

Before Mr. Justice Chamier and Mr. Justice Muhammad Rafiq.
 GUR PRASAD AND ANOTHER (DEFENDANTS) v. THE GORAKHPUR BANK
 LIMITED (PLAINTIFF) AND MAJID HUSAIN KHAN AND ANOTHER
 (DEFENDANTS)*

1914
 May, 27.

Charge—Fixed deposit—Competence of depositor to charge money on fixed deposit in a bank as security for a loan.

It is competent to a person who has money with a banking company on fixed deposit, with the assent of such company, if not without it, to assign to any person whom he pleases, either absolutely or by way of a charge, the debt due or about to become due to him from the banking company. *William Brandt's Sons & Co. v. Dunlop Rubber Co.*, (1) referred to. *Aga Mahomed Jaffer Bindanim v. Koclson Beesbees*, (2) distinguished.

THE facts of this case were as follows :—

One Majid Husain Khan, who had a sum of money in fixed deposit in the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation, Limited, borrowed money from the Gorakhpur Bank, Limited, and wrote them a letter by which he gave them a charge on his fixed deposit with the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation. This latter company, on Majid Husain Khan's letter being brought to their notice, assented to the charge, merely stating that the sum in their possession on behalf of Majid Husain Khan was less than was stated in the letter. Subsequently certain persons who held a decree against Majid Husain Khan attached the fixed deposit. The Bank coming to know of this filed objections, which were disallowed. They then brought the present suit for a declaration of their charge on the fixed deposit. The court of first instance dismissed the suit. The lower appellate court decreed it. The attaching decree-holders appealed to the High Court.

Mr. M. L. Agarwala and *Munshi Govind Prasad*, for the appellants.

Babu Durga Charan Banerji and *Munshi Iswar Saran*, for the respondents.

CHAMIER and MUHAMMAD RAFIQ, JJ.—This appeal arises out of a suit brought by the first respondent, the Gorakhpur Bank, Limited, for a declaration that it has a charge on the amount of a

* Second Appeal No. 942 of 1913 from a decree of Srish Chandra Basu, Additional Judge of Gorakhpur, dated the 6th of June, 1913, reversing a decree of Hidayat Ali, officiating Subordinate Judge of Gorakhpur, dated the 12th of December, 1912.

(1) (1905) L. R., A. C., 454. (2) (1867) I. L. R., 25 Calc., 9.

1914

GUR PRASAD
v.
THE
GORAKHPUR
BANK, LD.

fixed deposit standing to the credit of the second respondent Majid Husain Khan in the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation, Limited. The facts are that in May, 1910, Majid Husain Khan deposited Rs. 8,700 with the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation for three years to bear interest at the rate of 7 per cent per annum. A receipt in the ordinary form was issued to him containing in the margin the words "Not transferable." Majid Husain Khan in 1911 borrowed Rs. 4,650 from the Gorakhpur Bank, Limited, and on that occasion wrote to the Manager of that Bank a letter which is set out in the judgement of the lower appellate court. It purports to authorize the Bank, in case the loan was not repaid, to recover the amount from the sum for the time being standing in Majid Husain Khan's name in fixed deposit account with the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation, Limited.

The letter sets out the date and number of the fixed deposit receipt and it is found as a fact that Majid Husain Khan made over the receipt to the Gorakhpur Bank. On the same day the Gorakhpur Bank wrote to the Manager of the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation a letter giving notice that they had a charge on the fixed deposit. The Manager of the latter replied by a letter of the same date as follows:—"Dear sir, with reference to your (letter) of the 8th instant we beg to let you know that Majid Husain Khan of Begpur has got only Rs. 5,877 out of his deposit with us. So we have noted your lien on that amount only." From this it appears that a portion of the sum deposited had been withdrawn. In May, 1912, that is, a year later, defendants appellants obtained a decree against Majid Husain Khan, in the execution of which they caused the balance of the fixed deposit to be attached. The Gorakhpur Bank having come to know of this filed objections. The objections were summarily disallowed and the present suit was then instituted. The court of first instance held that the Gorakhpur Bank had no charge upon the amount under attachment. The Subordinate Judge was apparently of opinion that no one could have a charge on such a deposit unless he was in possession of it. On appeal the Additional Judge, Gorakhpur, reversed this decision and held that a valid charge on the fixed deposit had been created in favour

of the Gorakhpur Bank. In second appeal it is again contended that it was impossible for the Gorakhpur Bank to have a charge on this fixed deposit as it was not in possession of the money, and we were referred to the decision of the Privy Council in *Aga Mahomed Jaffer Bindanim v. Koolsom Beebee* (1). It appears to us that that case has no bearing whatever on the present case. In that case some fixed deposit receipts had been handed over by a man to his wife shortly before he died. After his death she claimed to be entitled to the amounts mentioned in the receipts. It was held that it was a case of an incomplete gift, that the effect of handing over the receipts was not to transfer the debts to the wife, that she had acquired no title to them, and that at most the evidence showed that the testator had intended to make a formal transfer of the deposits to his wife but had died before he was able to do so. In the present case we can see no reason why it should not be held that there was what would be called in England an equitable assignment by way of charge of the amount of the fixed deposit to the Gorakhpur Bank. The circumstance that the fixed deposit receipt bears the words "Not transferable" is immaterial, because it is not suggested that any charge on the money is claimed by the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation, and the latter distinctly recognized the right of the Gorakhpur Bank to a charge on the balance of the deposit. It has been held in many cases that the form of an assignment of this description is of no importance so long as the intention to assign or to make a charge is clear. An agreement between a debtor and a creditor that the debt shall be paid out of a specific fund coming to the debtor is a good equitable assignment. For example, in the case of *William Brandt's Sons and Company v. Dunlop Rubber Company, Limited* (2) some merchants had agreed with a Bank by whom they were financed that all goods sold by the merchants should be paid for by a remittance direct from the purchasers to the Bank. Goods having been sold by the merchants, the Bank forwarded to the purchasers notice in writing that that the merchants had made over to the Bank the right to receive the purchase money and requested the purchasers to sign an undertaking to remit the purchase money

1914

GUR PRASAD
2.
THE
GORAKHPUR
BANK, LD.

(1) (1897) I. L. R., 25 Cal., 9. (2) (1905) L. R., A. C., 454.

1914
 GUR PRASAD
 v.
 THE
 GORAKHPUR
 BANK, LD.

to the Bank. It was held that there was a good equitable assignment of the debt to the Bank. It is unnecessary to consider whether the assignment would have been valid if the Kayastha Trading and Banking Corporation had refused to recognize the assignment, for it expressly recognized the assignment. It is quite clear that, with consent of the Banking Corporation, if not without it, Majid Husain Khan was entitled to assign to any person whom he pleased either absolutely or by way of a charge the debt due or about to become due to him, from the Banking Corporation. It seems to us quite clear that in the present case there was an effective transfer of the debt due to Majid Husain Khan in favour of the Gorakhpur Bank by way of a charge. Therefore the Gorakhpur Bank were entitled to a charge on the fixed deposit as against the attaching creditors. The appeal fails and is dismissed with costs.

Appeal dismissed.

1941
 May, 27.

Before Mr. Justice Chamier and Mr. Justice Muhammad Rafiq.

NARAIN DIKSHIT (DEFENDANT) v. BINAIK BHAT AND ANOTHER (PLAINTIFFS)*
*Civil Procedure Code (1908), order XLI, rule 4—Appeal—Discretion of court—
 Decree based on ground common to all defendants—Court not bound to set
 aside decree as against non-appellant defendant.*

Where an appellate court reverses a decree in favour of a plaintiff upon grounds common to all the defendants, it is not bound to set aside the decree as against a defendant who has not appealed from it. *Seshadri v. Krishnan* (1) referred to.

THE facts of this case were as follows:—

The plaintiff sued to recover Rs. 1,939, on the basis of a mortgage executed by one Gajadhar deceased (uncle of defendant No. 1 and grand uncle of defendants Nos. 2 and 3). Defendant No. 1 pleaded that the bond was not genuine and that Gajadhar was not the manager of the family and had no right to alienate joint family property. Defendant No. 4, the minor Maharaja of Ajudhia, pleaded that the piece of land which was alleged to be Gajadhar's was endowed property. The first court gave a decree in favour of the plaintiffs. On appeal by the receiver of the

* Second Appeal No. 489 of 1913 from a decree of G. A. Paterson, District Judge of Benares, dated the 10th of December, 1912, modifying a decree of Ganga Sahai, Additional Subordinate Judge of Benares, dated the 15th of April, 1912.

(1) (1884) I. L. R., 8 Mad., 192.