

1864.
 NA'VSA' BIBA'
 v.
 BA'BU'
 BAHIRU'
 et al.

would still have been within the jurisdiction of the Munsif, and we consider, therefore, that the lower court acted erroneously in reversing the Munsif's decree on the grounds set forth. In Special Appeal No. 127 of 1863, which has been quoted in argument, the point which we have now decided does not appear to have been raised or determined. We lay down no general rule with respect to the valuation of claims for the redemption of mortgages, as there is a difference of opinion between the members of the Court on this subject, and it is not necessary that we should determine that question in this appeal. We reverse the decree, and remand the suit to be disposed of on the merits.

Decree reversed.

~~~~~

March 11.

VARJIVAN RANGJI v. A'JI DA'JI and others.

*Copies of Judgments—Translations.*

Parties to a suit are entitled to receive copies of the original judgment, not merely a translation.

THE plaintiff had presented a petition, stating that the Collector of Kheda had not furnished him with a copy of his English judgment in a suit between the petitioner and A'ji Daji and others, though application had been made for it. The Collector of Kheda, in reply to the call for explanation on the subject, reported that "a Gujarati translation of the judgment and decree was duly given to the petitioner on application;" that the petitioner applied for copies in English also, but, as it was not usual to furnish copies, his request had not been complied with.

PER CURIAM (COUCH and NEWTON, JJ.): —The Collector is to be informed that he ought to have furnished a copy of his judgment, which he was bound to record in English, and not a mere translation, and requested now to do so on the requisite conditions being complied with by the applicant.