



Saroj Bala Bansal

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Thakur Dawara Panjbiri Barnala through its
Mohtamim Tarsem Chand & ors.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present :- Mr. D.S.Bhinder, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Umesh Kaushik, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Jaiveer Singh, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 8.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. [Oral]

1. Challenge is to order dated 15.05.2025 (Annexure P-9) passed by Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Barnala, whereby an application filed by the petitioner seeking production of original WILL dated 04.03.2006, allegedly executed by deceased-Ravinder Kumar, son of Parkash Chand has been declined.

2. It has come on record that earlier Vinod Kumar Garg, Objector Nos.1 to 7 filed an application seeking direction to Objector-Saroj Bala Bansal to produce original WILL dated 26.04.2002 executed by Parkash Chand and original WILL dated 04.03.2006 executed by Ravinder Kumar. In the said application Saroj Bala Bansal through her counsel filed reply,



which reads as under :-

- “1. That para no.1 of the application needs no reply.
2. That para no.2 of the application are admitted being matter of record.
3. That para no.3 of the application is admitted to extent that that original wills are not produced by the objector. However the remaining facts are denied being incorrect. The true photocopies of will dated 26.04.2002 executed by late Sh. Parkash Chand and will dated 04.03.2006 executed by Sh. Ravinder Kumar are already placed on record by the objector Saroj Bala Bansal, hence there is no need to produce original wills at this stage.
4. That para no.4 of the application is denied being incorrect. Production of original wills is not required for filing the reply to the objections.”

3. In view of above, this Court finds that the present application filed by Saroj Bala Bansal who earlier herself produced photocopies of the WILL and claimed the same to be true, is nothing but an abuse of the process of law to delay the execution.

4. In view thereof, this Court finds no reason to interfere in the order dated 15.05.2025, passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Barnala.

5. Revision petition stands dismissed.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

07.08.2025

Pooja sharma-I

Whether speaking/reasoned. :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable. :

Yes/No