

In the High Court of Judicature, Bombay.

Thursday, the 30 day of June 1864

SPECIAL APPEAL No. 14 of 1864

Trimbukji bin Phandji Patil
of the Ahmednagar District.

Appellant

(Original Defendant.)

versus

Pandoji Walad Vitaji Patil
of the Ahmednagar District.

Respondent

(Original Plaintiff.)

Rs. 9-0-0

The claim in the Original Suit was to recover possession of two fields, of which Pandoji had been fraudulently deprived by Trimbukji in execution of a decree obtained in a collusion suit brought by Trimbukji against me & others.

In Appeal No. 344 of 1860 the District Judge of Ahmednagar at Ahmednagar on a remand in pursuance of the Decree of the Court of Appeal who had awarded to Pandoji one of the fields, Pandoji withdrawing his claim in the other.

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

case upon its merits in that the evidence
 prayed for by the appellant in his Dece.
 - Khasts was improperly rejected.

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

H.P. 14. P. 14

Lee. Andrew Aponting

Bill of Costs

By the Appellant

In the District

In the Moonseiff's Court	→	5.13.9.	
^{Ap. to} D ₁₁ of Judge's Court (including v. Fee)	→	10.1.11	15.15.8.

In this Court

Stamp for Memo. of special appl ⁿ	→	1 " "
Stamps for Copies of decree & judg ^t	→	48 " "
Stamp for Vithatutuama	→	2 " "
Batta for Procefs and Postage	→	1.1. "
Sectioner's Fee	→	1.8.6
Vithkeel's Fee	→	" 4.4

10.5.10

Ruppes—26.5.6.

By

By the Respondant
In the District

In the Mooniff's Court ————— 6. 8. 8.
Dun ^{Appt} Judges Court ————— 3. 7. 5. 10. " 1

In this Court

Stamp for Vekalutance ————— 2
Vekalutance Fee ————— 4. 4. 2. 4 4

Peepes. 12. 4. 5.



G. M. M.
Acting Registrar

G. M. M.

Sealed

The 30th day of June 1864