

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

**RSA-3814-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.03.2026**

GURDEEP SINGH

...Appellant

Vs.

CHARANJIT KAUR

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Sumeet Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Saksham Mahajan, Advocate
for the appellant.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present Regular Second Appeal has been filed against the concurrent judgments of the Courts below. By the judgment of the learned Trial Court, the suit filed by the respondent/plaintiff seeking a declaration of ownership over the suit property was decreed. Thereafter, the learned First Appellate Court affirmed the findings of the Trial Court and dismissed the appeal filed by the appellant/defendant. Aggrieved by the judgments and decrees so rendered, the appellant has preferred the present Regular Second Appeal, seeking appropriate relief.

2. Briefly stated, it is claimed by the respondent/plaintiff that she is the owner in possession of the suit property by virtue of being the wife of the deceased Jarnail Singh, who was the previous owner of the property. Earlier, Gurdeep Singh, the appellant/defendant, had filed a suit for specific performance of an agreement to sell dated 20.06.2000 executed by Jarnail Singh, concerning land measuring 4 bighas and 15 biswas situated at Village Sihora in Patti Mangewal. During the pendency of that suit, a compromise

was arrived at between Gurdeep Singh and Jarnail Singh on 24.09.2004, and accordingly, the suit was disposed of as withdrawn pursuant to the compromise. Under the terms of the compromise, Jarnail Singh became the absolute owner in possession of the land comprised in Khasra Nos. 235, 251, 252, 253, 253/1, 254, 259, 260, 461, 543/3, 1261/1981, 198, 199, and 197 situated at Village Sihora, as well as Khasra Nos. 47, 75, 265, 266, 267, 268, and 269 situated at Patti Mangewal. Upon the death of Jarnail Singh, his wife, Charanjit Kaur, the respondent/plaintiff, succeeded to the ownership and possession of the aforementioned properties. The appellant/defendant, Gurdeep Singh, being bound by the compromise and his own statements recorded therein, nonetheless began asserting claims over the suit property, which led to the filing of the present suit. The defendant appeared and contested the suit, but the learned Trial Court decreed the suit in favour of the plaintiff and consequently set aside Mutation Nos. 5399 of Village Sihora and 2519 of Patti Mangewal. In the first appeal, the learned Additional District Judge, Ludhiana, dismissed the appeal filed by the defendant. Aggrieved by the judgments and decrees passed by the Courts below, the appellant/defendant has preferred the present Regular Second Appeal.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant/defendant contended that there is no illegality in the findings recorded by the Courts below declaring Charanjit Kaur, the respondent/plaintiff, to be entitled to a life estate in Khasra Nos. 235, 251, 252, 253, 253/1, 254, 259, 260, 261, 543/3, 1261/1981, 198, 199, and 1967 situated at Village Sihora, as well as Khasra Nos. 47, 75, 265, 266, 267, 268, and 269 situated at Patti Mangewal, while

recognizing her as the absolute owner of land comprised in Khasra Nos. 106 and 107 of Village Patti Mangewal, Tehsil Payal, District Ludhiana.

4. The appellant/defendant, however, expressed grievance over the fact that Mutation Nos. 5399 of Village Sihora and 2519 of Village Patti Mangewal, which had been sanctioned in his favor, were declared illegal, null, and void. It is a settled proposition of law that mutation, by itself, does not confer ownership or title over immovable property. The parties are bound by the terms of the compromise dated 24.09.2004, which is binding on all the parties concerned. As per the said compromise, Charanjit Kaur is entitled only to a life estate in the suit property, with the exception of Khasra Nos. 106 and 107 of Patti Mangewal, over which she is recognized as the absolute owner. The compromise further provides that upon the termination of her life estate, the remaining property shall revert to the appellant/defendant, Gurdeep Singh. Accordingly, the setting aside of the aforementioned mutations was necessary to effectuate the terms of the compromise and to ensure that Charanjit Kaur holds the life estate, while reserving the reversionary rights of the appellant/defendant in the remaining property. In view of the above, this Court finds no illegality, perversity, or infirmity in the findings recorded by the Courts below. The appeal lacks merit and is, therefore, dismissed. Pending application(s), shall also stands disposed of.

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

19.03.2026

kv

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*