

1900
 NOV. 30 &
 DEC. 7.
 CRIMINAL
 REVISION.
 28 C. 297.

said that the accused had any reasonable ground of apprehension. It is not suggested that the Magistrate of the district had any hand in the initiation of the proceedings, or that he had in any way given directions or instructions either to the police officers or to their subordinates. The Magistrate in his explanation says that he had no knowledge of the matter, until he heard some time afterwards that the case had been instituted. The mere fact that the Magistrate of the district is, in his capacity as Collector, concerned in the management of the Raj Estate is no ground in our opinion for asking for a transfer of the case from the district. As regards the Honorary Magistrate there is no mention of the specific observations made by him in Court which led the accused to form the impression that he would send him to *hajat* and cancel his bail bond, although there was no evidence of any offence against him on the record. It is suggested that he was present at some conversations which the tenants had with the Sub-Inspector. It is worthy of note that the people who went to the Sub-Inspector have not made an affidavit, certainly it does not appear that the petitioner was one of them. The Honorary Magistrate denies any conversation of the character mentioned in the affidavit occurring in his presence between the tenants and the Sub-Inspector. The Honorary Magistrate no doubt, admits that the Sub-Inspector is a connection of his and he often goes to his house, but that by itself does not seem to us to be a sufficient reason for supposing that the accused will not [302] receive a fair trial from him. As regards the suggestion that inasmuch as the Honorary Magistrate in private life happens to be the manager of somebody else who has some claim to the Bettiah Raj, he is likely to support the complainant and go against the accused, we need only say that the statement is absurd upon its face. The Magistrate of the district says that if a proper application is made to him, he would transfer the case from the file of the Honorary Magistrate to that of some other Magistrate with first class powers so that an appeal might not lie to him but to the Sessions Judge. With this, however, we are not at present concerned. On the whole, therefore, we think no ground has been made out for the application for transfer in this matter and we accordingly discharge the Rule.

Rule discharged.

28 C. 302.

Before Mr. Justice Prinsep and Mr. Justice Handley.

PROKASH CHUNDER SARKAR (*Petitioner*) v. RAM PRASAD
 PATTAK (*Opposite Party*).^{*} [29th August, 1900].

Jurisdiction—Costs, Order for assessment of, without notice to party affected thereby—Revision by High Court—Code of Criminal Procedure (Act V of 1898), s. 148.

A Magistrate has no jurisdiction to pass an order under s. 148 of the Code of Criminal Procedure making a party liable for a certain sum as costs without notice to him, so that he may have an opportunity of contesting the same.

IN this case a proceeding was drawn up under s. 145 of the Code of Criminal Procedure between Ram Prasad Pattak as the first party and the petitioner Prokash Chunder Sarkar as the second party in the Court of Mr. Cook, the Joint Magistrate of Gya. On the 30th December 1899, the proceedings terminated in favour of Ram Prasad Pattak, who was

^{*} Criminal Revision, No. 519 of 1900, made against the order passed by L. S. S. O'Malley, Esq., District Magistrate of Gya, dated the 18th day of May 1900.

declared to be in possession of some of the disputed lands, and an order was made awarding him costs. Mr. Cook left the district, and Mr. O'Malley, who succeeded him, on the application of Ram Prasad Pattak assessed costs on the 18th May 1900 at Rs. 201-13-6 against the [303] petitioner without notice to him. The petitioner then applied to the District Magistrate to set aside the order passed on the 18th May, but Mr. O'Malley, who was officiating as District Magistrate, rejected the application.

1900
AUG. 29.
CRIMINAL
REVISION.
28 C. 302.

The petitioner thereupon applied for and obtained a rule from the High Court calling upon the District Magistrate to show cause why the order of assessment of costs should not be set aside as being made without notice to the petitioner.

Mr. Swinhoe (with him Babu Atulya Charan Bose and Babu Hari Bhusan Mookerjee) for the petitioner.

The judgment of the Court (PRINSEP and HANDLEY, JJ.) was delivered by

PRINSEP, J.—The rule is made absolute as the Magistrate admits that he passed the order under s. 148, Code of Criminal Procedure, making the petitioner liable for a certain sum as costs without notice to him, so that he might have an opportunity of contesting the same. The Magistrate is now at liberty to proceed after due notice to the parties concerned.

Rule made absolute.

28 C. 303.

APPELLATE CIVIL.

Before Mr. Justice Banerjee and Mr. Justice Brett.

BENI MADHUB MITTER (*Defendant* No. 2) v. PREONATH MANDAL AND ANOTHER (*Plaintiffs*).^{*} [13th December, 1900].

Arbitration—Award—Acquiescence—How far a defendant, not a party to an application for reference to arbitration, is bound by his conduct.

In a suit brought by the plaintiffs for recovery of possession of certain immovable property on a declaration of title thereto a reference was made to arbitration.

One of the defendants (defendant No. 2) did not join in the reference and did not take any part in the proceedings before the arbitrators, although it appeared that he, in obedience to a summons which was issued at the instance of another defendant, sent his servant to produce a document [304] before the arbitrators. An objection was now taken by defendant No. 2 that he was not bound by the award :—

Held, that it was so, and that the conduct of defendant No. 2 was not such that it could be said that he was bound by the award by reason of acquiescence.

THIS appeal arose out of an action brought by the plaintiffs for recovery of possession of certain immovable property on a declaration of title thereto. The plaintiffs and the defendants Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 7 applied to the Subordinate Judge of 24-Pergunnahs, Babu Bulloram Mullick, for an order of reference, and all the matters and disputes were accordingly referred to arbitration on the 16th of November 1896. The award was made on the 14th of June 1897. It gave the plaintiffs

* Appeal from Appellate Decree No. 2089 of 1898, against the decree of C. P. Caspersz, Esq., District Judge of 24-Pergunnahs, dated the 9th of July 1898, reversing the decree of Babu Bulloram Mullick, Subordinate Judge of that District, dated the 25th of July 1897.