

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

**RSA No.59 of 2012
Date of decision: 6.9.2016**

Rajni

... Appellant

Versus

Ram Kumar and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr.A.P.Bhandari, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr.Gurmail Singh Duhan, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The appellant-plaintiff is aggrieved of the dismissal of the suit seeking declaration with permanent injunction as consequential relief by challenge release deed dated 24.2.2004 by defendant No.2, her father, in favour of defendant No.1 nephew.

According to Mr.Bhandari learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that admitted position on record that the property at the hands of Mangal Singh was ancestral though appellant has right/share in the property allegedly released. If it is so, then in view of the provisions of 6 of the Hindu Succession Act which has been amended in 2005 qua release deed of 2004, the married daughter has no right to claim share in the aforementioned property. In view of the fact if the statue bars the plaintiff,

in my view, the ground taken in the suit is not acceptable. Both the courts

RSA No.59 of 2012

: 2 :

have rightly dismissed the suit. No ground for interference is made out.

RSA is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

September 6, 2016
Paritosh Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No