

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

**RSA No.3554 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of Decision.02.11.2015**

Meka and others

Versus

.....Appellants

Tara Chand

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate
for the appellants.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The property purchased in the name of the plaintiffs' father Raghubir came to be inherited by the mother Jamuna, widow Sarla and the plaintiffs jointly as children of Raghubir. Jamuna has sold 1/3rd share of the property to yet another son Birbal. The contention of the plaintiffs was that Jamuna could not have sold the property and they alone were entitled to the property. The argument is erroneous and against the provisions of law. A mother is a Class I heir and if she has sold the property what she has inherited from her son, there can be no objection taken by the plaintiffs. The suit was rightly rejected by both the Courts below and there is no scope for interference.

2. The second appeal is dismissed as involving no substantial question of law.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

**November 02, 2015
Pankaj***