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## KAMMA VENKATA NARASAYYAMMA GARU

(Frrst Defrendant), Respondeny.*
Ciwil Procedurc Code-del XIV of 1882, s, 24-Order by High Cowrt divecting District Coutt to tale accumat of mount due under morigage - Order by District Const declaring wmonn dau-- 1 pyrul.

The Figh Conet, by ita docree, direoted a Distriet Court to take an account of the amount due to a decreo-holder under a mortgage. The Distriot Court acoordingly took the account and passod an order declaring, in Court, under section 88 of the Trenster urproperty Act, the amount ao dno. Against that order the decree-holder appoaled to tha Thigh Court, when the objection was wised that no appent lay:

* Teld, that the order appealed ngemet was one falling under scotion 244 ( $c$ ) of the Code of Civil Proedure and an appeal lay.

By an order, dated 30th August 1901, the District Judge of Vizagapatam doclared, in Courts undor sectiou 88 of the Transfer of Property Act, the amount duc, up to a cortain date, to a decreeholder for priucipal and intorest on a mortgage, on taking an account as directed by tho High Court in its decree in Original Suit, No. 37 of 1896, and Pauper Appeal No. 5 of 1900. Against that order, the decree-holder preferred this appeal.
P. R. Sundara Ayyar, for respondent, took the preliminary objection that no appeal lay.

- T. Rungachariar for appellant.

Judement.-This is an appeal ly the decrec-holder in Original Suit No. 37 of 1896 (Pauper Appeal No. 5 of 1900 on the file of the High Court) against tho oxder of the District Judge of Vizagapatam, dated 30th August 1901, declaring in Court, under section 88 of the Transfer of Property Aot, the amount due to the decree-holder for principal and interest on the mortgage up to 7th Augast 1901, on taking an account as directed by the decree of this Court,

[^0]Tum abyain dated 7th February 1901, in the above appeal. The respondent's

Kamma
Venkata Narasayfamalagu. well founded, the account itself should have been taken in this Court and the ordop fixing the amount should have been declared in Court by this Court on the 30th of August 1901. In our opinion tho objection is not well founded and the order appeated against is really one falling under scction 244 (c) of the Civil Procedure Code being a question arising betweon the parites to the suit in which the decree was passed on appeal by this Court and relating to the exceution of that decree. Following the docision of this Court in the recent Full Bench cases, we hold that a decree for sale passed under section 88 of the Transfer of Property Act is the final decreo in the suit and that all proceedings talien subsequent to that decree for the purpose of onforeing and working out such decree are proceedings in exceution of that decree. A dearee for sale passed under that scection may declare the amount due on the mortgage at the date of such decree or direct, as was done in this caso, that an account be taken of what will be due to the plaintiff for principal and interest on the mortgage on a future day; which. is to be fixed by the decree itself. In this caso the 7th of August 1901 was the day so fixed by the appellate decrec of this Court, dated 7th of February 1901; and the decree further providod that the amount that might be declared duc on the 30th of August 1901 should be paid on or before the 31st of December 1901. In our opinion an application which the decree holder may make for taking the acconnt and declaring the amount which may bo found due on the taking of such account is an application to coforce that portion of the deoree within the meaning of section 230 of the Code of Civil Procedure; and that being so the decree-holdor is ontitled to apply under section 583 to the Court which passod the decree against which the appeal was proferred to the High Court. The Court which is to declare the amount dite by virtue of the appellate decrec is, therefore, the Court which passed the original docree. In this view the order in question falls under section $244(c)$ and is analogous to orders under clauses (it) and (6) of section 244 fixing the amount of mesne profits or interest payable under a decrec.
[The judgrient dealt with the items of account.]


[^0]:    * Appeal against the Ordor No. 164 of 1901, presented against the order of M. D. Boll, Distriet Judge of Vizagapatem, dated 30th August 1801, in Original Suit No. 37 of 1896 (Pauper Apper, No. 5 of 1900 on the flo of the High Oourti)

