

In the High Court of Judicature, Bombay.

Monday, the 6th day of February 1865.

SPECIAL APPEAL No. 914 of 1864

Ramshet bin Narayan Shet Pathe
Khot and Dhondoo Wassooder Bhag-
want of the Putnagiri Division of
the Konkan District. (Original Defendants)

Appellants

versus

Kuroo Pandoorung Satay Khot
of the Putnagiri Division of
the Konkan District

Respondent

(Original Plaintiff.)

Rs. 44-8-00

The claim in the Original Suit was to

In Appeal No. _____ of 186 _____ the
of the District of _____ at _____
the Decree of the _____ who

A Special Appeal was preferred in the High Court on the grounds that ~~the~~ the decision
of the Senior Assistant Judge is contrary to law
in that ⁽¹⁾ he finding that each of the sharers levied
his own dues direct from the cultivators, erred in
holding appellant liable because he made such
management

managements as he pleased with respect to
his own share and that (2) respondents' remedy
if any, being against the cultivators, the ^{court} judge
erred in making appellant liable.