

3. In response, appellants/ defendants filed written statement controverting the stand taken in the plaint while submitting that the plots were allotted in favour of the parties in view of resolution dated 27.09.1976 passed by the Gram Panchayat, Village Begowal, in accordance with Rule 10 (b) of the Punjab Village Common Land (Regulation) Rules, 1964. It was further averred that mother of respondents/ plaintiffs was allotted plot No.94; whereas the appellants/ defendants were allotted plot No.95 and the land in dispute formed part of plot No.95 and prayed that the suit was thus, liable to be dismissed.

4. The trial Court vide judgment and decree dated 23.09.1989 decreed the suit in favour of the respondents/ plaintiffs while restraining the appellants/ defendants from interfering in their peaceful possession over the suit land.

Aggrieved thereof, the appellants/defendants filed first appeal before the learned Additional District Judge, Kapurthala, however, the same came to be dismissed vide judgment and decree dated 06.04.1993 thereby, upholding the judgment and decree passed by the trial Court.

5. Impugning the aforementioned judgments and decrees, learned counsel representing the appellants/defendants submits that there has been misreading of evidence on the part of Courts below while decreeing the suit in favour of the respondents/ plaintiffs. On the other hand, no one has appeared on behalf of respondents-plaintiffs.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the appellants/ defendants and gone through the paper-book. I do not find substance in the submission made by learned counsel for the appellants/ defendants.

7. A concurrent finding of fact has been recorded in favour of

respondents / plaintiffs as regards their settled possession over the suit land which has been based on the documentary evidence produced on record in the shape of aks-shajra, Jamabandies as well as Khasra Girdwaries. .

More than that, nothing has been pointed out to submit that there has been any misreading of the material evidence or any such evidence has either been ignored.

8. In view of the detailed discussion made hereinabove, finding no illegality or perversity with the concurrent findings of fact recorded by both the Courts below as regards the possession of respondents-plaintiffs over the suit property, the present appeal is hereby dismissed there being no question of law involved.

9. Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

March 13, 2024
Anu

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No