case, the points for determination, the decision thereon, and the reasons for such decision…." It is obvious that bare answers to issues without reasons are not in compliance with the requirements of the said provision of the Civil Procedure Code, and the evidence germane to each issue must be reviewed or examined by the Judge, who should evaluate and consider the totality of the evidence. This, the learned District Judge has failed to do, and the Court of Appeal has overlooked in affirming the decision of the District Court.

It is the primary duty of a court deciding a case involving ownership of land, whether it is a partition action or *rei vindicatio* action, to consider carefully whether the relevant land (*corpus*) has been clearly identified. As already stressed, identity of the land is fundamental for the purpose of attributing ownership, and for ordering ejectment. In order to make a proper finding, it is necessary to formulate the issues in a clear and unambiguous manner to assist the reasoning process of court. In my considered opinion, the learned District Judge has seriously misdirected himself in the manner in which he formulated issue 6, which makes reference to the schedule to the petition and the plan and report prepared by Surveyor Dissanayake, which differ drastically form each other with respect to the location, boundaries and extent of the land described or depicted therein. By answering the issue in the affirmative without clarifying whether he was going by the schedule to the petition or on the basis of one of the survey plans prepared on the commissions issued by court, and if so which one, the learned District Judge has altogether begged the question of identity of the *corpus* which is so vital to a vindicatory action, which negates the possibility of deciding on the question of title that arises in this case. The resulting judgement, which unfortunately has been affirmed by the Court of Appeal, is fatally flawed, and the finding that title to the land claimed by the Respondents devolved on them by virtue of Deed No. 6165 marked P1 is altogether unfounded.

For all these reasons, I hold that substantive question 1(c) has to be answered in the affirmative, and that the Court of Appeal was indeed in error in affirming the decision of the learned District Judge that the Respondents had established title to the subject matter of the action

Prescription

In view of my answers to the 3 sub-questions of substantive question 1 on which special leave has been granted by this Court, it is unnecessary to decide question 2, which is whether the Court of Appeal erred in failing to consider that the learned District Judge has not duly evaluated the evidence on the question of prescription. I therefore do not propose to go into this question in depth. In a *rei vindicatio* action, it is not necessary to consider whether the defendant has any title or right to possession, where the plaintiff has failed to establish his title to the land sought to be vindicated and the action ought to be dismissed without more.

However, I wish to use the opportunity to deal with a submission made by learned President's Counsel for the Respondents before parting with this judgment. He has submitted that in terms of Section 45(3) of the Agrarian Services Act No. 58 of 1979, as subsequently amended, an entry made in the Agricultural Lands Register maintained under that Act is admissible as *prima facie* evidence of the facts stated therein, and that accordingly, the entry made in the Agricultural Land Register, a certified extract from which was produced marked "P1", in which the names of the Respondents appear as