

(1925) 07 MAD CK 0014
In the Madras High Court

Yoodara Sobhanadri

APPELLANT

Vs

Challagula Venkanna

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 29-07-1925

Acts Referred:

Citation : 96 Ind. Cas. 309

Hon'ble Judges : Reilly, J

Bench : Single Bench

Judgement

Reilly, J.—The only question argued for petitioner is whether the payment shown by the endorsement, Ex. A-21, saves limitation. The very amount of that payment, Rs. 900 is clear indication that part of it was towards interest as the original principal was only Rs. 800. The evidence shows that P.W. No. 1 who made the payment was defendant's agent duly authorised to make the payment. There does not appear to be anything in the suggestion that P.W. No. 1 did not follow the exact authority given to him by defendant in the matter. The payment clearly saves limitation.

3. The petition is dismissed with costs.