



CR-5624-2025

1

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

126

CR-5624-2025

Date of Decision: 21.08.2025

Gurtej Singh Sidhu

...Petitioner

VERSUS

Rabia Singh and Others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Prince Pasticha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer for setting aside the order dated 08.05.2025 passed by the learned Family Court, Camp at Talwandi Sabo, whereby, application under Order 33 Rule 1 read with Section 151 CPC “filed by respondent No.1”-Rabia Singh has been allowed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the application under Order XXXIII Rule 1 read with Section 151 CPC, filed on behalf of respondent No.1 – Rabia Singh through her mother/next friend, was wrongly allowed by the trial Court. It is urged that respondent No.1 – Rabia Singh is already maintaining a bank account with sufficient balance and that, moreover, her next friend is a Government officer. Hence, she could not have been declared an indigent person by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Talwandi Sabo, vide order dated 08.05.2025.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paper book.



CR-5624-2025

2

4. A perusal of the impugned order dated 08.05.2025 reveals that after filing of the reply, issues with respect to the indigency of the applicant/respondent No.1 were framed. In order to prove her indigency, respondent No.1 – Rabia Singh, while appearing through video conferencing, deposed that she neither owned nor possessed any movable or immovable property. During cross-examination by learned counsel for the petitioner/respondent No.1, she specifically stated that she neither lead any savings account nor possessed any gold ornaments. As recorded in para 4 of the impugned order, the petitioner sought to establish that respondent No.1 was maintaining a joint account with one Ravi Priya Singh. However, the same could not be proved, as no application had been moved on behalf of Rabia Singh for joining in the account of Ravi Priya Singh. Furthermore, as per report of the Collector dated 11.03.2022, respondent No.1 – Rabia Singh, daughter of Baljinder Sidhu, was found not to be the owner of any immovable property. Accordingly, issue No.1 was rightly decided by the trial Court in favour of respondent No.1 – Rabia Singh, and she was correctly declared to be an indigent person and exempted from payment of Court fee.

5. In view of the aforesaid discussion, no illegality or perversity is found in the impugned order dated 08.05.2025 so as to warrant interference by this Court. Accordingly, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)  
JUDGE

21.08.2025

*anil*

Whether speaking/ reasoned:  
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No  
Yes/No