

...

7. Learned counsel for the respondents also fairly conceded that the dispute is with regard to nature of the suit property whether the same is joint Hindu family and coparcenary property in the hands of Dhanna Singh and there is no dispute with regard to the fact whether the plaintiff is the real son of Narain Singh son of Dhanna Singh. So, the scope of controversy having been narrowed-down to determine whether the plaintiff has been able to prove the nature of the suit land to be joint Hindu family and coparcenary property as the onus was upon the plaintiff-appellant.

8. While arguing on this point, learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the plaintiff has been able to prove, on the basis of oral as well as documentary evidence, which is part of revenue record as also the judicial record, that the nature of suit property is coparcenary and joint Hindu family property and plaintiff is grandson of Dhanna Singh.

9. Learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that as per document, Ex. P3, available on the file which is excerpt having been prepared by revenue official in discharge of his official duty, the nature of suit land has been proved to be coparcenary and joint Hindu family property in the hands of Dhanna Singh. Excerpt [Ex.P3] is the basic record for succession and that was proved on the file as per statement of PW-3 Ram Dayal that the suit land was coparcenary and joint Hindu family property in the hands of Dhanna Singh, but the Courts below have completely ignored this fact.

10. Learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that as per document, Ex. P6, i.e., copy of judgment dated 10.4.1995 passed in Civil Suit No. 34 dated 14.1.1995 titled **Paramjit Kaur Vs. Dhanna Singh**, which was filed by none else than present respondents, namely, Paramjit