

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CR No. 1518 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.5.2017**

Punjab Wakf Board

...Petitioner

Versus

Hardeep Singh and another

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Ghulam Nabi Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.L. Saggar, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sunny Saggar, Advocate
for the respondents.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

When this case came up for hearing on 6.5.2016, following
order was passed by this Court:-

*“Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3
submitted that in the earlier litigation property of the
Wakf Board situated in village Payal was in dispute and
the said matter has already been decided, even the SLP
has also been decided.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks some time
to have appropriate instructions in this regard.*

Adjourned to 25.05.2016. “

Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the very outset, fairly
states that in compliance of the abovesaid order passed by this Court, he has
got the instructions to say that in an identical case pertaining to this very
khasra number in question, **Civil Revision No. 327 of 2015 (Punjab Wakf
Board Vs. Sarup Singh and others)**, was dismissed by this Court vide

order dated 2.2.2015 and thereafter, SLP filed by the petitioner-board was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 5.5.2015 passed in SLP No. 13003 of 2015.

Learned senior counsel for the respondents submits that **Sarup Singh's case** (supra) was based on same set of facts and the litigation has attained finality against the petitioner-board, vide abovesaid order dated 2.2.2015 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Despite making his best efforts, learned counsel for the petitioner could not distinguish the present case from **Sarup Singh's case** (supra) and rightly so, it being a matter of record. It is also not in dispute that both the civil litigations were pertaining to the same khasra number and were based on similar set of facts. Under these peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, present revision petition has been found squarely covered against the petitioner-board by the abovesaid orders passed by this Court as well as by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In this view of the matter, no case for interference has been made out.

Dismissed.

11.5.2017
AK Sharma

(**RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK**)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No