

IN THE COURT OF HON'BLE DISTRICT JUDGE, SIRSA:

Civil Suit No.	Date of Instt. of civil suit	Date of Decision of civil suit	Date of filing of appeal
252-C	31.5.2014	03.04.2018	

Value of the suit
Court fee & Jurdn.

Value of the appeal
Court fee & Jurdn.

Amount of Co

Rs.200/-

Rs.200/-

Rs.25/-

1. Bahadar deceased son of Sheo Karan through his LRs. *then 75 years*

(A). Laxmi Narayan- aged about 45 years

(B). Krishan, aged 65 years

(C). Rajo Devi, aged 82 years widow of Bahadar,

All Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad,
District Sirsa.

2. Khayali deceased son of Devasi through his LRs.

(A). Rameshwar son of Khayali, Resident of Khari Sureran,
Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

(B). Mani Ram deceased son of Khayali through his LRs.

(i). Ami Lal,

(ii). Bhoop Singh sons of Mani Ram son of Khayali,
Both Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil
Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

(iii). Bhura Ram deceased son of Mani Ram through his
LRs.

243-CA

7-378

(a). Raju, (b). Mahender, (c). Shishpal (wrongly named as Jagdish) sons of Bhura Ram son of Khayali, (d). Jayani Devi widow of Bhura Ram son of Khayali Ram,
...All Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad Distt. Sirsa

3. Jetha deceased son of Devsi through his LRs.

(A). Mahavir deceased son of Jetha through his LRs.

(i). Mahender, (ii). Risal sons of Mahavir

... Both Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

4. Brij Lal deceased son of Sohna through his LRs.

(a). Balbir-son,

(b). Bansi Lal..son of Brij Lal, Resident of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

5. Sultan deceased son of Sohna through his LRs.

(a). Om Parkash son of Sultan, Resident of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

.....Defendants/ Appellants

Versus

1. Manphool (aged 77 years) son of Basti son of Shera,

2. Sultan son of Basti son of Shera died through his LRs.

(a). Amar Singh, (b). Hari Singh sons of Sultan, Both Residents of Village Karamshana, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa, (c). Gutti Ram son of Sultan died through his LRs. (i). Sushil Kumar son of Gutti Ram, (ii). Nitu daughter of Gutti Ram (wife of Parmod), Resident of Sangria, Balimiki Mohalla, (d). Kanta daughter of Sultan (wife of Sunder), Resident of Balmiki Mohalla, Sirsa,

(e). Bimla daughter of Sultan (wife of Chunni Ram), Resident of Village Dhingawali, Tehsil Abohar, District Fazilka, (f). Gomati Devi widow of Sultan, Resident of Village Karamshana, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

3. Bahadar Ram deceased son of Basti son of Shera through his LRs. (a). Madan Lal, (b). Suresh Kumar (c). Ashok Kumar sons of Bahadar Ram son of Basti, All Residents of Village Chain Pura, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh.

4. Bhanu Ram deceased son of Basti deceased through legal heirs (i). Devi Lal, (ii). Atma Ram, (iii). Krishan Kumar, (iv). Jagdish, (v). Mani Ram, (vi). Dalip, (vii). Banwari, (viii). Sahab Ram son of Bhanu Ram son of Basti, All Residents of Village Karamshana, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

5. Chandu Ram deceased son of Basti deceased through legal heirs (i). Ram Parsad deceased son of Chandu through legal heirs (a). Mange Lal son of Ram Parsad, Resident of Ravatsar, District Hanumangarh, (b). Dharmpal son of Ram Parsad, (c). Narender sons of Ram Parsad son of Chandu, Both Residents of Chak Gokul Pura, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh, (ii). Om Parkash son of Chandu, Resident of Village Karamshana, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa, (iii). Hansraj son of Chandu, Resident of Village Nuwan, Tehsil Bhadra, District Hanumangarh, (iv). Subhash son of Chandu, Resident of Hanumangarh Junction, & Vill. Karamsana, Tehsil Ellenabad, Distt. Sirsa (v). Raje Ram, (vi). Desraj (vii). Kaviraj, (viii). Rajesh, (ix). Dalbir sons of Chandu son of Basti, All Residents of Village Dhandela, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh.

6. Nand Ram deceased son of Basti through legal heirs
(i). Bhagi Ram, (ii). Kalu sons of Nand Ram, Both
Residents of Near Killa Bihari Basti, Hanumangarh, (iii).
Dungar Ram, (iv). Sahab Ram sons of Nand Ram, Both
Residents of 6 Chak, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh.

7. Harchand deceased son of Basti through legal heirs
(i). Rajesh (ii). Satnarayan sons of Harchand son of
Basti, Both Residents of Village Nand Ram Ki Dhani,
District Hanumangarh.

8. Birbal son of Basti son of Shera, Resident of Village
Karamshana, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

.....Plaintiffs/ respondents

9. Dalip son of Shri Bahadar deceased son of Sheo Karan

10. Bhagwanti deceased daughter of Sheo Karan through her
LRs.

(A). Dharamveer Singh,

(B). Ranveer Singh,

(C). Ram Murti,

(D). Subhash sons of Jai Lal Beniwal deceased through
his LRs.

(i). Amit son of Subhash,

(ii). Kiran daughter of Subhash,

Both Residents of Village Kumharia, Tehsil Chopta,
District Sirsa.

(E) Saroj daughter of Bhagwanti (wife of Gopal Ram son
of Rameshwar), Resident of Village Umedpura, Tehsil
Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

11. Kalawati daughter of Sheo Karan (wife of Amar Singh Beniwal), Resident of Village Kumharia, Tehsil Chopta, District Sirsa.

12. Amar Singh deceased son of Khayali Ram through his LRs.

(i). Bimla Devi deceased daughter of Amar Singh through her LRs.

(a). Om Prakash Dudi son of Amar Singh Dudi, Resident of Village Madhosinghana, Tehsil & District Sirsa.

(b). Satbir Dudi son of Amar Singh Dudi, Resident of Village Madhosinghana, Tehsil & District Sirsa.

13. Seema daughter of Khayali (wife of Kashi Ram Nuhiyan), Resident of Village Kharia, Tehsil Rania, District Sirsa.

14. Lichma daughter of Khayali, Resident of Village Nimla, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

15. Savitri daughter of Shri Khayali, Resident of Village Gindran, Tehsil Rania, District Sirsa.

16. Manni Devi daughter of Khayali, Resident of Village Gindran, Tehsil Rania, District Sirsa.

17. Mahavir deceased son of Shri Jetha Ram through his legal heirs:-

(a) Indra daughter of Mahavir (wife of Maan Singh Nuhiyan), Resident of Near Police Station, Rawatsar, District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).

(b). Sunita daughter of Mahavir (wife of Krishan Saharan Teacher), Resident of Rajisar, Tehsil Rawatsar, District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).

(c). Dholu alias Kiran Bala daughter of Mahavir (wife of Mahender Singh Pilaniyan), Village Tara

Nagar Chak, Tehsil Rawatsar, District Hanumangarh
(Rajasthan).

18. Pala Ram son of Jetha Ram, Resident of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

19. Papli daughter of Jetha Ram (wife of Kuldeep Sinwar), Resident of Village Dariyapur, District Fatehabad.

20. Lekhi Ram (wrongly named as Lekh Ram) deceased son of Sohna through his LRs.

(a). Krishan,

(b). Lal Chand,

(c). Dharam Pal sons and

(d). Durga daughter of Lekhi Ram,

.....All Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

(e). Saraswati (wrongly named as Santro) daughter of Lekhi Ram (wife of Sahab Ram Khicharh son of Nirana Ram), Resident of Village Bahiya, Tehsil Rania, District Sirsa.

(f). Indra daughter of Lekhi Ram (wife of Mahavir son of Ramsawroop), Resident of Village Kalana, Tehsil Bhadra, District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).

(g). Sharda daughter of Lekhi Ram (wife of Ram Kumar son of Ramsawroop Rav Jaat), Resident of Village Rampuriya, Tehsil Tibbi, District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).

(h) Girdawri daughter of Lekhi Ram (wife of Mahavir), Resident of Village Kalana, Tehsil Bhadra, Distt. Hanumangarh

21. Daulat Ram deceased son of Sohna through his LRs.

↓(a). Ram Pal,

↓(b). Shanker Lal sons of Daulat Ram, Both Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

(c). Kamla daughter of Daulat Ram (wife of Bahadar Ram Dudi), Resident of Village Mallekan, Tehsil & District Sirsa.

↓(d). Reshmi (wrongly named as Reshma) daughter of Daulat Ram (wife of Hoshiyar Singh Dudi), Resident of Village Madhosinghana, Tehsil & District Sirsa already dead person through her legal heirs:-

i) Rohtash son

ii) Sameshta daughter of Reshmi

..both residents of vill. Madhosinghna, Tehsil and Distt. Sirsa

↓(e). Silochana alias Kamla daughter of Daulat Ram (wife of Pyare Lal Jhorar), Resident of Village Bani.

(f). Taro alias Bimla daughter of Daulat Ram (wife of Rameshwar Jhorar), Resident of Village Bani, Tehsil Rania, District Sirsa.

↓(g). Kalawati daughter of Daulat Ram (wife of Inderpal Sheoran), Resident of Village Rattakhera, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

22. Brij Lal son of Shri Sohna now deceased through his legal heirs:-

↓(i). Indra daughter of Brij Lal (wife of Surender Khadda), Resident of Village Dabli Khurd, Tehsil & District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).

- ii). Soma daughter of Brij Lal (wife of Deen Dayal Khadda), Resident of Village Dabli Khurd, Tehsil & District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).
- 23). Meeran daughter of Sultan (wife of Jagdish son of Devi Lal Khicharh), Resident of Village Leelan Wali, Tehsil & District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).
- 24). Shanti daughter of Sohna (wife of Manphool Godara), Resident of Village Gindran, Tehsil Rania, District Sirsa.
- 25). Kamla Devi daughter of Dhankauri daughter of Sohna, Resident of Chak Jhajhriyan Wali, Tehsil & District Sri Ganganagar.
- 26). Jana Devi daughter of Dhankauri daughter of Sohna, Resident of Village Neta Wala, Tehsil & District Sri Ganganagar.
- 27). Bimla daughter of Dhankauri daughter of Sohna, Resident of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

..Proforma respondents

Appeal against the Judgment & decree dated 03.04.2018 passed by the Court of Shri Sunil, Civil Judge, Junior Division, Ellenabad passed in civil suit no.252-C of 2014 titled as "Manohool and others Versus Bahadur & others" whereby the suit of the Plaintiffs has been decreed and passed the decree to the effect that to the effect that they have become owners in possession of the suit land having acquired proprietary and occupancy rights therein being in possession

for the last more than 60 years continuously without payment of any rent etc. Further, the entries in the revenue records showing the defendants to be owners of the suit land and plaintiffs as Gair Marusi are declared wrong and liable to be corrected. Further, the defendants are hereby restrained from interfering into the possession of the plaintiffs over the suit land in any manner. The impugned judgment and decree dated 3.4.2018, is totally wrong, against law, against facts and is not warranted by any law and is result of without applying judicious mind, hence the judgment and decree dated 3.4.2018 are liable to be set-aside.

CLAIM IN APPEAL

For setting aside the Judgment & decree dated 3.4.2018 passed by the learned Lower Court at Ellenabad in a casual manner, by acceptance of appeal with costs & for dismissal of the suit of Plaintiffs/ respondents being erroneous and against law and facts based on frivolous facts, by way of acceptance of the appeal, in hand with costs, through out..

GROUND OF APPEAL

Sir,

The appellants/ defendants, respectfully submit as under:-

1. That the Judgment & decree dated 03.04.2018 passed by the Court of Shri Sunil, Civil Judge, Junior Division, Ellenabad passed in civil suit no.252-C of 2014 titled as "Manohool and others Versus Bahadur & others" whereby the suit of the Plaintiffs has been decreed and passed the decree to the effect that to the effect that they have become owners in possession of the suit land having acquired proprietary and occupancy rights therein being in possession for the last more than 60 years continuously without payment of any rent etc. Further, the entries in the revenue records showing the defendants to be owners of the suit land and plaintiffs as Gair Marusi are declared wrong and liable to be corrected. Further, the defendants are hereby restrained from interfering into the possession of the plaintiffs over the suit land in any manner. The impugned judgment and decree dated 3.4.2018, is totally wrong, against law, against facts and is not warranted by any law and is result of without applying judicious mind, hence the judgment and decree dated 3.4.2018 are liable to be set-aside. Certified copies of the impugned Judgment & decree are hereby enclosed for the kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.
2. That the proforma respondents no.9 to 26 are unable to pursue the appeal in person, hence they

are impleaded as proforma respondents. However no adverse relief is being claimed against them.

3. That in short the facts of the case are that the plaintiffs have filed the Suit seeking the relief of Declaration to the effect that they are owners in possession of their respective shares in land measuring 25 Kanal 12 Marla as detailed and described in the headnote of plaint, situated within the revenue estate of Village Karamshana, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa as per Jamabandi for the year 2012-2013 and the revenue entries showing defendants as owners as per their respective shares are wrong, against facts and law and are liable to be corrected in favour of plaintiffs. The plaintiffs have submitted that plaintiffs No. 1 and 2 and forefathers of remaining plaintiffs were in cultivating possession of suit land since last more than sixty years as occupancy tenants and they were given the suit land by predecessors of defendants with an oral agreement not eject them (plaintiffs) at any point of time with a condition that they will pay the prescribed land revenue/cess claimed by the government and nothing more in the shape of batai except the land revenue as reflected in the relevant Jamabandies at the rate of six paise per Kanal upto the commencement of Punjab Occupancy Tenants (Vesting of Property Rights) Act, 1953 and accordingly, as per the definition of occupancy tenants, rights of occupancy tenants have

ripened/converted into the statutory ownership to their claim in the suit land. It is submitted that Bahadar, Bhanu Ram, Chandu Ram, Nand Ram and Harchand sons of Basti son of Shera have died and as per provisions of Section 8 of The Punjab Security of Land Tenure Act, the tenancy rights have devolved upon the male lineal descendants and as such the present suit is being filed by plaintiffs as per their respective shares as they have inherited tenancy rights from aforesaid deceased persons. It is submitted that plaintiffs have fulfilled the condition provided under the law of occupancy tenants rights and they are required to be declared as owners in possession of the suit land as per their respective shares. It is submitted that plaintiffs approached and requested defendants to admit their claim, but of no use.

4. That the defendants/ appellants however submitted that the possession of suit land was never handed over to the plaintiffs either by the predecessors of defendants or by the defendants. It is submitted that plaintiffs are having no concern or connection with the suit land. It is submitted that defendants have been shown as owners in possession of the suit land and revenue record is quite genuine and has been maintained by the revenue authority as per the spot verification and as per the actual status of land. It is submitted that plaintiffs under the guise of present suit wants to grab valuable

property of defendants. It is denied that plaintiffs are having any right, title or interest over the suit land. It is denied that plaintiffs being occupancy tenants are liable to be declared as owners of suit land. It is submitted that the suit is even not maintainable **as some of the persons against whom the suit has been filed, have already died and suit against a dead person is not maintainable and the same is liable to be dismissed on this ground alone.** It is further submitted that some of necessary persons have not been impleaded as parties to the suit and the suit is liable to be dismissed for non-joinder of necessary parties. Further the plaintiff has concealed true and material facts from the Hon'ble Court and plaintiff has no cause of action and locus-standi to file the suit. It is further relevant to mention here that relevant provisions of the CPC as amended to the date and the case laws, applicable thereto, hence the suit liable to be dismissed.

GROUNDS OF APPEAL

i) **That while deciding the issue no.1 the learned Trial Court has wrongly held that the burden of proof is on the defendants that the plaintiffs have paid the Batai/Tihai to the defendants, while according to the settled law, the plaintiffs are masters of their suit and as such it is the prime burden upon the plaintiffs that they should prove their onus without any reasonable doubt and according to law when the burden is discharged by the**

plaintiffs only then the burden shift upon the defendants to rebut the same, but here wrong thing has been observed by the Learned Trial court as the plaintiffs/respondents completely failed to discharge their burden that they are in possession of the land without payment of any Batai/Tihai as it is the plaintiffs who have brought the suit seeking the relief of Declaration and hence the plaintiffs should prove their own case by way of cogent evidence.

ii) That while deciding the issue no.1, the learned Trial Court has wrongly observed the occupancy rights in favour of the plaintiffs/respondents while the fact remains that for observing the occupancy rights in favour of the possession holders, three basic ingredients must be fulfilled by the persons namely i) **At the commencement of the Act (1st November 1887) the tenant has occupied the lands** ii) **Two preceding generations** (iii) **The period of such occupation must not be less than 20 years before 1st November, 1887 i.e the tenant must prove that he has continuously occupied land for thirty years and paid no rent therefore beyond the amount of land revenue thereof and the rates and cesses for the time chargeable thereon,** it may be presumed that he has fulfilled the conditions of clause(a) of sub section (1). But all these material facts and provisions relating to occupancy rights have been ignored by the learned Trial Court while passing the impugned Judgment and decree dated 03.04.20108 hence the same is liable to be set-aside.

iii) That the appellants/defendants have proved on file that the suit of plaintiffs was neither maintainable or sustainable, because the mandatory provisions of CPC have not been complied with by plaintiffs, because neither the plaintiffs deposited the process fee for the summoning of the defendants who have not appeared in the Court and also no specific order for the summoning of the defendants was ever passed by the learned Lower Court. The learned Lower Court also in gross violation of provisions of Order V of the CPC further proceed in the suit even without summoning and appearance of all the defendants in the suit and further in the absence of the non summoned defendants decided the suit and passed the impugned judgment and decree.

iv) That the learned Lower Court also failed to consider the material and legal lacuna involved in the suit that the suit of the plaintiff was/is hopelessly time barred and inspite of the fact that specific objections has been raised by the defendants in their written statement, the material factum of suit barred by law of limitation has not been decided or even considered by the learned Trial Court while passing the impugned Judgment and decree dated 03.04.2018. But all these technical grounds have been ignored by the learned Trial Court while deciding the suit and passing the impugned judgment and decree.

v) That the suit of plaintiffs/ respondents was also not maintainable and barred by the principle of resjudicata because as a matter of fact the predecessors in interest of the plaintiffs had filed the suit regarding the very suit

properties and these facts were very much in the knowledge of the plaintiffs/ respondents, but the plaintiffs knowingly concealed these facts while passing the impugned Judgment and decree.

vi) That while passing the impugned judgment, the learned Trial Court failed to observe any findings that the plaintiffs have filed the suit against the dead persons and even inspite of objections, filed by the defendants/ appellants, the plaintiffs even failed to implead the legal heirs of the dead persons as party which fact also legally fatal the case of plaintiffs, but the learned Trial Court failed to consider this material legal and technical matter while deciding the suit.

vii) That the learned Lower Court has decided the issues no.3 to 8 jointly which is against the provisions of law. As per law and settled propositions of law, findings on every issue must be decided separately but the learned Lower Court failed to comply with provisions of law, hence findings of the learned Lower Court are liable to be set-aside. However from the perusal of the evidence it is very much clear that the learned Lower Court has not given the detail of exhibits tendered at the time of arguments or evidence of the appellants/defendants and the same has been ignored by the learned Lower court.

viii) That the issue with regard to the relief has also been decided against law & facts because the case of the plaintiffs was prima facie not maintainable being barred by law of limitation and merit dismissal, but this material fact /aspect has not been considered by the court

which resulted into passing the impugned judgment and decree dated 3.4.2018.

ix) That the evidence of defendants/appellant has been wrongly ignored by the Trial Court. If the Trial Court had applied proper judicious mind on the evidence of defendants/appellants, then the suit of Plaintiffs/respondents must have been dismissed.

x) That the impugned judgment and decree dated 03.04.2018, has been passed by the Ld. Trial Court in a hurried manner and the impugned judgment and decree is not warranted by any law. The Ld. Trial Court also failed to discuss and rely upon the case law as was produced by the counsel for the defendants, which resulted into passing the impugned judgment and decree dated 03.04.2018.

xi) That the impugned judgment and decree is based on surmises and conjectures & the same is outcome of non apply of judicious mind and the same has been passed in a haste and causal manner hence the same is liable to be set-aside.

xii) That after deducting days spent in obtaining the certified copy of impugned judgment and decree, the appeal is being filed well within limitation.

5. That the requisite court fee of Rs.25/- is fixed on the appeal.

It is therefore, prayed that the impugned Judgment and decree dt.03.04.2018 passed by Learned Civil Judge, Ellenabad may kindly be set-aside and the suit of Plaintiffs/respondents, may kindly be dismissed, by

accepting the appeal in hand with costs throughout, in the interest of justice.

Any other relief in addition to above to which the defendants/ appellants found entitled or this Hon'ble Court may deem fit be also granted in favour of appellants and proforma respondents

Sirsa/

Submitted by

1. Bahadar deceased son of Sheo Karan through his LRs. (A). Laxmi Narayan- (B). Krishan, (D). Rajo Devi, widow of Bahadar, All Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa. 2. Khayali deceased son of Devasi through his LRs. (A). Rameshwar son of Khayali, Resident of Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa. (B). Mani Ram deceased son of Khayali through his LRs. (i). Ami Lal, (ii). Bhoop Singh sons of Mani Ram son of Khayali, Both Residents of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa. (iii). Bhura Ram deceased son of Mani Ram through his LRs. (a). Raju, (b). Mahender, (c). Shishpal (wrongly named as Jagdish) sons of Bhura Ram son of Khayali, (d). Jayani Devi widow of Bhura Ram son of Khayali Ram, ...All Residents of Village

Khari Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad Distt.

Sirsa 3. Jetha deceased son of Devsi

through his LRs. (A). Mahavir deceased

son of Jetha through his LRs. (i).

Mahender, (ii). Risal sons of Mahavir ...

Both Residents of Village Khari Sureran,

Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa. 4. Brij

Lal deceased son of Sohna through his LRs.

(a). Balbir-son, (b). Bansi Lal..son of

Brij Lal, Resident of Village Khari

Sureran, Tehsil Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

5. Sultan deceased son of Sohna through his

LRs. (a). Om Parkash son of Sultan,

Resident of Village Khari Sureran, Tehsil

Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

Presented by Sh. S.C. Verma Adv

Put up in Peshi on Today

Dated 7-5-18
Harmesh
Superintendent
Gr. II (Jud.)

रिश्द

.. Defendats/appellants

[Signature]
[Signature]

THROUGH: S.C VERMA, ADV. SIRSA

ब्रज प्रकाश

महेश

महेश

[Signature]

[Signature]
A JV
5/5/18

Mahender Singh महेश

महेश

Rishad

R/ Sir,

Cost Fee is correct and civil Appeal is

With in time. Report submitted Please.

Harmesh
Adv.

1

For Uploading on Website

**COURT NOTICE
(U/o 5 Rule 20 CPC)**

**IN THE COURT OF Dr. Ram Niwas Bharati
District and Sessions Judge Sirsa**

**Next Date, Purpose of case, Orders and Judgments as well as other
case information is available on <http://ecourts.gov.in>**

BHADAR DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS. ETC

Vs.

MANPHOOL ETC.

CNR No. HRSI01-002865-2018

Next Date:- 27-03-2019

PUBLICATION ISSUED TO RESPONDENTS NO.

**2(c)(i)(ii), 3(c), 4(iii) to (viii), 5(i)(a,b,c), 5(ii, iii, iv, v), 6(i, ii, iii, iv), 7(i, ii), 8, 14,
17(a), 19, 20(e, f, g, h), 21(c), 21(d(i)(ii), 21(f), 23, 25, 26, 27.**

To,

The Manager
Dainik Chetna News Paper
Bhiwani.

Whereas it has been proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the defendant(s)/respondent(s) above named cannot be served in the ordinary way of service. Hence, this proclamation **under order 5 Rule 20 CPC** is hereby issued against him/them and should appear personally or through their counsel on **27-03-2019 at 10:00 a.m.**

Take notice that, in default of his/their appearance on the day before mentioned, the above said case will be heard and determined in his/their absence according to law.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this **15-03-2019**.



**District and Sessions Judge
Sirsa**