



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

FAO-1109-1997

Date of decision : 12.09.2025

SHIROMANI GURUDWARA PARBANDHAK COMMITTEE

....Appellant

Versus

S. SUCHA SINGH AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. A.P.S. Virk, Advocate for
Mr. P.S. Thiara, Advocate
for the appellant.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Instant appeal is directed against order dated 05.03.1997 passed by Sikh Gurdwara Judicial Commission, Amritsar, on a petition filed under Section 142 of the Sikh Gurdwara Act, 1925.

2. The operative part of the award, reads as under:

“Relief

My findings on issue no.1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 are in favour of petitioner committee. I hold that no specific instance of misappropriation of funds of the Gurudwara by the respondents is proved either by oral evidence or documents produced by the petitioner committee. But at the time, I hold issue No.6 in favour of the petitioner committee and against the respondents because the respondents have failed to get the accounts checked by the S.G.P.C. authorities. They also did not produce the record in the office of petitioner committee for said purpose as directed. The petitioner committee being supervisory body of all the notified Sikh Gurudwara under the Act was under legal obligation to demand such accounts for checking. By not doing so, the



respondents have committed the acts of malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, abuse of powers and neglect of duty. I, thereof, direct the respondents to pay Rs.2500/- as damages. I order the immediate removal of the respondents from the memberships of the committee of management, Gurdwara Sahib Fatehabad, Village Fatehabad, Distt. Amritsar and they are further disqualified to become as member of any notified Sikh Gurdwara and the Board for a period of five years. xxx”

3. Counsel for the appellant is not in position to point out any clear allegation levelled in petition regarding misappropriation of funds of the Gurdwara, by the respondents. For having not provided the accounts for checking, the respondents were disqualified for five years. The tenure of disqualification has already lapsed.

3. In view thereof, this Court does not find any reason to keep the appeal pending. The same is ordered to be dismissed.

September 12, 2025

(Pankaj Jain)

Dpr

Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No