

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Second Appeal No. 194/2018

Rajveer Singh S/o Shri Puran Singh, Aged About 40 Years, B.c
Rajput, R/o Chak-19, L.n.p., Thakrawali Dhani, Tehsil And Dist.
Sri Ganganagar.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Kana Ram S/o Shri Jasram, B/c Kumhar, R/o - Chak 3 ML
Tehsil Sri Ganganagar At Present Chak-6E Choti Naya
Chak, Tehsil And District Sri Ganganagar,
2. Puran Singh Through His Lrs.
- 2/1. Bhupendra Singh S/o Late Shri Puran Singh, B/c Rajput,
R/o - Thakrawali, Dhani, Tehsil And District Sri
Ganganagar.
- 2/2. Ravindra Singh S/o Late Shri Puran Singh, B/c Rajput,
R/o - Thakrawali, Dhani, Tehsil And District Sri
Ganganagar.
- 2/3. Devendra Singh S/o Late Shri Puran Singh, B/c Rajput,
R/o - Thakrawali, Dhani, Tehsil And District Sri
Ganganagar.
3. Sultan Singh S/o Shri Revant Singh, B/c Rajput, R/o Chak
19 Lnp Thakrawali Dhani, Tehsil And Distr. Sri
Ganganagar.
4. State Of Rajasthan, Through Tehsildar (Revenue), Sri
Ganganagar.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Vipin Makkad

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA BORANA

Order

24/02/2026

1. The present second appeal has been filed aggrieved of
judgment & decree dated 30.05.2018 passed by the District
Judge, Sriganganagar in Civil Regular Appeal No.12/2011 (CIS

No.40/2014) whereby judgment & decree dated 09.09.2011 passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Sriganganagar in Civil Original Suit No.73/2006 stood, affirmed.

2. Vide judgment & decree dated 09.09.2011, the learned Trial Court proceeded on to dismiss the suit as filed by the plaintiff for declaration of sale deed dated 22.01.1985 to be void.

3. The learned Trial Court, while deciding issue No.1, specifically observed that the property in question could not be termed to be an 'ancestral property' as it was proved on record that father of the plaintiff who sold out the property in question vide impugned sale deed dated 22.01.1985 had acquired the property although by succession, but not from his father. Once it was established that the property was not an ancestral property, defendant No.5, Puran Singh i.e. father of the plaintiff was very much entitled to sell out his self-acquired property. The plaintiff had no right in the said property by birth, as claimed by him.

4. The above finding recorded by the learned Trial Court stood affirmed by the First Appellate Court.

5. In the opinion of this Court, the above finding being in total consonance with law, does not deserve any interference. No substantial question of law arises in the present appeal and the same is hence **dismissed**.

6. Stay petition and pending applications, if any, stand **disposed of**.

(REKHA BORANA),J