1981 December 2

[LORIS, STYLIANIDES, PIKIS, JJ.]

ANDROULLA PH. ECTORIDOU AND ANOTHER

Appellants-Plaintiffs,

ν.

EMILIOS EMILIANIDES AND OTHERS, IN THEIR CAPACITY AS ADMINISTRATORS OF THE ESTATE OF THE DECEASED COSTAS MOUSKI,

Respondents-Defendants.

(Civil Appeal No. 6014).

Construction of documents—Principles applicable—Meaning of a clause must be gathered from the wording of the relevant stipulation read in the context of the document in its entirety—Bond in customary form—Time from which interest started running.

The only issue in this appeal was the time from which the interest on a bond in customary form started running. The material clause in the bond read as follows:

"I am obliged to pay the above amount on demand together with interest at 4% per annum".

The trial Court held that interest was payable from the date of demand.

Upon appeal by the plaintiffs:

Held, that the meaning of a clause of a document must be gathered from the wording of the relevant stipulation read in the context of the document in its entirety; that the only construction that can be placed on the relevant clause is that the capital was payable together with interest at the rate of 4% per annum from the date of the execution of the bond; accordingly the appeal must be allowed with costs.

Appeal allowed with costs.

20

15

5

10

Appeal.

Appeal by plaintiffs against that part of the judgment of the

District Court of Nicosia (Boyadjis, S.D.J. and G. Nicolaou, D.J.) dated the 16th October, 1979, (Action No. 1217/79) whereby the defendants were ordered to pay interest at the rate of 4% from 28.11.1978 and not from 1.3.1969.

L. Papaphilippou, for the appellants.

5

10

Th. Ioannides, for the respondents.

LORIS J.: The judgment of this Court will be delivered by my brother Judge Stylianides, J.

STYLIANIDES J.: This appeal is directed against part of the judgment of a Full Court of Nicosia (Boyadjis, S.D.J. as he then was, and G. Nicolaou, D.J.) raising a single question only, i.e. the time from which the interest on a bond found by the trial Court to be a bond in customary form started running.

The plaintiffs' claim was for £3,000.—plus interest at 4% 15 from 1.3.1969 by virtue of a bond in customary form executed on 1.3.1969.

The question of interest was neither specifically raised nor argued before the trial Court. The trial Court held that the interest is payable from the date of demand.

20

The bond is exhibit No. 2.

The principles of construction of documents are well known and we need not embark on them. The meaning of a clause of a document must be gathered from the wording of the relevant stipulation read in the context of the document in its entirety.

25

We considered the material clause of the bond, i.e. clause 2, separately and the bond in its entirety. Clause 2 reads:-

"Τὸ ὡς ἄνω ποσὸν ὑποχρεοῦμαι ὅπως τὸ πληρώσω εἰς πρώτην ζήτησιν μετὰ τόκου πρὸς 4 τοῖς ἐκατὸν ἐτησίως".

("I am obliged to pay the above amount on demand together with interest at 4% per annum").

There is no ambiguity in it. The only construction we can place on it is that the capital was payable together with interest at the rate of 4% per annum from the date of the execution of the bond. The sum was made payable on demand. Not only is

35

1 C.L.R. Ectoridou and Another v. Emilianides and Others Stylianides J.

this meaning warranted by the wording of the bond but such construction is inescapable in view of the findings of the trial Court that the bond is in customary form (see s. 78 of the Contract Law, Cap. 149).

In the result the appeal is allowed with costs. The judgment of the trial Court is varied so as to carry interest at 4% per annum as from 1.3.1969.

Appeal allowed with costs.