Bey have always lived out of Cyprus, the time of their absence does not count. Our English translations of the Mejellé certainly seem to imply that it is an excuse only when it is the claimant who is absent; and the Greek translation (Nicolaides) is, " if *the Plaintiff* is under age or of un- " sound mind or in a distant city." In the absence of any authority on the point I should hold that, under the Turkish law, absence is only an excuse when it is the absence of the claimant.

In my opinion however the answer to this question does not depend on the Turkish law but on the Immovable Property Limitation Laws, 4 of 1886 and 5 of 1887. I think that these Laws apply to all actions for recovery of immovable property of every kind; and under them, if the Defendants were suing the Plaintiffs for the 2/30th shares in dispute, and the latter were to prove undisputed adverse possession for 15 years, the action would not be maintainable; for under those Laws time begins to run when the right to bring the action accrues, unless the claimant is under one of the disabilities mentioned therein; and ignorance is not one of the disabilities; and absence from Cyprus is only a disability when it is the claimant who is absent.

PARKER, ACTING J., concurred.

Appeal dismissed.

The case of *Gregori Haji Lambro v. W. Rees Davies* as King's Advocate reported in pages 110–121 of the original edition is no longer of any importance.

The case of *Diophanto Themistocles v. A. Christophi* reported in pages 121–123 of the original edition is no longer of any importance.