

RSA No.2536 of 2014(O&M)
Date of Decision: 15.1.2016

Yadwinder Singh

---Appellant

versus

Bachan Kaur

---Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr. Surinder Gandhi, Advocate
for the appellant

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

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present regular second appeal has been directed against the concurrent findings recorded by the courts below whereby claim of the appellant-plaintiff in regard to joint ownership in the suit land on the basis of agreement dated 31.8.2006 has been rejected.

Counsel for the appellant would submit that the courts below have wrongly rejected the agreement dated 31.8.2006 on the premise that it requires registration or the same has not been proved in accordance with law.

I have heard counsel for the appellant, perused the records particularly the judgment impugned in appeal and find no reason to intervene.

The appellant has staked his claim to joint ownership of the suit

property primarily on the basis of agreement dated 31.8.2006 which is in the form of a Relinquishment Deed. Admittedly, the document is not registered as envisaged under Section 17 of the Registration Act. It is not plea of the appellant that the property, subject matter of the agreement is of value less than Rs. 100/-. This apart, the courts below have rightly held that the appellant failed to prove the agreement, in accordance with law. This apart, the agreement does not describe khasra numbers of the land.

In view of what has been discussed hereinbefore neither any substantial question of law, as has been sought to be raised in para 8 of the grounds of appeal, arises nor contentions raised by the appellant are meritorious. As a result, the appeal is dismissed in limine. No order as to costs.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

15.1.2016
PARAMJIT