

In the High Court of Judicature, Bombay.

Monday, the 20<sup>th</sup> day of June 1864.

SPECIAL APPEAL No. 80 of 1864.

The Collector of Law-  
and of the Soubhur  
District (Original Defendant) } Appellant

versus

Vitub Narsidas of "  
the Soubhur District } Respondent  
(Original Plaintiff)

Rs. 66-1-1-

The claim in the Original Suit was to recover rent taken by  
the Collector though not due.

In Appeal No. 212 of 1862 the Acting Judge  
of the District of the Puncan at Lawna affirmed  
the Decree of the Ass. Judge who awarded the claim.

A Special Appeal was preferred in the High Court on the grounds that the deci-  
-sion <sup>of the Acting District Judge</sup> is opposed to law in that the  
Acting Judge has misconstrued clause  
4 Section II of Regulation XVII of 1827  
in

in holding that the collector is precluded from recovering the remaining rent should the half crop taken by him in part satisfaction of the rent be insufficient.

The Court confirms the decree of the Court below with costs.

Joseph Arnold  
H. M. Fisher

Bill of Costs

By the Appellant  
In the District

In the Assistant Judge's Court	15.9.3	
Do. Judge's Court	11.3.9	26.13.1

In this Court

Stamp for memo. of Special app <sup>l</sup>	8.0.0	
Stamps for Copies of decree & judg <sup>t</sup>	7.8.0	
Stamp for Vutkalutrama	2.0.0	
Patla for Process and Postage	" 14.0.0	
Sectioner's Fee	1.11.0	
Vutkal's Fee	1.15.9	
	<u>22.0.9</u>	
	<u>Rupces - 48.13.9</u>	

By

By the Respondent

In the District

In the Assistant Judge's Court ————— 35.7.8 ✓  
2<sup>d</sup> Judge's Court ————— 2.15.9 ✓ 38.7.5 ✓

In this Court,

Stamp for Vukalutnama ————— 2.0.0 ✓  
Vukuel's Fee. ————— 1.15.9 ✓ 3.15.9 ✓

Rspees - - 42.7.2



Cymme  
Acting Registrar.

Cymme  
Clerk

The 20<sup>th</sup> day of June 1864.