

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CR No.7510 of 2013**

**Date of decision: 3.12.2015**

**Kamla Devi**

**..... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Chameli Devi and others**

**..... Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not? Yes
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Present : Mr. J.P.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

**ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)**

Petition filed by respondent No.1 i.e. Smt. Chameli Devi, under Section 372 of Indian Succession Act, for granting succession certificate on account of death of her husband namely K.P.Sharma on 17.12.2005, was accepted by the Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Rohtak. As even an appeal preferred against the said judgment failed and was dismissed vide judgment dated 4.9.2013, Kamla Devi, who was respondent No.6, in the original petition, has preferred the present revision.

On a consideration of the matter in issue and the evidence on record, both the Courts concurrently concluded that Chameli Devi was indeed the legally wedded wife of late K.P.Sharma. Whereas, claim of the petitioner that she was married to K.P.Sharma and was entitled to succeed

his estate, was rejected, for the evidence on record proved that she indeed was married to Ram Dass. Copies of the voter card, ration card and the proceedings in a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 initiated by the Kamla Devi herself, substantiated the said position. Nothing was brought on record, least any cogent or credible evidence, to show that the marriage between the petitioner and Ram Dass was ever dissolved. Accordingly, it was observed that **“respondent No.6 shall be at liberty to seek remedies under law for establishing her own status independently of the present proceedings, which are limited to the issue of grant of certificate”**.

Learned counsel for the petitioner could not show as to how the conclusions that have concurrently been recorded by the Courts below, were either contrary to the position on record or suffered from any material illegality.

No other argument was advanced.

In the wake of the position as set out above, no interference is warranted in exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The petition being devoid of merit is accordingly, dismissed.

**December 3, 2015**

Manoj Bhutani

**(ARUN PALLI)  
JUDGE**