

RSA-803 of 2023 (O&M)

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

RSA-803 of 2023 (O&M)
Reserved on: 22.12.2023
Pronounced on: 12.01.2024

Narinder Singh @ Nidhan Singh and others

.....Appellants

Versus

Jasbir Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Argued by: -Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Sr. Advocate, with
Ms. Aashna Aggarwal, Advocate, and
Mr. Vishal Pundir, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. Naresh Prabhakar, Advocate,
for caveator/respondents No.1 to 6.

Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate,
for respondent No.7.

NAMIT KUMAR, J.

1. This Regular Second Appeal is directed against the judgment and decree dated 30.11.2015 passed by the Court of learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Mohali, whereby suit for declaration with consequential relief of permanent injunction filed by respondent-plaintiffs was decreed as well as against the judgment and decree dated 17.11.2022 passed by the Court of learned Additional District Judge, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali), whereby appeal filed by the appellants-defendants against the judgment and decree dated 30.11.2015, has been

dismissed.

2. For convenience sake, reference to parties is being made as per their status in the civil suit. Brief facts of the case pleaded by the plaintiffs are that Hardial Singh son of Chuhan Singh common ancestor of the plaintiffs and defendants did not execute the alleged Will dated 13.12.1973 of his estate. The alleged Will has been forged and fabricated by defendant no.1 – Narinder Singh, defendant no.4 – Davinder Singh and Bhupinder Singh deceased, after the death of their father Hardial Singh as Hardial Singh was of unsound mind before 5 years of his death, who died on 15.12.1973. The alleged Will dated 13.12.1973 does not bear the signatures/thumb marks of Hardial Singh deceased. It is further submitted that plaintiff No.1 Jasbir Singh applied vide letter no. 58 on 23.01.2007 to the copy agency of the concerned revenue official, Kharar for the supply of attested copy of the alleged Will dated 13.12.1973 but as per report dated 23.01.2007 of the concerned official of the revenue authority, it is clear that there is no alleged Will available in the revenue record, since the alleged Will was not executed by Hardial Singh. It is further submitted that Mohinder Singh son of Hardial Singh was adopted during the life time of Hardial Singh by father of Tej Kaur. Tej Kaur was wife of Hardial Singh, who died about 20 years back. Therefore, Mohinder Singh has no share in the suit land i.e. 209 Kanal 3 Marla which was owned by Hardial Singh. It has been further submitted that plaintiffs No.1 to 3 inherited 3/16 share i.e. 39 Kanal 4 Marla in equal share after the death of their mother Pritam Kaur, whereas, plaintiffs No. 4 to 6 being the daughter and sons of deceased Charan Kaur inherited 1/16 the share i.e. 13

Kanal 2 Marla of land in equal shares. It has been further submitted that the judgment and decree dated 9.06.1995 passed in the Civil Suit No.633 dated 5.10.1994 by Sub Judge Ist Class, Kharar suffered by defendant No.4-Davinder Singh in favour of defendant No.5-Jasbir Singh and Jagdish Singh (since deceased) husband of defendant No.6-Paramjit Kaur and father of defendant No.7-Gurdeep Singh is illegal, null and void and same is obtained by fraud and also not binding upon the plaintiffs qua their share in the suit land. The alleged decree and judgment came to the knowledge of plaintiffs on 24.01.2007 when they received the copy of jamabandi from the revenue official. The sale deeds dated 7.2.2008 executed in favour of defendant No.8 are also illegal. It has been further submitted that the defendants No.1,4 and Bhupinder Singh (deceased) after the death of Hardial Singh after forging the alleged Will dated 13.12.1973 of the suit land, illegally got the mutation sanctioned in their names in the absence of Pritam Kaur as well as plaintiffs No.1 to 3 and Charan Kaur deceased in connivance with the revenue officials without giving any notice to them. Thus, the alleged mutation is illegal, null and void and does not confer any right, title and interest over the suit land of the share of the plaintiffs qua the defendants.

3. Upon notice, the defendants no. 1 to 7 appeared through their counsel and filed joint written statement by taking preliminary objection that plaintiffs are estopped from filing the present suit by their own act and conduct. On merits, it has been submitted that Hardial Singh was residing with the defendants and was pleased with the

services of defendant No.4 and Bhupinder Singh father of defendants No.2 and 3, executed a valid Will on 13.12.1973 with regard to the land in question on the basis of which mutation was sanctioned by the competent revenue authority. It has been denied being wrong that Hardial Singh was of unsound mind for the last 5 years before his death. The original Will was produced before revenue officer at the time of getting entered the mutation. It has been further submitted that Will dated 13.12.1973 is genuine document executed by Hardial Singh in sound and disposing mind and the mutation on the basis of which was legally and validly sanctioned. The decree dated 9.6.1995 is legal and valid decree passed by competent court of law and the same was not obtained by fraud as alleged. It has been further submitted that the Will in question is genuine document and was executed by Hardial Singh voluntarily, with free mind and had been accepted by revenue officer for sanction of inheritance of Hardial Singh regarding land at village Tangori vide mutation no. 794 dated 20.01.1973. Moreover, the property in suit was ancestral and coparcenary property in the hands of Hardial Singh of joint undivided Hindu Family formed by Hardial Singh and his sons Narinder Singh, Bhupinder Singh, Devinder Singh in which they were already having right by birth and after the death of Hardial Singh they also became owner of his share as per valid Will dated 13.12.1973. Rest of the averments made in the plaint were denied and prayer for dismissal of the suit was made.

4. In his separate filed written statement, defendant No.8 has taken the preliminary objection that he is a *bona fide* purchaser for

valuable consideration of the land purchased by him and he is holding his possession on the basis of the registered sale deed. On merits, it has been submitted that defendant No.8 is unaware of the ownership of suit land and he is only aware of the land purchased by him for valuable consideration regarding which he is holding the sale deeds in his possession. It has been further submitted that defendant No.8 has purchased land measuring 4 Kanal 15 marla situated at village Tangori, Hadabast No. 278, Tehsil & Distt. Mohali for a sum of Rs. 23,75,000/- from Paramjit Kaur wife of Jagdish Singh, Gurdeep Singh son of Jagdish Singh vide registered sale deed No. 3178, Zild No. 0, Bahi No.1, page No.0 dated 7.02.2008 before Sub Registrar , SAS Nagar, Mohali. He purchased the land measuring 4 Kanal 13 Marla situated at village Tangori, Hadbast No. 278, Tehsil & Distt. Mohali from Jasbir Singh son of Devinder Singh vide sale deed no.3177, Zild no. 0, Bahi no. 1 dated 7.02.2008 for a sum of Rs. 23,25,000/-. Defendant No.8 is owner in possession of the land mentioned in two sale deeds. After denying the other averments of the plaint, the defendants have prayed for dismissal of the suit.

5. Plaintiffs filed replication to the written statements filed by defendants and denied all the averments contained in the written statements and reiterated all the averments of the plaint.

6. From pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed by the Court of First Instance vide order dated 16.7.2009:-

1. Whether plaintiffs are entitled to the declaration as prayed for? OPP
2. Whether the Will dated 13.12.73 executed by Hardial Singh is illegal, null and void? OPP

3. Whether the judgment and decree dated 9.6.95 is not binding? OPP
4. Whether the sale deed dated 7.2.08 is illegal, null and void? OPP
5. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for permanent injunction as prayed for? OPP
6. Whether the plaintiffs are estopped from filing the present suit by their act and conduct? OPD
7. Whether the suit is not maintainable? OPD
8. Relief.

7. The parties led their respective evidence. The Court of first instance, after appreciating evidence on record decreed the suit filed by the plaintiffs vide judgment and decree dated 30.11.2015.

8. Feeling aggrieved against the said judgment and decree of the trial Court, defendants preferred an appeal before the lower appellate Court, which has been dismissed vide judgment and decree dated 17.11.2022.

9. Learned Senior Counsel for the appellants contended that the judgments and decrees passed by both the Courts below are against law and the evidence on record and suffer from surmises and conjectures. He further contended that both the Courts below failed to appreciate that mutation of inheritance with regard to land of village Tangori, Tehsil Kharar, was sanctioned on the basis of 'Will' executed by Hardial Singh in favour of his three sons. He further contended that respondents/plaintiffs have mixed-up the self-acquired properties of the appellants with that of the property inherited from their father Late Sh. Hardial Singh and, therefore, the appellants filed an application for amendment of the written statement, during the pendency of the appeal. He further contended that impugned judgment and decree was passed by the Lower Appellate Court on 17.11.2022, whereas, the application

for amendment of the written statement was decided after the decision of the main case i.e. 25.11.2022. He further contended that after the death of Hardial Singh mutation no.794 dated 20.01.1973/05.06.1975 was sanctioned on the basis of his 'Will' dated 13.12.1973, which was admitted by Tej Kaur, Mohinder Singh (adopted by his maternal grandfather) and Piara Singh had sworn his affidavit admitting 'Will' dated 13.12.1973. He further contended that in Civil Suit No.152 of 1995 titled as 'Davinder Singh Vs. Mohinder Singh' decided on 16.04.2001 in relation to land at Village Banur, Tehsil Rajpura, District Patiala, Punjab, the respondents being party to the said suit filed written statement dated 25.09.1995, wherein they had stated that succession of land of Village Tangori was on the basis of 'Will' and it was not natural succession and, thereafter, no cause of action nor having any *locus standi* to the respondents/plaintiffs to file the present suit regarding the land at Village Tangori, SAS Nagar. He further contended that there was delay in filing the suit, therefore, same was liable to be dismissed being hopelessly time barred. He has further referred to the statement of DW-2 Balbir Singh and PW-4 Kuldeep Singh, who in his cross-examination stated that mutation was sanctioned on 20.01.1973 and original 'Will' was attached with the original record of revenue authorities. He further contended that applications filed by the appellants for amendment of written statement and for leading additional evidence have been wrongly rejected by the Courts below. In support of his contentions, learned Senior Counsel has relied upon the judgments rendered in *M/s Craft Centre and others Vs. The*

Koncherry Coir Factories, Cherthala 1991AIR (Kerala) 83, State of Orissa and another etc. Vs. Sri Damodar Das 1996 AIR (Supreme Court) 942, Lachhman Singh (deceased) through Legal Representatives & Ors. Vs. Hazara Singh (deceased) through legal representative and others 2008(5) SCC 444, Shyam Lal @ Kuldeep Vs. Sanjeev Kumar and others 2009(12) SCC 454, Dineshbhai A. Parikh Vs. Kripalu Cooperative Housing Society, Nagarvel, Ahmedabad and others 1980 AIR (Gujarat) 194, Kurdia Vs. Rameshwar Dass and others 2009(3) RCR (Civil) 672, Dilbagh Singh Vs. Umed Singh and others 2012(25) RCR (Civil) 854, Bhanwar Lal Vs. The Board of Revenue Raj. Ajmer and another 2017(3) W.L.N 529, Ranganathan Vs. Narayanan 2015(15) RCR (Civil) 816, Jal Singh and another Vs. Chunni Lal and others 2019(10 RCR (Civil) 210, Hari Kishan and others vs. Rati Ram and others 2018(4) PLR 783, Harmesh Kaur and others Vs. Taro and others 2019(3) PLR 827, Mahila Ramkali Devi and others Vs. Nandram (D) Thr. LRs and others 2015(5) RCR (Civil) 562, Prithi Pal Singh and another Vs. Amrik singh and others 2014(1) RCR (Civil) 327, Jagmal Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others 2016(5) RCR (Civil) 195.

10. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondents No.1 to 6-caveator contended that suit of the plaintiffs has rightly been decreed by the Courts below as the appellants failed to prove the alleged 'Will' on record. He further contended that at the time of filing written statement, the defendants had not taken preliminary objection qua

limitation and as such, no issue qua the same was framed by the trial Court. He further contended that appellants filed revision petition being Civil Revision No.7226 of 2013 before this Court for leading secondary evidence, which was disposed of vide order dated 30.03.2015. The operative part of the order dated 30.03.2015 passed in the said revision petition is as under: -

“I have already observed that the justification for the production of secondary evidence had been already brought out in the written statement. The manner of whether the court will accept the evidence tendered as such secondary evidence is a matter of judicial appreciation and such evidence cannot be thwarted at the threshold even without allowing for the defendant to give evidence in that regard. If such evidence is given, the court will examine the surrounding circumstances and the quality of evidence to accept or reject the contentions raised in the defence as regards the genuineness of the Will. The court is bound to frame an issue regarding the truth and the genuineness of the Will alleged to have been executed on 13.12.1973 and the order passed already shall be set aside to allow the defendant to offer such evidence and the court will take a decision as regards the genuineness or otherwise of the Will including even the existence or otherwise of the Will while disposing of the case. The reference to the Will in the mutation proceedings is only to be taken as a corroborative piece of evidence and will not substitute the requirement of having to establish in the first place the existence of the Will; in the second place, truth and genuineness in the manner Section 68 of the Evidence Act dictates that the evidence shall be give and finally in the manner that Section 63 of

the Indian Succession Act enjoins that the Will shall be executed and attested as per the requirements of law.”

However, even after the aforesaid order, the appellants/defendants could not prove the alleged ‘will’ by leading any cogent secondary evidence. Accordingly, the issue regarding genuineness and existence of the ‘will’ in question was decided against the appellants. In support of his contentions, learned counsel relied upon the judgments rendered in ***Ajendraprasad N. Pande & Anr. Vs. Swami Keshavprakeshdasji N. & Ors. 2007(1) RCR (Civil) 481, Jarnail Singh Vs. Kulwinder Singh and another 2021 (1) RCR(civil) 531, P. Lakshmi Reddy Vs. L. Lakshmi Reddy 1957 AIR (Supreme Court) 314, Annakili Vs. A. Vedanayagam & ors. 2007(4) RCR (Civil) 780, Krishnamurthy S. Setlur Dead by LRs. Vs. O.V.Narasimha Setty and others 2007(2) RCR (Civil) 313, Ram Niwas and another Vs. Roshan and others Vol. CSL VI(2007-2) The Punjab Law Reporter 235, and Dr. Mahesh Chand Sharma Vs. Raj Kumari Sharma 1996(1) R.R.R. 387.***

11. Learned counsel for respondent No.7 contended that respondent No.7 is a *bona fide* purchaser from the appellants for a valuable consideration, therefore, his right has rightly been protected by the lower appellate Court.

12. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

13. For the sake of convenience and in order to adjudicate upon the issue, the pedigree table is required to be reproduced, which is as under: -

Chuhar Singh ! Hardial Singh ---- Tej Kaur (15.12.73) !					
! Mohinder Singh (Adopted by maternal grand-father)	! Davinder Singh @ Bara Singh (Def.4)	! Pritam Kaur (1970) w/o Piara Singh	! Narinder Singh @ Nidhan Singh (Def.1)	! Bhupinder Singh (deceased)	---- Jaswant Kaur (Def.2) (Wife)
	! !	! ! !		!	
Jasbir Singh @ Jagbeer Singh (Def.5)	Jagdish Singh --- Paramjeet Kaur (Died) (Def.6) ! Gurdeep Singh (Def.7)	! ! ! ! ! !		Charanjit Singh (Def.3) (Son)	
	! Jasbir Singh (Plf.No.1)	! Balwinder Singh @ Kuldeep Singh (Plf.No.2)	! Swaran Kaur (Plf.No.3) (daughter)	! Charan Kaur (died)	
		! Plf.4 Harpreet Kaur (Minor)	! Plf.5 Paramjit Singh (Minor)	! Plf.6 Gursewak Singh (Minor)	

14. Respondents No.1 to 6/plaintiffs are the legal heirs of Pritam Kaur pre-deceased daughter of late Hardial Singh; defendants No.1 and 4 are the sons of Hardial Singh and defendants No.2 and 3 are the legal heirs of Bhupinder Singh (pre-deceased son of late Hardial Singh). Plaintiffs filed a suit for declaration claiming that plaintiffs No.1 to 3 are owners and are in joint possession of the suit property to the extent of 3/16th share and plaintiffs No.4 to 6 are owners and are in joint possession of the suit property to the extent of 1/16th share being legal heirs of late Hardial Singh and 'Will' dated 13.12.1973 allegedly executed by late Hardial Singh in favour of his sons, namely, Narinder Singh @ Nidhan Singh (defendant No.1), Davinder Singh @ Bara

Singh (defendant No.4) and defendants No.2 and 3 (legal heirs of Bhupinder Singh, pre-deceased son of Hardial Singh is forged and fabricated one on the basis of which mutation of inheritance qua the land situated in village Tangori, was sanctioned on 20.01.1973/05.06.1975. Plaintiffs also challenged subsequent transfer made by defendant No.4-Davinder Singh to his sons and by defendants No.6 and 7 in favour of defendant No.8-Sukhvinder Singh.

15. The mutation of inheritance qua the land situated in village Tangori, was sanctioned on the basis of alleged 'Will' dated 13.12.1973, which is claimed by the plaintiffs as a forged and fabricated document. The onus to prove the genuineness/existence of the Will was on the appellants. However, the original Will of Hardial Singh has not seen the light of the day. It is the specific stand of the appellants that the same was lying with original revenue record and has been either lost by the revenue officials or has been managed to be stolen by the plaintiffs. However, the appellants did not summon any witness to prove the same. As such, the said plea does not seem to be plausible and is recorded to be rejected. Moreover, the photocopy of the said Will has not been produced and proved on record. Plaintiff-Jasbir Singh had applied for copy of 'Will' to the concerned revenue official, Kharar, on 21.01.2007 but it was reported that no such 'Will' was available in the revenue record. Indisputably, mutation of inheritance regarding land of Hardial Singh, situated in village Banur, was sanctioned in favour of his all legal heirs, including plaintiffs i.e. legal

heirs of Pritam Kaur for want of 'Will' against which an appeal was filed which stands dismissed on 21.10.2023.

16. The appellants have claimed that once the plaintiffs admitted qua sanctioning of mutation on the basis of the Will in some previous civil proceedings, now they cannot challenge the same after such a long time. However, it is the case of the plaintiffs that dispute in the earlier proceeding was qua the share of Mohinder Singh, who was already adopted by his maternal grand-father and it was nowhere mentioned that the present plaintiffs had relinquished their share in the property of Hardial Singh. Furthermore, PW 1-Jasbir Singh has categorically stated that their signatures were taken on power of attorney by their maternal uncle in the case pending at Rajpura. Both the courts below have rightly held that the aforesaid version of the plaintiffs appears to be quite reasonable as it is not uncommon if a person contesting the suit got signatures of other parties with whom he has good relations at that point of time. A perusal of the record would show that Pritam Kaur daughter of Hardial Singh had pre-deceased him and all her children were minor at that time, when mutation was sanctioned and she was not called at the time of sanction of mutation and DW-1 – Narinder Singh and DW-4-Davinder Singh had stated in their statements that Hardial Singh had deep love for his daughter-Pritam Kaur and he got deep pain when Pritam Kaur died. Furthermore, Piara Singh husband of Pritam Kaur appeared while appearing as a witness has categorically stated that he was not present at the time of sanctioning of mutation of inheritance of Hardial Singh.

Moreover, at the time of sanctioning of mutation, presence of DW 2 Balbir Singh-son of attesting witness and DW 3 Hardeep Singh does not seem to be genuine for the reason that their presence had not been marked in the mutation proceedings. PW 4 Kuldeep Singh, AOK, Assistant from the office of Kanoongo, Kharar, stated that there was no Will on record and affidavit of Hardial Singh and the alleged affidavit of Piara Singh and Swaran Kaur were also not there. Further, as per the endorsement made on the back of mutation-sheet, it is mentioned that Mohinder Singh and Tej Kaur had no objection to the mutation of Will, but the record does not show as to whether Pritam Kaur was called at the time of sanction of mutation in favour of defendants No.1 and 4 and Bhupinder Singh. The fact that once original Will or copy thereof has not been produced, same having been witnessed by Bakshish Singh and Harnam Singh and scribed by one Mohinder Singh, remained suspicious and 'Will' cannot be held to be validly executed, and which has not come on the record, is a concurrent finding of fact by two Courts. DW-1-Narinder Singh in his cross-examination stated that on the 'Will' only signature of Harnam Singh and thumb impression of Puran Singh were lying who also demonstrated that alleged 'Will' is neither signed nor thumb marked by deceased Hardial Singh.

17. Defendants No.1 to 6 have also claimed that some of the property was self-acquired property and they had filed application under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC for amendment of written statement. However, the said application has rightly been dismissed by the Appellate Court on the ground that the facts sought to be incorporated

in the written statement, were already in the knowledge of the defendants and they had failed to show their due diligence as to why they could not plead about the same earlier. The Appellate Court has rightly held that when the appeal was ripened for final hearing, there was no plausible ground to allow the application for amendment of written statement at a belated stage.

18. The appellants claim that suit of the plaintiffs is hopelessly time barred. The law of limitation finds its roots in the maxims '*Interest Reipublicae Ut Sit Finis Litium*', which means that there should be a limit to litigation and '*vigilantibus non dormientibus Jura subveniunt*' which means the law will assist only those who are vigilant with their rights and not those who sleep upon it. The law of limitation specifies the statutory time frame within which a person may initiate a legal proceeding or a legal action can be brought. If a suit is filed after the expiry of time prescribed, it will be barred by the Limitation. However, the time from which period of limitation begins to run depends upon the subject matter of the case and a specific starting point of such period is provided extensively by the Schedule in the Limitation Act. It generally starts from the date when the summons or notice is served or the date on which the decree or judgment is passed or the date on which the event that forms the basis of the suit takes places. However, it is well settled that there is no limitation of suit for declaration on the basis of title and cause of action arrives only from the date of knowledge of mutation. The plaintiffs have specifically pleaded that they came to know about the mutation, when they had

applied for copy of the jamabandi/Will in the year 2007 before the revenue authorities. The suit was filed on 20.04.2007. The plaintiffs have satisfied the Court that their action is not barred by lapse of time. The case law cited by learned senior counsel for the appellants are not applicable to the present case having distinguishable facts and circumstances.

19. The Appellate Court has rightly held that transfer of land is within the shares of transferors/vendors and thus decree dated 09.06.1995 and sale deed in favour of defendant No.8-Sukhwinder Singh could not be declared illegal, null and void. Moreover, no appeal has been preferred by the plaintiff against the aforesaid finding recorded by the Appellate Court.

20. On the last date of hearing i.e. 04.12.2023, one of the arguments raised on behalf of the appellants was that the lower appellate Court dismissed the appeal preferred by the appellants, on 17.11.2022 whereas applications under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC and Order 41 Rule 27 CPC were dismissed on 25.11.2022. For verifying the said fact, lower Court record was summoned, which has been perused and the argument raised on behalf of the appellants is falsified from the original lower Court record. On the same very date i.e. 17.11.2022, separate orders were passed by the lower appellate Court wherein it has been stated that arguments on applications under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC and Order 41 Rule 27 CPC have been heard and vide separate detailed orders, the same have been dismissed. The said order reads as under: -

“Arguments heard on applications. The application under Order 6 rule 17 CPC and 41 Rule 27 CPC have been dismissed vide separate detailed orders.

Arguments on main appeal also heard. Vide my separate detailed judgment of even date, the appeal filed by appellants has been ordered to be dismissed with costs. Decree sheet be prepared. Trial court record along with copy of judgment be sent back and appeal file be consigned to the record room.

Sd/-

*Pronounced in open Court: (Sandeep Kumar Singla),
Dated: -17.11.2022 Additional District Judge,
SAS Nagar (Mohali)”*

21. It is clear from the above order that two applications have been dismissed on the same very day when the appeal was dismissed and it is only a typographical mistake that instead of 17.11.2022, the date has been typed as 25.11.2022, while rejecting the applications.

22. Concurrent findings have been recorded by both the Courts below that plaintiffs No.1 to 3 are owners and are in joint possession to the extent of 3/16 share and plaintiffs No.4 to 6 are also owners and are in joint possession to the extent of 1/16th share of the suit land and that the plaintiffs have proved that the Will dated 13.12.1973 allegedly executed by Hardial Singh, is illegal, null and void. Learned senior counsel for the appellants has failed to show that the findings recorded by Courts below are perverse or illegal or based on misreading, non-reading or mis-appreciation of the material evidence on record.

23. In view of above, no question of law muchless substantial question of law arises for consideration in the present appeal. No other point has been urged.

24. Dismissed.

25. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

12.01.2024
R.S.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No