

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

**Reserved on 25<sup>th</sup> of September, 2025**

**Pronounced on 9<sup>th</sup> October, 2025**

**CR No.3285 of 2023 (O&M)**

Shabeg Singh (since deceased) through his LRs and others ...Petitioners

Versus

Resham Singh (since deceased) through his LRs and others ....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present : Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. B.S. Bedi, Advocate  
for respondents No.1(i) to (ii).

Mr. Kanwaljit Singh, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Jashan Preet Deol, Advocate  
for respondents No.4 to 6.

**PANKAJ JAIN, J.**

Challenge is to the order dated 26<sup>th</sup> of September, 2022 and 1<sup>st</sup> of November, 2022 whereby the application filed by the petitioners under Order I Rule 10 CPC seeking impleadment of Sh. T.P.S. Bedi, Advocate, as defendant, has been ordered to be rejected.

2. In a connected CR No.2256 of 2023, this Court vide order dated 25.09.2025 has allowed the application filed by the petitioners seeking amendment of the plaint.

3. The substantive proposed amendments related to the present revision petition which have been allowed to be incorporated, read as under:

“Para 4. That Sh. Iqbal Singh and Sh. Raghbir Singh aforesaid on the basis of false, frivolous fictitious and bogus alleged General Power of Attorneys as stated above sold away the land in question to defendant no.1 through alleged sale deeds bearing No.1745, 1744, 1743, 1746 thus the sale deeds alleged to have been executed by the aforesaid persons who have impersonated the plaintiffs would be considered to be void documents since the plaintiffs i.e. the heirs of Smt. Jinda have never executed the Power of Attorneys out of their own volition in favour of Iqbal Singh and Raghbir Singh. The factum of fraud having been committed upon the plaintiffs is also corroborated by the fact that the said power of Attorneys allege to have been executed by the plaintiffs in favour of Iqbal Singh and Raghbir Singh in those Power of Attorneys the present address of the executants i.e. present plaintiffs have been shown to the 504 R Modal Town Karnal whereas reality is that the executants i.e. Predecessor of the present plaintiffs were resident of Village mehes, District Patila and it is also pertinent to mention here that the previous Counsel i.e. Sh. T.P.S. Bedi in order to grab the suit property in collusion with other codefendants have shown the executants i.e. plaintiffs resident of his own address. The Sub Registrar who has registered the above said documents had he known that the above said executants i.e. plaintiffs are not resident of Karnal he would not have registered the allege Power of Attorney. It is also important to mention here that the 2<sup>nd</sup> attesting witness which was shown in the allege Power of Attorney is also the clerk of Sh. TPS Bedi Advocate previous counsel of the plaintiffs. It is also pertinent to mention here that the alleged sale deed which were executed in favour of the defendants from the Power of Attorney holders those sale deeds were also executed at Delhi and not at Karnal and this was done intentionally by the defendants to achieve the ulterior motive of the defendants.

7. xxxx

Para 5. That the above said allege Power of Attorneys and allege sale deeds are a product of fraud and not binding on the rights of the present plaintiff as the predecessor of the present plaintiff i.e. Darshan Singh, Shepagh Singh and Payara Singh have never thumb mark upon the alleged Power of Attorneys and had been impersonated by the defendants. It is also pertinent to mention here that the signatures of the present plaintiffs which were given by the plaintiffs as well as their predecessors to their previous counsel as the same were required by the previous counsel for the legal proceedings were used by the defendants in order to achieve the ulterior motive of fraud by executing the allege Power of Attorneys in their favour and on the basis of the same the defendants has executed the alleged sale deed in their favour. It is also pertinent to mention here that the plaintiffs came to know that that now the previous counsel i.e. Sh. T.P.S Bedi Advocate by misusing, the signed paper of the plaintiffs has also executed an alleged full payment agreement in favour of Resham Singh in connivance with other co-defendants.

8. xxxx

Para 5 (a). That it is also pertinent to mention here that the present plaintiffs and their predecessors after winning the case from the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India sought execution and had been put in possession in the year 1995 and remained in occupation for some years. Thereafter Resham Singh i.e. defendant no.1 with the help of his sons and other Gunda elements forcibly got the possession of the suit land in the absence of the plaintiffs as they were the resident of village Mehasdistrict Patila. As the plaintiffs came to know about the dispossession the plaintiffs have approached Resham Singh and asked him as to why he has taken possession of the suit property at which Resham Singh told the plaintiffs that he has got the allege sale deeds in his favour.

9. xxxxx

Para 5(b). That it is pertinent to mention here that senior Advocate Sh. T.P.S. Bedi who had been a long standing counsel of 25 years for the plaintiffs and their predecessor in interest Smt. Jindha since 1973, abuse his fiduciary capacity and betraying the absolute trust in him by the plaintiff, out righted cheated them of the suit property comprising 20 acres agriculture land situated in Nissing, District Karnal while he was representing them as their counsel. The said counsel got executed two Power of alleged Attorneys in favour of his own men where he himself was the witness and in which he had given his own residential address as the address of the plaintiff whereas plaintiffs resided in Punjab and had never resided at the address of the counsel. The advocates engaged by the plaintiffs from time to time have acted with ulterior motive in breach of their fiduciary duty an in an unprofessional manner to the detriment of the plaintiffs. Even in the plaint only one alleged Power of Attorney has been mentioned out of two Power of Attorneys the previous counsel who is behind the fraud had also illegally introduce Veer Kaur as an alleged co-owner in the suit property. It is also pertinent to mention here that the previous counsel was well known about the case which was contested between the plaintiffs and the defendants i.e. "***Gurpreet Singh Versus Payara Singh***" but the previous counsel has not whisper even a word regarding the previous litigation. It is important to mention here that in the above mentioned case Sh. T.P.S. Bedi was the counsel for the present plaintiffs and well-known about the facts of the case and even then the said counsel first denied and concealed the existence of the alleged two Power of Attorneys and after almost 4 years later the counsel has supported those alleged Power of Attorneys when it was sold to his front man Resham Singh i.e defendant no.1. It is also submitted that the previous counsel categorically affirmed that the present plaintiffs were left with no interest in the suit property since they had sold the same to his from man Resham Singh i.e defendant no.1. it is also important to mention here that the previous counsel after procuring thumb mark/signature of his clients i.e. present plaintiffs on blank papers

use the same in filing replies against their interest and supporting the claim of ownership of Resham Singh i.e. defendant no.1 over the suit property and the previous counsel has also won over other advocates who had been subsequently to engaged by the present plaintiff to seek redress. The above mentioned things are cleared by the fact that the present plaintiffs engaged an advocate in 2011 who filed application under order 1 rule 10 CPC in December 2011 and February 2012 for impleading the previous counsel as a party in the previous suit enumerating various Acts and conduct of the previous counsel relating to the fraud perpetrated by him on present plaintiffs while they had been his clients as a result of which the suit property was allegedly sold to his front man i.e. Resham Singh defendant no.1 in the present suit. However, the said advocate argued the said application during the next five and a half years that he was counsel for the plaintiffs and neither did he seek amendment in the plaint.”

4. In view of the amended plaint, the gravamen of the averments raised by the plaintiffs are that the plaintiffs have been defrauded by Sh.T.P.S. Bedi, Advocate, who was representing them in earlier rounds of litigation. Even though T.P.S. Bedi is not beneficiary under the consequential sale deeds and is thus not a necessary party, but in his absence the allegations levelled in the plaint, cannot be answered and is thus definitely a proper party.

5. In view thereof, this Court finds that the Trial Court erred in dismissing the application filed by the plaintiffs under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC declining their prayer to implead Sh. T.P.S. Bedi, Advocate as one of the defendants.

6. Consequently, the present revision petition is allowed. Impugned orders are hereby set aside. Sh. T.P. Singh Bedi, Advocate is ordered to be impleaded as defendant No.9 in the main suit.

**October 09, 2025**

**(Pankaj Jain)  
Judge**

**Dpr**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No