

SMT JUSTICE T. RAJANI

MA CMA Nos.155, 237 and 2462 of 2012

COMMON JUDGMENT:

Though the above three appeals are preferred on various grounds, at the hearing, the impugned judgments are assailed only on one ground. In fact, the judgments are not assailed, but the decrees following the said judgments are questioned.

2. It is submitted by the counsel for the appellants in these appeals that though an order of pay and recover was given by the court below, in the decrees, joint and several liability was mentioned. Hence, the appellants seek this court to clarify the said aspect.

3. A perusal of the impugned judgments would show that the court below ordered that R3 shall pay entire compensation amount to the petitioners and recover the same from R1 and R2. The respective decrees, at paragraph 4, also reflect the same direction, directing R3 to pay entire compensation amount to the petitioners and recover the same from R1 and R2. Hence, the decrees are not found to be in variance with the judgments.

4. Having regard to the above, these appeals are dismissed as there is no clarification that is required in these cases. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

T. RAJANI, J

July 13, 2018
LMV