The 27th April 1874.

## Present:

The Hon'ble Sir Richard Couch, Kt., Chief fustice, and the Hon'ble W. Ainslie, 7 udge.

## Special Appeal.

Case No. 1620 of 1873.
Special Apteal from a decision passed by the $\mathcal{F} u d g e$ of Dinagepore, dated the arst fune 1873, reversing a decision of the Moonsiff of Sahibgunge, dated the 31st December 1872.
Sooraj Kant Acharje (Plaintiff), Appellant,
versus
Khoodee Narain Manna and others (Defendants), Respondents.

Mr. C. Piffard for Appellant.
Baboo Sreenath Doss for Respondents.
A judgment, which shows on the face of it want of due consideration of evidence and the introduction of foreign matters into the case, may be brought up before the High Court in special appeal.

Couch, C.7.-We think we cannot allow the decision of the Judge to stand. He says that the evidence was altogether on one side, as in fact it was, it being that for two years rent had been paid at the rate at which it was claimed. Then he says that the plaint"iff " fails to show any agreement for enhanced "rent, or that actually enhanced rents "were paid." We cannot understand his saying that the plaintiff failed to show that enhanced rents were paid, and if they had been paid for three years, it would be evidence of an agreement to pay rent at that rate. But the Judge goes on to state what ${ }_{w_{i 2}}$ appears to us to be the key to his judgment, this., that the enhancement of all ryots in "is mehal and their "resistance to the same
"enhancemenn, and there could be no
"ing to it, and ef rent, the parties not agree-
"forced from the even if exactions had been
"they from the ryots for some years, and
"sueh pere clearly proved, I cannot consider
"subsequenily fro to be the rents as due
"look upon such from the ryots. I would rather
"and upon such excess payment as abwabs to justesses." There is nothing in the case exactions. the Judge in speaking of these as importions. It is clear that he unfortunately mess to take into account-some knowledge Vol. XXII.
he, had acquired of the state of things in this mehal. A judgment which shows on the face of it a want of due consideration of the evidence in the case, and the introduction of other matters, is one which we think we cannot allow to stand. There is an error in the decision of the case and in the investigation of it which has affected the decision on the merits, and it may be brought before this Court in special appeal. The appellant is entitled to have the unbiased judgment of the Lower Appellate Court on the facts of the case. The decree foust be reversed, and the case remanded for re-hesring.

The costs will follow the result.

The 27th April 1874.
Present:
The Hon'ble J. B. Phear and G. G. Morris, fudges.
Registration in Collectorate-Cause of Action. Case No. 1242 of 1873.
Special Appeal from a decision passed by the Subordinate fudge of Bhaugulpore, dated the 13th March 1873, affirming a decision of the Moonsiff of Monghyr, dated the 20th 7 uly 1872.
Rewat Mahton and another (two of the Defendants), Appellants, wersus
Penum Mundar and others (Plaintiffs), Respondents.
Baboo Boodh Sen Singh for Appeilants.
Baboo Mohinee Mohun R'oy for Respondents.
Where parties relying on their title to cemain property apply to have their names put into the Collectorate books, and their application is successfully opposed by other parties claiming the same property on the ground of a conveyance made to themselves, such opposition constitutes a guod cause of action to the parties first mentioned if they have the right alleged.

Phear, 7 .-We think that no ground has been furnished to us upon which we ought to interfere with the decision of the Lower Appellate Court upon special appeal.

It was first objected that the plaintiffs had shown no cause of action in this suit. But the purpose of the suit is to have a declaration of title to property; and the plaintiffs distinctly say that, in reliance upon the strength of their title which they want to have declared, they went to the Collectorate to have their names put into the Colloctorate

