

**RA-RS-91-C-2017 (O&M) in
RSA No. 2509 of 1985 &**

**RA-RS-92-C-2017 (O&M) in
RSA No. 2507 of 1985**

-1-

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

**RA-RS-91-C-2017 (O&M) in
RSA No. 2509 of 1985
Date of Decision: 10.11.2017**

Ajmer Singh (deceased) through his LRs and others

.....Appellants

vs.

Rajinder Singh (deceased) through his LRs

.....Respondents

**RA-RS-92-C-2017 (O&M) in
RSA No. 2507 of 1985**

Ajmer Singh (deceased) through his LRs and others

.....Appellants

vs.

Rajinder Singh (deceased) through his LRs

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Manjit Singh Khaira, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Madan Gopal Bagga, Advocate,
for the applicants-respondents.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By these applications, the applicants-respondents seek a review of the judgment of this Court dated 12.09.2017, firstly on the ground that this Court has erred in holding that the suit land is not *Jagir* land, inasmuch as a *Jagir* is a grant in perpetuity and therefore, at no stage can it be not declared to be a *Jagir*.

**RA-RS-91-C-2017 (O&M) in
RSA No. 2509 of 1985 &**

**RA-RS-92-C-2017 (O&M) in
RSA No. 2507 of 1985**

-2-

This Court already having expressed its opinion as to why the suit land stopped being a *Jagir*, in view of the fact that the respondent-plaintiff did not challenge beyond a certain point the transfer of *Jagir* land by his father to his other sister and did not challenge at all the transfer to yet another sister, as also did not further agitate before this Court the transfer of other *Jagir* land to one Nathu Ram after the suit was decreed in his favour (alongwith a suit in favour of one of the sisters of the plaintiff), (and as such, the land having lost its character as a *Jagir*), I do not see as to how these review applications would be maintainable, the scope for a review being extremely limited, i.e. only on account of an error patent on the face of the record, i.e. this Court not having dealt with something apparent on the record, or having held something contrary to the record.

Expression of the opinion of this Court, on why the suit land lost its character as *Jagir* land, does not fall in either of the two categories.

No other point has been urged.

Consequently, both these applications are dismissed.

November 10, 2017
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No.