

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

Krishnananda

Vs.

Kattu Siva Ashram

C.A.No.6196 of 2000

(S.B. Sinha and Markandey Katju JJ.)

18.01.2007

JUDGMENT

S.B.Sinha, J.

1. The defendant No. 4 in the original suit is the appellant before us. The plaintiff is the first respondent herein. The suit of the original plaintiff was dismissed. The defendant No. 4 did not prefer any appeal thereagainst.

2. Appellant claimed title over the land by adverse possession. The said claim was negated by the learned Trial Judge. The First Appellate Court, however, opined that both the plaintiff (respondent No. 1 herein) and defendant No. 4 (appellant herein) had not acquired any title to the property.

3. Aggrieved by certain findings arrived at by the First Appellate Court, the appellant preferred a second appeal before the High Court of Madras which was dismissed summarily. The High Court opined that as defendant No. 4 did not file any suit nor the Trial Court having given any relief in that behalf, the appeal was not maintainable.

4. The appellant is before us aggrieved by the said order of the High Court.

5. There cannot be any doubt that the second appeal filed at the instance of the appellant herein was not maintainable as the First Appellate Court had merely arrived at certain findings which might be relevant for the purpose of determination of an issue by and between the appellant and the original plaintiff, but the same were not relevant for determination of an issue amongst the defendants inter se. Moreover, no decree against the appellant was preferred.

6. It is stated before us by Mr. Sundaravaradan, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos. 2 to 4, that in view of the fact that the aforementioned Raman Pillai died without leaving behind any issue; escheat proceeding has been initiated. If that be so, there

cannot be any doubt, whatsoever, that the appellant herein would be entitled to raise all contentions in regard to his title in appropriate proceedings, if initiated against him. He may even bring a fresh proceedings against the said respondent.

7. The appellant has sought to produce before us a purported Will dated 5.1.1965, executed by the said Raman Pillai. We, however, reject the prayer of the appellant to take the said Will on record as the contention that Raman Pillai bequeathed his entire property in his favour should not be allowed to be raised before us at this stage for the first time. This appeal is dismissed with the aforementioned observations. No costs.