

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND  
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RSA No.4259 of 2017 (O&M)  
Date of Decision.31.01.2019

Anguri

...Appellant

Vs

Om Pati Devi

...Respondent

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

Present: Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate  
for the appellant.

:-

**AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)**

**C.M. No.11070-C of 2017**

For the reasons stated in the application, delay of 76 days  
in filing of the appeal is condoned.

Application is allowed.

**RSA No.4259 of 2017**

The present regular second appeal is directed against the  
concurrent finding of fact whereby the suit of the appellant-plaintiff  
for declaration by laying challenge to the registered relinquishment  
deed dated 29.09.2007 being illegal, null and void and a result of  
fraud and misrepresentation, has been dismissed by the trial Court  
and affirmed by the lower Appellate Court.

Plaintiff in the plaint alleged that her intention was to  
relinquish the property in favour of nephew and not in favour of  
sister-in-law. The defendant fraudulently got the relinquishment deed  
registered in the office of registrar as the plaintiff was under the  
impression that she is transferring the property in favour of nephew.

Defendant denied the allegations made in the plaint and

supported the act of the plaintiff of her own volition and good sense.

Ms. Sharmila Sharma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submitted that ingredients of fraud and misrepresentation have been proved to the hilt but the Courts below abdicated in dismissing the suit.

I am afraid aforementioned argument is not sustainable, as during the course of trial, plaintiff in the cross-examination admitted appendation of signature on the relinquishment deed. Even otherwise intention was to give property to the nephew, who is none else but son of the defendant.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the concurrent finding rendered by the Courts below, much less, no substantial question of law arises for determination by this court. No ground for interference is made out. Resultantly, the second appeal is dismissed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**January 31, 2019**  
Pankaj\*

Whether Reasoned/Speaking    Yes

Whether Reportable                No