Before Sir Francis W. Maclean, K. C. I. E., Chief Justice, and Mr.
Justice Bodilly and Mr. Justice Staley.

NEPAL CHANDRA GHOSE

v.

MOHENDRA NATH ROY CHOWDHURY.*

Landlord and tenant—Suit—Rent—Co-sharer landlord—Variance between
pleading and proof—Converting suit of one nature into one of a different
nature.

When a landlord sues for the entire rent of a holding, but it is found that he
is entitled only to a share of the rent, the suit must be dismissed, unless his co-
sharer landlords are made parties to it, or an arrangement is proved between the
landlords and the tenant that the latter should pay each landlord his proportionate
share of the entire rent.

Guni Mahomed v. *Moran*(1) followed.

SECOND APPEAL by the defendants, Nepal Chandra Ghose
and another.

The plaintiff, Mohendra Nath Roy Chowdhury, instituted a
suit for the recovery of arrears of rent amounting to Rs. 105-12-6
pies, on the allegation that within his zemindari the defendants
held a *jama* of about 11½ bighas of land at an annual rent of
Rs. 6-14 annas in cash, besides certain quantities of paddy·
Rent was claimed for the years 1303, 1304 and 1305 B.S.

The defendants contended that the plaintiff owned only
4 annas of the *maliki* interest, the other shares being owned by the
sons of one Kailash Nath Ghose and one Bama Sundari, who were
not parties to the suit ; that the plaintiff had brought the suit on
the fraudulent allegation that he had the sole right ; that they, the
defendants, held under the *ijaradar* and were not liable to the
plaintiff for rent ; and that the holding was now held by one

* Appeal from Appellate Decree No. 196 of 1901, against the decree of
Jogendra Nath Roy, Additional Subordinate Judge of 24-Pergunnahs, dated the
12th November 1900, reversing the decree of Kally Prossauno Roy, Munsiff of
Basirhat, dated the 25th January 1900.

(1) (1878) I. L. R. 4 Calc. 96 ; 2 C. L. R. 371.

Chandra Nath Chowdhury, who had purchased the defendants' interest at an auction sale.

The Munsif dismissed the suit, holding that the plaintiff had failed to adduce satisfactory evidence of realisation of rent. As to the admitted 4 annas share of the plaintiff, he observed "Plaintiff did not claim share of rent of his share, in proper way."

On appeal, the Subordinate Judge held that there was no doubt that the plaintiff was entitled to recover from the defendants 4 annas share of rent, if Chandra Nath had not acquired the holding by purchase. The case was remanded for a finding as to whether Chandra Nath had purchased the defendants' holding and whether the plaintiff was bound to recognise him. The Munsif having found that Chandra Nath had not acquired any right by his purchase of the holding, which was not transferable, the Subordinate Judge decreed the suit for 4 annas share of the rent, holding that there was no proof that the plaintiff was entitled to recover the entire rent.

Dr. Ashutosh Mukerjee (Babu Biraj Mohan Mosumdar with him), for the appellants. The suit ought to have been entirely dismissed. *Guni Mahomed* v. *Moran*(1), lays down that a suit brought by a co-sharer landlord for rent is not maintainable, without making the other co-sharers parties thereto, in the absence of any arrangement between the co-sharer landlords and the tenant that the latter should pay each co-sharer his proportionate share of the entire rent. Such an arrangement has not been alleged or proved in the present case, nor could an issue on the point be framed and decided, on the pleadings.

Babu Sarat Chandra Roy Chowdhury, for the respondent. It is not open to the other side to raise the point now, as no issue was joined on it. If that had been done, the arrangement referred to in the case of *Guni Mahomed* v. *Moran*(1) might have been proved. The relief granted to the plaintiff by the lower Appellate Court was not inconsistent with, but only less than the relief claimed in the suit.

Dr. Ashutosh Mookerjee, in reply.

(1) (1878) I. L. R. 4 Calc. 96; 2 C. L. R. 371.

MACLEAN C.J. * In this suit the plaintiff claimed the whole 16 annas of the rent. It turned out that, at the most, he was entitled only to a 4 annas share, and a decree has accordingly been given for such share. The defendants appeal.

1904

NEPAL CHANDRA GHOSH

v.

MOHENDRA NATH ROY CHOWDHURY.

Their contention is that the plaintiff is not entitled to a decree even for that share. It is argued that the plaintiff sued originally for the whole 16 annas share, but is found entitled only to a 4 anna share of the rent, that his co-sharer landlords are not co-plaintiffs nor defendants, that there is no allegation or proof of any arrangement between the landlords and the tenants that the tenants should pay each co-sharer his proportionate share of the entire rent and that, in the absence of any such arrangement, the suit is not maintainable. This contention is supported by the decision of a Full Bench of this Court, *viz*, *Guni Mahomed* v. *Moran*(1).

A suit, originally of one nature has been converted into a suit of an entirely different nature. As I have pointed out the plaintiff originally claimed 16 annas of the rent. It was found that he was only entitled to 4 annas : but as there was no arrangement between the co-sharers landlords and the tenants as to the payment to each co-sharer of his proportionate share of the rent, I do not see how the suit can be maintained.

In respect to the argument that the question as to the plaintiff's right to receive separately 4 annas of the rent was not put in issue or decided, the answer is that suggested by the learned vakil for the appellant, that the suit being for the whole 16 annas share, it was incumbent on the plaintiff, in the absence of his co-sharers, to show that he was entitled to the entire 16 annas. The suit is not based on the footing of his only being entitled to 4 annas of the rent. I think, therefore, that the suit must fail and be dismissed with costs throughout, the judgment of the Court of Appeal below being reversed.

BODILLY J. I concur.

STALEY J. I concur.

M. N. R.   *Appeal decreed.*

(1) (1878) I. L. R. 4 Calc. 96; 2 C. L. R. 371.