



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

309

**RSA-347-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision : 27.11.2025**

Jeet Singh and another

..... Appellants

versus

The Punjab State and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Jaideep Verma, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Harinder Pal Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. On 08.04.2025, this Court passed the following order:-

“Dr. Hitinder Kaur, Chief Registrar (Births & Death), Punjab is present in person. She brings to the notice of the Court that as per the post-mortem report of the deceased dated 25.02.2013 probable time that elapsed between death and post-mortem was opined to be 'within 10 days'. The dead body was recovered in village Passiana, District Patiala. Since the date of death as well as place of death could not be ascertained, clarification was sought from the Office of the Registrar General, India Govt. of India, Ministry of Home Affairs vide communication dated 08.11.2013. Vide communication dated 25.11.2013 the issue was clarified as under :-

Dated : 25/11/2013

*To
The Chief Registrar of Births & Deaths and
Director of Health & Family Welfare, Punjab,
Parivar Kalyan Bhawan
Sector 34-A, CHANDIGARH-160034
Sub: Clarification regarding registration of death entries in
drowning cases.*

Sir,

Please refer to your office letter no. SBHI (ME-1)/Pb/2013/9227 dated 8th Nov., 2013 vide which clarification has been sought on determination of place and date of death in drowning cases.

2. In this connection, it is to clarify that in the aforesaid cases provision of Section 8 (1) (e) of the RBD Act, 1969 could be followed. The date on which the dead body is recovered could be ascertained as the date of death and in case of place of death, the place where the body is found could be determined as the place of death. However, it should be ensure to make an entry in the remarks column of death register that 'Exact date of death could not be ascertained in the Post Mortem Report'.

Yours faithfully,

*(Ajay Khanna)
Deputy Director (CRS)*

She submits that accordingly advice was issued to the Civil Surgeon-cum-District Registrar, Births & Death, Patiala vide communication dated 10.12.2013.

Adjourned to 14.10.2025.

Personal presence of the concerned officer is exempted till further orders.”

2. In view of above, the plaint is ordered to be returned to the plaintiff to file the same before the Court of competent jurisdiction at Patiala.
3. Keeping in view that unfortunate parents who lost their young son are before the Courts seeking recovery of damages for last 11 years, this Court is sanguine that the Court to whom the matter shall be assigned shall make an endeavour to decide the suit expeditiously, preferably, within two years.
4. Disposed off, accordingly.
5. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

27.11.2025
Dinesh

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE