

1891

JAN. 28.

APPEL-
LATE
CIVIL.

15 B. 650.

15 B. 650.

[650] APPELLATE CIVIL.

*Before Mr. Justice Birdwood and Mr. Justice Parsons.*BABAJI BIN PATLOJI (*Original Plaintiff*), *Applicant v. BABAJI
BIN MAHADU (Original Defendant), Opponent.**

[28th January, 1891.]

*Dekkhan Agriculturists' Relief Act (XVII of 1879), s. 53—Special Judge—His power
to review his own order—Review.*

The Code of Civil Procedure is not applicable to proceedings before the Special Judge under the Dekkhan Agriculturists' Relief Act (XVII of 1879).

The Special Judge has, therefore, no jurisdiction to grant a review of a decree or order once made by him on the ground of the discovery of new evidence.

[R., 19 B. 116 (120); 2 C.L.J. 306 (309).]

THIS was an application under s. 622 of the Code of Civil Procedure (Act XIV of 1882).

The opponent's father, Babaji, purchased certain property in execution of a decree against one Sakharam.

Thereupon Sakharam's son, Maruti, brought a suit, No. 19 of 1885, to recover his half share of the lands purchased at the Court sale by Babaji. The Subordinate Judge decided this suit in Maruti's favour; but as the lands had been mortgaged by Sakharam, and as Babaji had paid off the mortgage-debt, Maruti was directed to file a redemption suit.

In 1885 the plaintiff, as assignee of Maruti's rights, filed a redemption suit (No. 493 of 1885) against Babaji, and obtained a decree. Babaji made an application No. 199 of 1887 to the Special Judge for a revision of the decree under s. 53 of the Dekkhan Agriculturists' Relief Act (XVII of 1879). But his application was rejected in November, 1887.

In the meantime Babaji had appealed to the District Judge against the decree passed in Maruti's favour in suit No. 19 of 1885. The District Judge reversed this decree on the 15th December, 1888, on the ground that Maruti's share had passed at the execution sale to Babaji, the auction-purchaser, and that he had, therefore, no right to the property in dispute.

Thereupon Babaji applied to the Special Judge for a review of the order rejecting his application No. 199 of 1887. He urged that as the District Judge had found that Maruti had no right to [651] the property in dispute, the decree passed in favour of his assignee, the plaintiff, in the redemption suit should be set aside.

The Special Judge granted the review applied for, and reversed the decree in the redemption suit.

Against this order of review the present application was made to the High Court under its extraordinary jurisdiction.

Balaji Abaji Bhagvat, for the applicant.—The Special Judge had no jurisdiction to review his order. The provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure apply to proceedings before the Subordinate Judge and not to those before the Special Judge: see s. 74 of the Dekkhan Agriculturists' Relief Act (Act XVII of 1879); *Vishwanath Shridhar v. Aba bin Joti* (1).

* Application No. 199 of 1890.

(1) P. J. for 1886, p. 11.

Ganesh Ramchandra Kirloskar, contra.—Every Court has an inherent jurisdiction to review its own decrees or orders, just as it has the power to amend a decree and bring it into conformity with the judgment. The Legislature need not confer the authority in express terms.

1891
 JAN. 28.
 —
 APPEL-
 LATE
 CIVIL.
 —
 15 B. 650.

JUDGMENT.

BIRDWOOD, J.—In this case the plaintiff obtained a redemption decree, which was confirmed by the Special Judge, who called for and examined the record under s. 53 of the Dekkhan Agriculturists' Relief Act of 1879. The High Court also declined to interfere with this decree when applied to under s. 622 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The Special Judge, however, granted a review of his decree, on the ground that the District Court had, subsequently to that decree, disallowed the right of the plaintiff's vendor to the property which the plaintiff sought to redeem, and at the rehearing he reversed his former decree and rejected the plaintiff's claim.

The plaintiff now asks this Court to set aside the Special Judge's second decree on the grounds, first, that the Special Judge had no jurisdiction to review his first decision, and, secondly, that the decision of the District Judge furnished no sufficient cause for granting a review. It also now appears that the District Judge's decree has been reversed by this Court, which affirmed the right of the plaintiff's vendor to the property in dispute: see *Maruti v. Babaji* (1).

[652] There is no provision in the Dekkhan Agriculturists' Relief Act itself which lays down the procedure to be followed by the Special Judge, or gives him the power of reviewing an order once passed by him. Section 74 of the Act provides only that, except so far as it is inconsistent with this Act, the Code of Civil Procedure shall apply to all suits and proceedings before Subordinate Judges under the Act. It would appear, therefore, that the Code of Civil Procedure is not applicable to proceedings before the Special Judge; and this was the opinion also of the Division Bench (Sargent, C.J., and Nanabhai, J.), which decided *Vishwanath Shridhar v. Aba bin Joti* (2). It follows that the Special Judge has no jurisdiction to grant a review of a decree or order once made by him on the ground of the discovery of new evidence, as was done by the Special Judge in this case; for, apart from special legislative authorization, no Court would have any such power.

We reverse the order of the Special Judge, granting a review, and the decree which followed it, and restore the decree of the Subordinate Judge, with costs of this application on the opponent.

Order reversed.

(1) P. J. for 1890, p. 213.

(2) P. J. for 1886, p. 11.