

SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S ORDERS
			WPMS No.1926 of 2026 <u>Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.</u> Mr. Pankaj Semwal, Advocate for the petitioners. Mr. Anchit Khokhar, Advocate for respondent no.1 through V.C. Mr. Siddhartha Jain, Advocate for respondent nos.3 and 6. Ms. Sangeeta Adhikari Patni, Advocate holding brief of Mr. N.S. Pundir, Advocate for respondent nos.4 and 5. Mr. Ajay Singh Bisht, Advocate for respondent no.7. By means of the present petition, the petitioners have sought the following reliefs:- “i. Issue a Writ, Order, or Direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding Respondent Nos. 1 to 7 to immediately freeze, seal, and restrict any form of withdrawal or transaction from the Saving Accounts, Fixed Deposits, and Lockers of Late Mr. Narwel Singh (as detailed in Paragraph 5 of this petition). ii. Issue a Writ or Order directing that the status quo of all the dynamic and static assets across the Respondent Banks be maintained strictly, till the Petitioners approach and secure interim protection from a competent Civil Court via a formal suit. iii. Pass any other such order or relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.” In the petition, it has been pleaded that the situation of the petitioner has become critical because, following the unfortunate demise of their father, Mr. Narwel Singh, on 27.01.2026 and their mother, Mrs. Surrender

			Kaur, on 23.01.2019, the petitioners and respondent Nos. 8 and 9 became equal joint owners of the estate. Since respondent Nos. 8 and 9 were merely recorded as nominees in the father's bank accounts, the petitioners have recently discovered that respondent No. 8 has begun abusing this administrative status by unilaterally making several financial transactions and withdrawing substantial amounts of money from the banks without the petitioners' knowledge or legal consent. This ongoing, unauthorized siphoning of joint family funds, executed in absolute secrecy and without informing the other lawful legal heirs, threatens to completely deplete the corpus before a civil suit can be instituted, leaving the petitioners with no alternative but to seek immediate protective intervention. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that since the civil courts are closed as of now and the petitioners cannot wait till the opening in July, hence the relief which has been prayed in the writ petition be being granted. Learned counsel for the respondents would submit that they do not have any specific role as such. They further submit that the dispute between the petitioner on one hand and respondent nos.8 and 9 on the other hand, the bank had absolutely no role to play. The apprehension as being expressed on behalf of the petitioners that the civil courts are closed during vacation and they cannot approach the civil courts for any immediate remedy is totally erroneous inasmuch as Rule 13 of the General Rules (Civil), 1957 provides for work on holidays. Rule 13 is extracted hereunder:- “13. Work on holidays. -Except with the consent of parties, no suit, case or appeal shall
--	--	--	---

			be heard on a gazetted holiday: Provided that on gazetted holiday a Court shall not refuse to do any act or make any order urgently required or which may with propriety be done or made out of Court. [Provided further that during civil court vacations, civil cases may be instituted and urgent fresh matters may be heard. For the purpose of, one officer in the cadre of [Civil Judge (Junior Division)] and one in [Civil Judge (Senior Division)] cadre shall remain present on rotation basis throughout the civil courts vacations in district Dehradun, Haridwar, Nainital, and Udham Singh Nagar. In other districts, if an officer in aforesaid cadre is not available, any other officer, to whom charge is given for this purpose, shall hear urgent matters.]” Since Rule 13 of the General Rule (Civil) provides for institution of suits/cases even during the holidays, hence in view of the urgency as being expressed by the petitioners they will be at liberty to institute the suit/case etc. before Civil Court as advised by their the counsel during summer vacations. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition is dismissed. (Siddhartha Sah, J.) 19.06.2026 Ravi
--	--	--	--