

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8606/2025

Sunil Kumar Sharma Son Of Late Shivkumar Sharma, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Sushil Kumar Sharma S/o Late Shri Mahadev Prasad Sharma, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Nawalgarh Hall 1B Khailat Ghosh Lane Kolkata-6.
2. Shiv Kumar Sharma Son Of Late Shri Mahadev Prasad Sharma, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Nawalgarh, Currently Residing At 102-J Block-F, New Alipur, Kolkata-53. (Deceased) Through Lrs-
3. Triveni Devi Sharma (Daughter Of Late Shri Mahadev Prasad Sharma) Wife Of Shri Omdutt Sharma, Aged About 85 Years, Resident 8 Adarsh Nagar Ajmer District Ajmer Rajasthan.
4. Deputy Registrar Sir, Sub Registrar Office, Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu.
5. Kanta Devi Sharma Wife Of Shri Sushil Kumar Sharma, Resident Of Village Nawalgarh, Teshil Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu.
6. Santosh Devi Sharma (Daughter Late Shri Mahadev Prasad Ji Sharma) Wife Late Shri Yajnadutt Sharma, Aged About 82 Years, Resident 32/914 Laxman Chowk Alwar Gate Ajmer District Ajmer Rajasthan.
7. Sharda Devi Sharma (Daughter Of Late Shri Mahadev Prasad Ji Shari) Wife Of Shri Moolchand Sharma, Aged About 78 Years, Resident Of D 7/7105 Vasant Kunj, New Delhi.
8. Sushila Devi Sharma Wife Of Late Shivkumar Sharma, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu.
9. Savita Sharma Wife Of Devendra Kumar D/o Late Shiv Kumar Sharma, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Jaipur.
10. Sujit Kumar Sharma Son Of Late Shivkumar Sharma, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Nawalgarh, District

Jhunjhunu, Currently Residing In Kolkata.

11. Preeti Wife Of Ajay Vondawal Son Of Late Shiv Kumar Sharma, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Faridabad.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Pratyushi Mehta

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Aditya Matolia

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BIPIN GUPTA

Judgment / Order

27/02/2026

1. Without pressing the writ petition on merits, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the parties are yet to lead their evidence, the application was not maintainable at that stage. He, therefore, prays that liberty be granted to the petitioner to file an appropriate application after the parties have led their evidence.
2. Considering the same, the present writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.
3. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to file an appropriate application, after the parties have led their evidence, praying therein for comparison of the disputed signatures with the admitted signatures. The learned Trial Court shall decide such application in accordance with law.
4. With the above observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.
5. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(BIPIN GUPTA),J