



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

RSA-4486-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision : 11.03.2025

Mahant Ganga Ram

...Appellant

Vs.

Gurnam Singh and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Daman Dhir, Advocate
 for the appellant.

 Mr. Ajay Pal Singh, Advocate
 for respondent No.2-Caveator.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (Oral)

1. The plaintiff assails the correctness of concurrent findings of fact arrived at by the Courts below while dismissing his suit for grant of decree of declaration that he is Mohtmim of Dera Smadh Baba Rangi Ram located in Village Rupalheri, Tehsil Bassi Pathana, District Fatehgarh Sahib. He filed the suit claiming that previous Mahant-Jagdev Dass died and he was appointed as Mahant in a congregation on 25.06.2014.

2. On the other hand, defendants contested the suit on ground that the plaintiff has filed different suits claiming Mahantship on various Deras, which have been dismissed and defendant was nominated as Mahant by the congregation of various surroundings villages, namely, Gram Panchayat Sampla, Gram Panchayat Sampli, Gram Panchayat Pamour and Gram Panchayat Kheri.



3. The plaintiff appeared in evidence. He failed to prove that he served Mahant-Jagdev Dass during his life time. He was also unable to tell the number of Gurdwaras and cremation grounds located in village Rupalheri. Moreover, Mahant-Dhuni Dass admitted that the plaintiff used to reside in Kankhal.

4. Both the Courts below, upon appreciation of the evidence, held that the plaintiff failed to prove his case.

5. Heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paper-book alongwith the scanned copy of the requisitioned record.

6. Learned counsel representing the appellant relies upon the proceedings of 25.06.2014 to contend that he was appointed as Mohtmim of the Dera. He submits that defendant failed to prove that he was ever appointed as Mahant.

7. This Court has considered the submissions made by the learned counsel representing the parties.

8. In fact, it is proved on the file that the plaintiff has never resided in the Dera in question located in village Rupalheri. Moreover, it is the case of the plaintiff that the Dera belongs to Udasin Sect., however, he failed to prove the same.

9. Furthermore, the plaintiff filed two separate suits claiming Mahantship of different Deras, which were dismissed.

10. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground to interfere is made out.



- 11. Hence, the appeal is dismissed.
- 12. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

11.03.2025
neeraj

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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