

(1901) 10 MAD CK 0015
In the Madras High Court

Nataraja Pillai and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

Venkatachella Pillai

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-10-1901

Acts Referred:

Citation : (1902) 12 MLJ 93

Judgement

1. From the terms of the gift (Exhibit I) it would appear that the properties were given to the daughter and her husband from niece love and affection. There is nothing there to indicate that the property given to the son-in-law was given in consideration of past service or that to the daughter for her maintenance, she being in an indigent state. Though these claims are now set up in support of the gift, they are not substantiated by any trustworthy evidence. The son-in-law not being an illatom son-in-law has, therefore, not the shadow of a right to the property, and the alienation to him must be held invalid. And so in the case of the daughter, as no authority is cited to us allowing the father of a married daughter to bestow undivided family property on her even for maintenance.
2. The second appeal fails and is dismissed with costs.