

CR-3937-2022

1

2026:PHHC:049522



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

1.

CR-3937-2022

Angrej Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Mahant Baba Satnam Singh Chela Mahant Harnam Singh @ Mahant
Hakam Singh and another

... Respondents

2.

CR-3943-2022

Angrej Singh

... Petitioners

Versus

Mahant Baba Satnam Singh Chela Mahant Harnam Singh @ Mahant
Hakam Singh and others

... Respondents

Date of decision : 30.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Kanwal Goyal, Advocate and
Ms. Sheena Dahiya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Singh, Senior Advocate with
Ms.Anamika Sheoran, Advocate
for respondent no.1.

Mr. N.S. Dandiwal, Advocate
for respondent no.2.

**VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)**

1. This order will dispose of two civil revision petitions.
2. The first CR-3937-2022 has been filed by Angrej Singh stating himself to be 'Chela' of Late Mahant Baba Satnam Singh 'Chela' Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh. Challenge in the present revision petition is to the order dated 02.09.2022 passed by the Ist Appellate Court in Civil Appeal no.143 of 2016 vide which the application filed by the petitioner for being impleaded as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh, 'Chela', Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh under Order 22 Rule 4 CPC has been rejected and respondent no.1 i.e., Mahant Baba Satnam Singh 'Chela' Mahant Harnam Singh @ Mahant Hakam Singh has alone been allowed to be impleaded as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh 'Chela' Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh. It would be relevant to note that the name of the respondent no.1 is the same as that of the Mahant who has died and who the petitioner and the respondent no.1 are claiming to be LR's of.
3. The second revision petition i.e., CR-3943-2022 has also been filed by Angrej Singh who is alleging himself to be the 'Chela' of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh 'Chela' Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh in which challenge is to the order of even date dated 02.09.2022 in Civil Appeal no. 304 of 2019 passed by the Ist Appellate Court vide which the application filed by the petitioner for being impleaded as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh, 'Chela' Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh under Order 22 Rule 4 CPC has been rejected. Common questions of law and facts arise in



both the cases.

BRIEF BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

4. Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Darshan Singh had filed two civil suits. Civil Suit no.41-A instituted on 07.04.2005 (the suit hereinafter referred to as “suit of 2005”) was filed by the said Mahant in which Mohinder Singh was the sole defendant and in which suit, following prayer was made:-

“Suit for declaration to the effect that the order dated 9.8.2003 passed by Sh. Tarsem Mangla PCS, Additional Civil Judge(Senior Division) Moga vide succession application No. 6-12 instituted on 30.3.1999 RT No. 19-2 of 3-2001 is null and void, without jurisdiction and is likely to be revoked under Section 383 of the Indian Succession Act.1925 with consequential relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendant from enforcing the said order in any manner with further relief of indemnity to the plaintiff who is the better claimant or any other relief which this Court may deem fit and proper.”

5. Civil Suit no.456 instituted on 20.11.2004 was also filed by Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Darshan Singh in which there were five defendants namely Mohinder Singh, Darshan Singh, Chanan Singh, Shamsher Singh and Hakam Singh and in the said suit, declaration was sought to the effect that he was the Mahant/ Manager of Gurudwara Bhai Mal Singh being Chela of Mahant Bhai Darshan Singh Chela Bhai Kehar Singh and that he was entitled to manage and receive the income of properties attached to or owned by the Gurudwara Bhai Mal Singh and the details of the property were given and challenge was further made to various mutations vide which exchange etc. were effected. For the sake of



convenience, the said suit would be hereinafter referred to as “suit of 2004”).

6. The suit of 2005 was dismissed by the trial Court vide judgment and decree dated 29.02.2016. It is not in dispute that during the pendency of the said suit, Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh had died and Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Paramjit Singh was impleaded as his legal representative. The fact that Mahant Satnam Singh was the ‘Chela’ of Mahant Paramjit Singh is not disputed either by the petitioner or by the contesting respondent no.1 before this Court. Against the said judgment and decree dated 29.02.2016, Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh had filed an appeal which is civil appeal no.143 of 2016. In the said appeal since Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh had died on 08.05.2021, two applications were filed for being impleaded as legal heirs of said Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh. One application was filed by the present petitioner Angrej Singh, who was claiming that on the basis of “Bheikh” ceremony / resolution which took place on 17.05.2021, the said Angrej Singh had been appointed as ‘Chela’ of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh. On the other hand, respondent no.1 Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Harnam Singh @ Mahant Hakam Singh was claiming that he was legal representative of Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Baba Paramjit Singh on the basis of “Bheikh” ceremony and resolution dated 25.05.2021.

7. The Ist Appellate Court vide order dated 02.09.2022 had



allowed the application filed by respondent no.1 and dismissed the application filed by the petitioner Angrej Singh by observing that the resolution / “Bheikh” ceremony dated 17.05.2021 relied upon by Mahant Baba Angrej Singh does not inspire confidence, whereas, “Bheikh” ceremony / resolution dated 25.05.2021 relied upon by respondent no.1 inspires confidence. In the said order, however, it was clarified that the said order would not have effect on the rights of any person, who have right to pursue independent remedy regarding Mahantship. The said order dated 02.09.2022, as has been stated hereinabove, is the subject matter of challenge in CR-3937-2022.

8. The suit of 2004, which was also filed by Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh, was decreed vide judgment and decree dated 23.09.2019 and during the pendency of said suit, Baba Paramjit Singh had died and Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ of Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh was impleaded as his legal representative. The said aspect has not been disputed before this Court. In the said case, an appeal was filed against the judgment and decree dated 23.09.2019 by Mohinder Singh and the said Satnam Singh who had been impleaded as legal representative of Paramjit Singh was the respondent in the said appeal. Since Satnam Singh had also died during the pendency of the said appeal, thus, both the parties i.e., the petitioner as well as respondent no.1 had filed two separate applications for impleadment, claiming to be legal representative of said Satnam Singh, on similar lines as in the suit of 2005 and in the said applications, similar order dated



02.09.2022 had been passed as was passed in the appeal arising in the suit of 2005.

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner in both the civil revisions has submitted that since in the present case, there is a serious dispute on the aspect as to which are the parties who are to be declared as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh, the best course open in the said circumstances is to implead the petitioner Angrej Singh as well as respondent no.1 Mahant Baba Satnam Singh Chela Mahant Baba Harnam Singh as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh and to permit both the above-said persons to pursue the appeals on behalf of the said Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh who was represented through Baba Mahant Santam Singh. It is submitted that the issue as to who is the real legal representative of said Baba Satnam Singh 'Chela' Paramjit Singh should be decided in separate proceedings as the said intricate question cannot be decided by the Ist Appellate Court in summary proceedings. It is submitted that the observations made in the impugned orders are prejudicial to the rights of the petitioner and thus, the impugned orders deserve to be set aside and the revision petitions filed by the petitioner deserve to be allowed. In support of his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Suresh Kumar Bansal vs. Krishna Bansal & Anr.*** reported as ***2010(2) SCC 162.***

**ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF CONTESTING RESPONDENT NO.1**

10. Learned senior counsel for respondent no.1 in both the revision petitions has submitted that the impugned orders have been rightly passed, inasmuch as in the impugned orders it has been observed that the resolution/ “bheikh” ceremony in favour of respondent no.1 is apparently more genuine as some of the persons who were present in the said “bheikh” ceremony were also present in the “bheikh” ceremony dated 22.11.2018 of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh. It is further submitted that it has been rightly observed that the resolution dated 17.05.2021 relied upon by the petitioner does not inspire confidence. It is further submitted that at any rate, it is clarified in the order dated 02.09.2022 that the said order would not effect the rights of any person who has right to pursue independent remedy regarding Mahantship, and thus, the rights of the petitioner to pursue the said remedy has not been prejudiced and the orders passed are only for the purpose of pursuing the appeal on behalf of Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh who was represented through his LR Mahant Baba Satnam Singh, who has also since died.

ARGUMENT ON BEHAL OF RESPONDENT NO.2

11. Learned counsel for respondent no.2 has submitted that the present dispute is between the petitioner and respondent no.1 and he has no role in the same.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

12. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Suresh Kumar***



Bansal (supra) while considering the case was examining an issue in which after the death of the original plaintiff therein-Mohan Lal, two set of persons had filed applications for bringing them on record as legal representatives of the said deceased plaintiff. One set, were the persons who were claiming to be natural heirs of the said original plaintiff and the other was the person who was claiming a Will in his favour. In the said case, the trial Court had impleaded the natural heirs as legal representative and not the person claiming the Will in his favour on the ground that the Will seems to be suspicious. The Hon'ble Supreme Court after considering the entire issue and the repercussions of not impleading the person claiming to be have a Will in his favour and in order to shorten the litigation observed that the proper course to follow was to bring all the heirs and legal representatives of the deceased plaintiff on record including the legal representatives who are claiming to be heir on the basis of the Will of the deceased plaintiff so that all the legal representatives of the deceased plaintiff can represent the estate of the deceased for the ultimate benefit of the real legal representatives and in case said process is followed, the same would prevent delay in disposal of the suit. It was further observed that the benefit would be ultimately given to the person / persons depending upon the adjudication with respect to the Will.

13. This Court is of the opinion that the course adopted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the said case is the best course to be adopted in the present case also. It is a matter of settled law that if a person is



impleaded as legal representative, it is only for the purpose of pursuing the rights of the original party to the lis. Mere impleadment as legal representative for the purpose of pursuing the appeal does not amount to final adjudication with respect to the entitlement of the said person to the estate of the deceased. In the present case, it is the lis instituted by one Baba Paramjit Singh which has to be adjudicated upon by the Ist Appellate Court in both the appeals. Once the two appeals are finally decided, then the subsequent question which might arise is as to which party would be entitled to inherit the rights of Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh which might crystallize after the adjudication of the appeals. For the said purpose, the parties claiming conflicting rights would need to institute appropriate proceedings / suit. It would be relevant to note that both the impugned orders have further noticed and clarified the fact that the orders which have been passed have no effect on the rights of any person who have further right to pursue independent remedy regarding Mahantship. In the said circumstances, the best course open is to implead the present petitioner as well as respondent no.1 as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh who had been admittedly impleaded as legal representative of Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh for the purpose of pursuing the case instituted by Mahant Baba Paramjit Sngh.

14. Accordingly, both the revision petitions are partly allowed and the impugned orders dated 02.09.2022 are set aside to the extent that the petitioner Angrej Singh in both the civil revisions has not been impleaded



as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh. Accordingly, the petitioner as well as the respondent no.1 are ordered to be impleaded as legal representative of Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh for the purpose of pursuing the appeal no. 143 of 2016 arising from judgment and decree dated 29.02.2016 as well as civil appeal no.304 of 2019 arising out from the judgment and decree dated 23.09.2019 subject to just exceptions and also for the limited purpose of pursuing the rights of the original plaintiff in both the suits i.e., Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh.

15. It is made clear that none of the parties would raise any plea contrary to the interest of Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh in the said appeals. It would further be open to both the parties to raise their respective claims in independent proceedings / suit with respect to rights / estate of Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh or Mahant Baba Satnam Singh ‘Chela’ Mahant Baba Paramjit Singh and the said suit / proceedings would be decided independent of the observations and the orders passed in the present civil revision petitions.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

March 30, 2026.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No