

(1903) 09 MAD CK 0010
In the Madras High Court

Oodayanasamy Tevar and Another

APPELLANT

Vs

Alagappa Chetty and Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-09-1903

Acts Referred:

Citation : (1904) 14 MLJ 342

Judgement

1. The objection that the consent of the guardian was not obtained before he was appointed, was not taken in the petition to set aside the sale and

he is now appealing as guardian on behalf of the minor. It is at best a mere irregularity. See Mussumat Bibi Walian v. Banke Behari Per shad Singh

7 C.W.N. 774. No notice was necessary to the father's representatives. The suit was against a father and sons forming a joint Hindu family and it

was, therefore, quite unnecessary to join the sons as representatives of the father on his death. The appeal is dismissed with costs.