

**CPC O. 41 R. 31, CPC S. 96 - High Court failed to realise that it was deciding the First Appeal and that it had to be decided strictly in adherence with the provisions contained in Order XLI Rule 31 of the Code - The said provisions provide guidelines for the appellate court as to how the court has to proceed and decide the case - The provisions should be read in such a way as to require that the various particulars mentioned therein should be taken into**

**consideration.***Held*, thus, it must be evident from the judgment of the appellate court that the court has properly appreciated the facts/evidence, applied its mind and decided the case considering the material on record. It would amount to substantial compliance with the said provisions if the appellate court's judgment is based on the independent assessment of the relevant evidence on all important aspects of the matter and the findings of the appellate court are well founded and quite convincing. It is mandatory for the appellate court to independently assess the evidence of the parties and consider the relevant points which arise for adjudication and the bearing of the evidence on those points. Being the final court of fact, the first appellate court must not record mere general expression of concurrence with the trial court judgment rather it must give reasons for its decision on each point independently to that of the trial court. Thus, the entire evidence must be considered and discussed in detail. Such exercise should be done after formulating the points for consideration in terms of the said provisions and the court must proceed in adherence to the requirements of the said statutory provisions. (*Vide Sukhpal Singh v. Kalyan Singh [AIR 1963 SC 146]* , *Girijanandini Devi v. Bijendra Narain Choudhary [AIR 1967 SC 1124]*, *G. Amalorpavam v. R.C. Diocese of Madurai [(2006) 3 SCC 224]* , *Shiv Kumar Sharma v. Santosh Kumari [(2007) 8 SCC 600]* and *Gannmani Anasuya v. Parvatini Amarendra Chowdhary [(2007) 10 SCC 296 : AIR 2007 SC 2380]* .)"

**[Read Judgment here: 2011 PLRonline 0007,](#)**