

## APPELLATE CIVIL.

Before Sir Charles Sargent, Kt., Chief Justice, and  
Mr. Justice Nánábhái Haridás.

NA'RA'YANDA'S RA'MDA'S, (PLAINTIFF) v. SA'HEB HUSEIN,  
(DEFENDANT).\*

1888.  
April 9.

*Practice—Minor, suit against—Názir appointed guardian ad litem—Power of Court to direct fee to be paid by plaintiff for communication with natural guardian—Civil Procedure Code (Act XIV of 1882), Sec. 458—Procedure.*

There is no power in the Court to order a plaintiff to pay a fee for the purpose of enabling the Názir, who has been appointed guardian *ad litem*, to put himself in communication with the natural guardians and other friends, but the Court may refuse to go on with the suit if it should be of opinion that the Názir has been unavoidably prevented from making himself acquainted with the case against the minor.

In a suit against a minor residing in a Native State at a distance from the Názir of the Court, who was appointed guardian *ad litem*, and the Názir was prevented from conducting the minor's defence without incurring expense which the plaintiff refused to pay,

*Held*, that the Court, if it chose, might cancel the appointment of the Názir as guardian *ad litem* under section 458 of the Civil Procedure Code (Act XIV of 1882).

THIS was a reference by Ráv Sáheb Vyankatráv Rukmangad Inámdár, Subordinate Judge of Bijápur, under section 617 of the Civil Procedure Code (Act XIV of 1882).

The facts of the case were stated as follows :—

“One Náráyandás bin Rámdás sued one Gaffur Sáheb, a minor, as the son and heir of Sáheb Husain, the deceased executant of a bond dated 12th September, 1884, to recover Rs. 20 as principal and Rs. 11-14-0 as interest=Rs. 31-14-0, with costs from the estate of the deceased. The bond sued on was said to have been passed at Bijápur, and the cause of action was said to have accrued within the jurisdiction of the Subordinate Judge's Court at Bijápur. The minor defendant is residing with one Chandábi, his sister, in the Miraj State outside British India, and no other person is said to be living in British India who is fit and willing to act as his guardian *ad litem* in this suit. His property is presumably worth less than Rs. 250. On the application of

\* Civil Reference, No. 4 of 1888.

1888.

NARAYAN DÁS  
RÁM DÁS  
v.  
SÁHEB  
HUSEIN.

the plaintiff's *wakil* supported by an affidavit, the Názir of the Subordinate Court was, under the circumstances, appointed such guardian under section 456 of the Code of Civil Procedure, and summons was duly served on him. He said that as the minor resides with his relatives at Miraj he was not able to obtain any instructions from the latter as to the merits of this case, and that, therefore, he was not in a position to make any defence in this suit."

The questions referred by the Subordinate Judge for the High Court's opinion were:—

1. Whether, under the circumstances mentioned above, the Názir sufficiently represents the minor defendant?
2. If not, what procedure should the Court follow for the purpose of bringing this suit to a trial on the merits?

The Subordinate Judge's opinion on the first point was in the negative. On the second he was of opinion, that a sufficient fee should be levied from the plaintiff, to enable the Názir to put himself in communication with the natural guardians or other friends of the minor for the purpose of obtaining instructions from them, that the fee so levied should be calculated as costs in the suit, and that the amount of fee to be levied should be determined by the Court.

*Vishnu Krishna Bhátvaldekar* for the plaintiff:—The Court has no power to demand fees from the plaintiff. As the Názir has accepted the guardianship, he is bound to obtain all instructions from his ward. He can get the expenses from the minor's estate. The Court may remove the Názir under section 458 of the Civil Procedure Code, and appoint another person to defend the suit.

*Vásudev Gopál Bhandárkar* for the defendant:—The plaintiff will not be a loser if he pays the expenses, for if he succeeds in the suit he will get them included in the costs. Under the rule of English law, a plaintiff in such a case is called upon by the Court to pay such expenses, and the Court is to make order as to its repayment on decision: see Simpson on Infants, p. 464.

SARGENT, C. J.:—There is no power in the Court to order the plaintiff to pay a fee for the purpose of enabling the Názir, who

has been appointed guardian *ad litem*, to put himself in communication with the natural guardians and other friends of the minor, but the Court may well and indeed ought to refuse to go on with the suit if it should be of opinion that the Názir has been unavoidably prevented from making himself acquainted with the case against the minor. In the present case, the minor is residing in a Native State at a distance from the Názir, who is thus practically prevented from conducting the minor's defence without incurring expense; the Court might well, under such special circumstances, in the event of the plaintiff refusing to provide the means for enabling the Názir to obtain the necessary information from the minor's relations, cancel the appointment of the Názir (which it is to be remarked is not obligatory on the Court) either in exercise of its inherent power over its own officer or at any rate under section 458 of the Civil Procedure Code, which applies to other causes for removal as well as misconduct.

1888.

---

NÁRÁYANDÁS  
RÁMDÁS  
v.  
SÁHEB  
HUSEIN.

---

## APPELLATE CIVIL.

*Before Sir Charles Sargent, Kt., Chief Justice, and  
Mr. Justice Nánábhái Haridás.*

JOSHI KA'LIDA'S, PLAINTIFF, v. KOLI DA'DA' ABHESANG,  
DEFENDANT.\*

1888.  
April 12.

---

*Bond—Penalty—Stipulation to pay double the amount of debt on default of  
payment of any instalment.*

A stipulation by which, on default of payment of one instalment, double the entire amount of the debt due under an instalment bond was to become at once payable, held to be in the nature of a penalty.

THIS was a reference by Ráv Sáheb Ranchodlál K. Desái, Subordinate Judge of Umreth, under section 617 of the Civil Procedure Code (Act XIV of 1882).

The facts of the case were stated as follows:—

“The defendant in this suit executed the bond sued on in favour of the plaintiff on the 5th July, 1885, for Rs. 26 Bábáshái, equal to British currency Rs. 22-12-0, promising to pay the same

\*Civil Reference, No. 52 of 1887;