



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RA-RS-37-2025 in/and

RSA-2132-2025

Date of Decision :21.07.2025

AMAR SINGH

. . . . Appellant

VS.

KULDEEP KAUR AND OTHERS

. . . . RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr.Sunil Chadha, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr.Tara Dutt, Advocate, for the applicant-appellant.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

This is an application under Order XLVII Rule 1 CPC read with Section 151 CPC seeking review of the order dated 01.07.2025 passed by this Court, whereby the main appeal [RSA-2132-2025] was dismissed *in limine*.

It was noticed by this Court in the order dated 01.07.2025 that the case of the appellant-plaintiff is depending upon sale deed dated 20.06.1986, whereby he purchased land to the extent of 17 marla from Bhag Singh and to the extent of 8½ marla from Jaswinder Singh. It was contended that after the death of vendors-Jaswinder Singh and Bhag Singh, their legal heirs had started claiming the suit land by taking benefit of the fact that mutation on the basis of sale deed dated 20.06.1986 was not sanctioned.

The Courts below had dismissed the suit after observing that original sale deed dated 20.06.1986 was not produced and only the certified copy thereof was placed on record and none of the contesting witnesses had been examined. By concurring with the finding of the Courts below, this Court had dismissed the appeal [RSA-2132-2025] *in limine*.

Seeking a review, learned Senior counsel submits that in case order has been passed by missing a decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court or a particular provision of law, then it constitutes a ground for review.

Learned Senior counsel refers to ***Collector, Cuttak and others Vs. Bharat Chandra Bhuyan, 2014 (84) RCR (Civil) 633***. For the same proposition, reliance is also placed upon ***Aby Abraham Mathew Vs. Hindustan Newsprint Ltd., 2002 (1) ICC 484***.

Learned Senior counsel submits further that though it is true that original sale deed dated 20.06.1986, the basis of the case set up by the plaintiff-appellant was not produced, but its certified copy was produced by the registration clerk inasmuch as the document in question was a registered document. Learned Senior counsel then refers to Section 57(5) of the Registration Act, 1908 in order to contend that when certified copy signed and sealed by the registering officer is produced, the same is admissible for the purpose of proving the contents of the original documents.

Learned Senior counsel also refers to ***Appaiya Vs. Andimuthu @ Thangapandi and others, 2023 AIR Supreme Court 4810***.

After considering the submission of learned Senior counsel, this Court finds sufficient grounds to review the order dated 01.07.2025 and as such, the said order is hereby recalled. The main appeal [RSA-2132-2025] is restored to its original number and is taken on board today itself.

Let notice of motion be issued in RSA-2132-2025 to the respondents for 14.10.2025.

21.07.2025
Vivek

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes
Whether reportable	: No