer

The 12th day of July 1864