	ر د د دوه هما موداه د	(1)
Sr. No.	Date	Orders
		* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
		+ RSA 176/2003 & CM Nos. 587 - 588/2003
•		NARENDRA PRASAD MATHUR Appellant Through Mr.Dinesh K.Gupta, Advocate. versus
		D.D.A Respondent Through
		CORAM: HONBLE MR. JUSTICE R.S. SODHI
		<u>ORDER</u> % 17.10.2003
		This Regular Second Appeal under Section 100 CPC is directed
i		against the judgment and order dated 11 th August, 2 003,
		passed by the Additional District Judge, in RCA No. 133/2000,
		whereby the learned Judge dismissed the appeal preferred
		against the judgment and decree dated 3 rd August, 2000, passed by the Sub Judge, Delhi in Suit No.390/1990.
		The appellant herein wants to raise fresh issues before me.
	Andreas	The same cannot be permitted as the Supreme Court in
Signatu Signing Date Certify that t	ure Not Verified	· contd2/-

r. No.	Date	Orders	S
	*	-2	RSA 176/2003
	* 4		
	÷	Kondiba Dagadu Kadam Vs	Savitribai Sopan Gujar & Ors.
	·	1999 (3) SC 164 has held that	
		"In a case where from two inferences are poss appellate court is bind second appeal. Adopting permissible. The High opinion for the opinion unless it is found that to the mandatory provise settled position on the base of the mandatory provises."	a given set of circumstances sible, one drawn by the lower ding on the High Court in any other approach is not a Court cannot substitute its nof the first appellate court the conclusions drawn by the were erroneous being contrary isions of law applicable or its basis of pronouncements made was based upon inadmissible
		In view of the above	e, RSA 176/2003 is dismis
			F00 (0000 -111 1::
		Consequently, CM Nos. 587	- 588/2003 also stand dismiss
			W CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH
A	·	OCTOBER 17, 2003	R.S. SODHI, J
1		bp	
- ,	Ø.	•	