We do not remove it from his possession – אין מוציאים אותה מידו

OVERVIEW

The נהרדעי ruled in the case of 'זה אומר של אבותי (regarding which ר"נ ruled גרא"ג), that if a third party took possession of the property, כדא"ל does not remove him from this property (even if he makes no claim¹). תוספות expands this ruling.

ואפילו כתבו הרשאה² זה לזה הואיל³ ורשעים הם⁴ אין נזקקים להם:

And this ruling of אין מוציאין אותה מידו is effective even if they wrote a הרשאה to each other. The reason the הרשאה is ineffective; since they are רשעים, we do not assist them.

SUMMARY

The rule of אין מוציאין אותה מידו is in effect even if they wrote a הרשאה to each other.

THINKING IT OVER

תוספות writes that אין נוקקים להם since they are רשעים. Seemingly only of them is [certainly] a רשעים; there is no reason to assume that they are both רשעים; why therefore does תוספות rule that אין נזקקים לאין even if הזה לזה הרשאה זה ל $?!^6$

 $^{^{1}}$ See ד"ה אין מחל רשב"ם and ד"ה.

² A הרשאה is a power of attorney. In this case, each of the initial litigants (after they realized that a third party took possession) gave the other litigant the power to claim on his behalf the disputed property. Seemingly once these two were executed, each one of them is seemingly the rightful owner; for he is claiming this property on his own behalf and on behalf of the other litigant who granted him the power of attorney to litigate on his behalf. The third usurping party seemingly has no rights at all since he is not making any claim (see 'Overview' and footnote # 1). Nevertheless, די"כ will not remove the third party from the property, as תוס' continues to explain.

 $^{^3}$ It is apparent from תוספות that he disagrees with the שב"ם ד"ה אין אין להם חלק בה who states אין להם הלק בה, for then it is obvious that a הרשאה is ineffective (since it may not belong to either of them).

⁴ One of the two initial litigants is certainly a רשע, for the property belongs to only one of them. See 'Thinking it over'.

⁵ See footnote # 4.

⁶ See בל"י אות רמו.