BLOGS

Doctrine of Res Judicata: Sec 11 of Civil Procedure Code

Samridhi M · 03 Aug 2023

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Introduction Principles of Res Judicata Conditions to impose Res Judicata Exceptions to the Principle of Res Judicata Is Res Judicata a form of Withdrawal of the Suit? What happens if a court refuses to apply the principle of Res Judicata? Landmark Cases on Res Judicata Conclusion

Introduction

Res judicata and estoppel are legal principles in the Indian legal system, which serve to prevent repetitive litigation and ensure fairness and consistency in judicial proceedings.

Res judicata, governed by **Section 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908**, is a doctrine that prohibits a court from re-examining a case that has already been conclusively decided by the same court, involving the same parties, subject matter, and under the same title.

In simple terms, if a matter has been previously adjudicated and a final judgment has been delivered on it, it cannot be re-litigated. This post seeks to examine the various nuances and the multiple issues circling this principle.

Principles of Res Judicata

The doctrine of Res Judicata serves several important objectives in the legal system. These objectives are based on three underlying maxims:

1. Nemo debet bis vexari pro una et eadem causa: This Latin proverb means “no man should be vexed twice for the same cause”. The basic goal of Res Judicata is to save the parties from having to go through endless litigation over the same problem. Once an issue has been determined definitively by a competent court, the same parties should not be permitted to re-litigate the same dispute.

2. Interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium: This Latin maxim means “it is in the best interests of the State to put an end to litigation”. The Res Judicata concept enhances judicial efficiency and the finality of rulings. It guarantees that disagreements are settled definitively, lowering the pressure on the legal system and eliminating unnecessary and time-consuming litigation.
3. Res judicata pro veritate occipitur: This Latin proverb translates as “a matter adjudged is accepted as correct”. Res Judicata creates a presumption of validity and finality for decisions made by competent courts. The court’s judgements are said to be founded on a thorough assessment of the facts and law, and they should not be readily reversed.

Conditions to impose Res Judicata

If specific criteria, as outlined in Section 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, are satisfied, the theory of Res Judicata works as a bar on a court’s jurisdiction to try a claim.

The following requirements must be met in order to establish Res Judicata as a legitimate defense in a future suit:

Same Matter in Issue: The matter directly and substantially in issue in the succeeding suit must be the same as the matter directly and substantially in issue in the previous suit, either actually or constructively.

The prior litigation must have been between the **same parties or parties claiming under them**. This implies that the parties in the second litigation must be the same as the parties in the preceding suit or claim filed under the same title.

Litigating Under the Same Title: The parties in the first complaint must have been litigating under the same title as they are in the second. In other words, in both circumstances, they should have the same legal interest in the subject matter.

Competent Court: The court that resolved the previous suit must be competent to hear the future suit or suit involving the same subject. This assures that the previous suit’s ruling was made by a court with competent jurisdiction.

Final Decision: The court in the prior litigation must have heard and eventually determined the topic immediately and significantly in question in the following suit. Res Judicata must be used after a final judgement on the merits of the case.

It is vital to highlight that the concerned party **must raise the Res Judicata** defense in the later complaint. If a party fails to raise the Res Judicata issue, or if the trial court fails to outline such an issue and the appeal court raises it on its own, such invocation of the concept may be deemed improper. Res Judicata can only be considered by the court if it is raised by the parties involved in the case.

Exceptions to the Principle of Res Judicata

Collateral Attack: Under this exception, a party may dispute the legality of a previous decision in a new court or procedure. Collateral challenges are usually focused on procedural or jurisdictional grounds, rather than the merits of the previous court's ruling.

In such circumstances, the emphasis is on the court's power or competency in issuing the original ruling. Collateral assaults may be more likely to succeed in legal systems having numerous jurisdictions, such as those run by federal governments, or when a local court is sought to enforce or accept a foreign court's verdict.

Res Judicata may be thrown aside in circumstances involving **breaches of due process to preserve fairness and justice**. For example, if a person's right to counsel was violated in a prior trial, the subject may be entitled a re-trial with legal representation.

Mistake of Fact: If a decision is based on a major factual error that was not found earlier, the court may re-litigate the case to correct the error.

Fraud or Misconduct: Res Judicata may be set aside to prevent injustice if there is proof of fraud or misconduct that impacted the outcome of the prior trial.

Changed Circumstances: If there have been significant changes in circumstances or new evidence that could not be produced during the prior trial, the court may consider re-opening the case.

Inequitable Application: If using Res Judicata will result in an inequitable outcome or excessive hardship, the court may grant an exception.

Is Res Judicata a form of Withdrawal of the Suit?

Order 23, Rule 1 addresses res judicata and suit withdrawal. If the plaintiff withdraws or abandons their claims without requesting permission from the court, they will be banned from

initiating a new complaint based on the same cause of action.

The essential difference is that in res judicata, the subject is completely heard and definitively settled between the parties, but in a withdrawal, the plaintiff voluntarily decides to withdraw or relinquish their claims before a final judgement on the merits of the case is reached.

What happens if a court refuses to apply the principle of Res Judicata?

When a court disregards the concept of res judicata and produces inconsistent decisions on the same topic, the case may be heard by a third court. In such a case, the third court will apply the res judicata doctrine based on the preceding suit's ruling.

It is now the obligation of the parties concerned in the current case to bring the prior case to the court's notice. Based on the facts and circumstances of the case, the court will determine whether or not to accept the res judicata plea.

Landmark Cases on Res Judicata

The Indian courts have from time to time clarified the meaning of several terms associated with the principle of Res Judicata. Some of the them are detailed below:

The Allahabad High Court clarified in the case of ***Vasudevanand Saraswati v. Jagat Guru Shankaracharya*** that the word "same title" in the context of res judicata implies the same ability. The key question is whether the parties involved in the case are legally the same person or a distinct person. If the same individual appears in a new role, a previous lawsuit's ruling does not serve as res judicata.

Similarly, even though the property involved is same, the second litigation will not be considered res judicata if the rights being asserted are different. As a result, the word "title" focuses on the interest or ability of the party initiating or defending the case rather than the cause of action.

The Allahabad High Court decided in the case of ***Muneesh Kumar Agnihotri v. Lalli Prasad Gupta*** that the theory of res judicata applies only where an issue was directly and substantially in question in the prior action between the same parties or persons claiming under the same title.

The court found that, while the problems remained the same in this instance, the parties' titles altered. The claim to the business was brought via their father in the previous litigation, but the claim in the later suit was based on the firm being launched with joint family money, resulting in the appellants' entitlement to the business and the property obtained from those joint family assets.

As the title of parties differed in the subsequent suit, the court did not accept the argument of res judicata, even though the issues were the same.

The Kerala High Court held in the case of ***Mavelikkara Ex-Servicemen's Multipurpose Co-operative Society v. Parvathy Amma Rajamma*** that the idea of identity of subject matter under Res Judicata should not be restricted to a physical sense but should also include a judicial meaning. This indicates that the subject issue of the dispute is not just the same physical thing or property, but also the legal rights and claims linked with that subject matter.

The Delhi High Court ruled in ***Krishan Kumar v. Vimala Sehgal*** that if circumstances have changed, a landlord can file a second petition for own occupation even though their previous application for the same reason was denied by the Rent Controller. The landlord's demands were different when they submitted the initial petition in 1961, since their son had not returned from England and their children were small, according to the court.

However, because of the landlord's retirement, their children's maturation, and other reasons, the court concluded that the prior ruling should not be considered Res Judicata. As a result of these changing circumstances, a fresh petition might be considered and filed.

Conclusion

The doctrine of Res Judicata seeks to avoid the issuing of numerous judgments on the same subject and protects the interests of all parties concerned by prohibiting the plaintiff from receiving damages from the defendant for the same injury twice. The legal system maintains speed, impartiality, and consistency in the settlement of disputes and litigation by employing res judicata.