IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE DEEPAK KHOT

ON THE 3rd OF NOVEMBER, 2026

CIVIL REVISION No. 277 of 2026

CNR No.: MPHC010177512026

RAGHVENDRA SINGH

Versus

JITENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Ramanath Dwivedi - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Ayush Tiwari - Advocate for the respondent No.1/plaintiff.

Shri Sandeep Vyas - Panel Lawyer for the respondent/State.

ORDER

The present revision has been filed by the petitioner under Section 115 of the Code of Civil Procedure being aggrieved by the order dated 12.12.2025 passed by Civil Judge-I, Junior Division, Rampur Baghelan, District in RCSA-118/2024, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC has been rejected.

2. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the suit is ex-facie time-barred and deserves to be rejected at the threshold. It is submitted that if, upon perusal of the averments made in the plaint, the suit appears to be ex facie barred by limitation, the parties should not be unnecessarily compelled to prosecute the entire suit proceedings, which would cause undue harassment to the defendants. It is submitted that the suit has been filed for

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

declaration and permanent injunction.

3. It is submitted that the respondent/plaintiff has prayed for relief that the entries made in Column No. 3 of the revenue records in respect of the defendant Nos. 1 and 3 and Sher Mohammad in respect of the disputed lands bearing Survey No. 525/2, area admeasuring 0.8090 hectare, Survey No. 525/3, area admeasuring 0.8090 hectare and Survey No. 525/4 area admeasuring 0.8090 hectare situated at Village Richhari, Tehsil Rampur Baghelan, District Satna, Madhya Pradesh, be declared as void and illegal being contrary to the rights and interests of the plaintiff.

4. The respondent/plaintiff further prayed that the two separate sale deeds dated 30.04.1994 and 15.07.1994 respectively executed by deceased Sher Mohammad in favour of defendant No. 2 in respect of Survey No. 525/3 area admeasuring 0.8090 hectare be declared void and illegal, being contrary to the rights and interests of the plaintiff.

5. The respondent/plaintiff further prayed that the plaintiff be declared the owner and Bhumiswami of Survey No. 525, area admeasuring 6.47 acres, which has been recorded in the revenue records under its sub-divided numbers in Survey Nos. 525/2, 525/3 and 525/4.

6. The respondent/plaintiff has also prayed for relief that a decree of permanent injunction be passed in favour of the plaintiff restraining defendant Nos. 1 to 3 from selling, mortgaging or gifting the disputed suit properties to any third person on the basis of the revenue records, and further restraining the defendants from interfering with the plaintiff's possession.

7. It is submitted that the whole suit is based on two sale deeds which

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

were executed in the year 1994 of which a fictitious and vexatious cause of action has been tried to be portrayed to bring the suit within limitation. It is submitted that from the averments of the plaint, it is clear that the respondent/plaintiff himself has averred that he earned the knowledge of sale deeds in 2015 and thereafter the suit was filed in the year 2024 i.e. after nine years.

8. It is submitted that from a bare perusal of the pleadings, it is clear that the suit is barred by limitation, as the period prescribed under Article 58 of the Limitation Act for seeking a decree of declaration is three years. It is submitted that even for the sake of argument, if it is assumed that the period of limitation commenced from the date of knowledge i.e. in the year 2015 then also the suit is ex facie barred by limitation. Otherwise also, from a holistic reading of the averments made in the plaint, it is absolutely clear that the sale deeds were executed in the year 1994 in respect of Survey No. 525, out of which, one portion of Survey No. 525/1 was sold by the respondent/plaintiff himself, however, it has been averred in the plaint that Survey No. 525 was never subdivided in Min numbers and, therefore, the respondent/plaintiff was unaware that the revenue entries had been changed behind his back and on the basis of the said revenue entries, the sale deeds had been executed in the year 1994.

9. It is also pleaded that, upon obtaining the revenue entries for the years 1998–1999 to 2002–2003, the respondent/plaintiff gathered knowledge in the year 2024 that the mutation in favour of defendant No. 2 had been carried out on the basis of his entry in Column No. 12 in Revenue Case No.

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

23A/6A/2000–2001. It is submitted that the disputed lands are ancestral properties of the respondent/plaintiff. It is further pleaded that in the year 2015 when the respondent/plaintiff intended to transfer his land bearing Survey No. 525 then only he came to know that Survey No. 525 has been subdivided into Survey Nos. 525/1, 525/2, 525/3 and 525/4 out of which only Survey No. 525/1 is recorded in the name of respondent/plaintiff and other survey numbers are recorded in the name of defendant No.2. It is averred that in the year 2015, after gaining knowledge of aforesaid facts, the respondent/plaintiff made communication with the defendants to know as to how their names have been mutated. Thereafter, the remaining land owned by the respondent/plaintiff, bearing Survey No. 525/1, was transferred by the respondent/plaintiff vide registered sale deed dated 04.02.2015, and thereafter, the present suit was filed in the year 2024.

10. It is submitted that from the entire pleadings of the plaint, it is clear that the respondent/plaintiff was very much aware of the fact that Survey No. 525 was subdivided into four survey numbers, out of which the survey number, in respect of which, the name of the respondent/plaintiff was recorded was sold by the respondent/plaintiff in the year 2015, after gaining knowledge that the other survey numbers were recorded in the names of the defendants.

11. Per contra, counsel for the respondent/plaintiff has submitted that the suit is not barred by limitation, as the respondent/plaintiff came to know about the aforesaid transaction as well as the mutation of the defendants' names in the revenue records for the very first time in the year 2024. It is

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

submitted that the land bearing Survey No. 525 is an ancestral land and was recorded in the name of respondent/plaintiff and prior to him it was recorded in the names of his predecessors. However, in the year 2015, when the respondent/plaintiff intended to transfer the land, he came to know that it was subdivided and the names of defendants have been recorded in the revenue records, the respondent/plaintiff initiated proceedings and in the year 2024 upon receiving the revenue records, he immediately filed the suit. Therefore, the suit is not barred by limitation.

12. It is submitted that merely because the plaintiff came to know about the subdivision of Khasra No. 525 while executing the sale deed dated 04.02.2015 in respect of Khasra No. 525/1, it cannot be presumed that he had knowledge of the sale deeds executed in the year 1994 or the mutation proceedings. Therefore, the suit cannot be held to be barred by limitation from the date 04.02.2015.

13. It is further submitted that the revenue entries filed along with the plaint merely reflect the names of defendants No. 1 to 3 in Column No. 4 and do not disclose the name of Sher Mohammad. It is specifically pleaded that when the plaintiff enquired from the defendants in the year 2015 about the entries, they concealed the fact about the sale deeds and expressed ignorance about the said entries.

14. It is submitted that, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Biswanath Banik v. Sulanga Bose***, (2022) 7 SCC 731 , the plaint must be read as a whole and cannot be rejected by relying upon isolated averments. It is submitted that in paragraph 6 of the plaint, the plaintiff has specifically

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

averred that when he asked defendants No. 1 to 3 in the year 2015 to get the revenue entries corrected, they did not deny the title of the respondent/plaintiff rather they categorically admitted that the plaintiff himself was in actual cultivating possession and assured him that they would take legal advice and get the entries of Survey Nos. 525/2, 525/3 and 525/4 corrected and restored in the plaintiff's name.

15. It is further submitted that in the year 2015 the defendants had acknowledged the plaintiff's title and cultivating possession and assured him that the revenue entries would be corrected. The first clear refusal and threat allegedly occurred in the first week of March 2024, when defendant No. 2 objected to the plaintiff's cultivation and threatened him against sowing the next crop on Khasra No. 525/3.

16. It is submitted that the plaintiff discovered the relevant revenue entries and mutation proceedings only after obtaining the Revenue records in May 2024. He obtained certified copies of the two sale deeds for the first time on 07.06.2024, as evident from the Sub-Registrar's endorsements and certified-copy receipt. The suit was thereafter instituted on 06.08.2024, within two months.

17. It is further submitted that the question of limitation, in view of the plaintiff's specific pleadings regarding the date of knowledge of the sale deeds and mutation proceedings, involves mixed questions of fact and law and cannot be decided at the threshold under Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC without recording evidence.

18. It is further submitted that the plaintiff is not an executant of the

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

sale deeds which were executed by Sher Mohammad in the year 1994. Therefore, being a non-executant claiming to be the true owner in possession, he is not required to seek cancellation of the sale deeds under Section 31 of the Specific Relief Act and the ancillary prayer for declaring the sale deeds null and void does not determine the limitation governing the suit for declaration of title and permanent injunction.

19. To bolster his submission, counsel for the respondent/plaintiff has placed reliance upon the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the cases of **Daya Singh and another vs. Gurdev Singh (Dead) by L.Rs. and others, (2010) 2 SCC 194, Chhotanben and another vs. Kiritbhai Jalkrushnabhai Thakkar and others, (2018) 6 SCC 422, P. Kumarakurubaran vs. P. Narayanan and others, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 975, Karam Singh vs. Amarjit Singh and others, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2240, Hussain Ahmed Choudhury and others vs. Habibur Rahman (dead) through L.Rs. and others, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 892** and the orders passed by this Court and the coordinate Bench in **Civil Revision No. 650/2024-Smt. Anita Yadav and others vs. Ramnath Yadav and others** decided on 24.09.2026 and **Civil Revision No. 1147/2024-Rupali Gupta vs. Kaptan Singh and others** decided on 29.10.2025.

20. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

21. It is a trite law that to decide an application under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC, only pleadings of plaint are germane as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Chhotanben vs. Kirtbhai Jalkrushnabhai Thakkar (2018) 6 SCC 422**. The Hon'ble Apex Court has held as under:-

"15. What is relevant for answering the matter in issue in the

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

> context of the application under Order 7 Rule 11(d) CPC, is to examine the averments in the plaint. The plaint is required to be read as a whole. The defence available to the defendants or the plea taken by them in the written statement or any application filed by them, cannot be the basis to decide the application under Order 7 Rule 11(d). Only the averments in the plaint are germane. "

22. From perusal of the entire pleadings made in the plaint, this Court has found that the respondent/plaintiff himself has stated that in the year 2015, when he intended to sell the land, he came to know that the land bearing Survey No. 525 had been subdivided into four survey numbers. Thereafter, out of the said four subdivided survey numbers, he sold one portion bearing Survey No. 525/1, which was recorded in his name, which makes it clear that the respondent/plaintiff was very much aware of the fact that the land was subdivided into four survey numbers and that the mutation in favour of the defendants was taken place much prior to it in the year 2000–2001. In order to create a cause of action, the respondent/plaintiff has averred that after gaining knowledge in the year 2015, he applied for certified copies of the revenue records, which he received in the year 2024, and thereafter, the suit was filed. From the pleadings of the plaint, it is clear that the respondent/plaintiff came to know in the year 2015 that the land bearing Survey No. 525 was subdivided into four survey numbers, out of which three survey numbers were recorded in the names of the defendants on the basis of the sale deeds executed in the year 1994. However, it is impracticable to believe that the respondent/plaintiff did not obtain the revenue records for almost nine years i.e. from 2015 to 2024 and that only after obtaining the said revenue records the suit was filed. Admittedly, the sale deed was executed in the year 1994, meaning thereby, the revenue

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

records were changed prior to it and thereafter certain other changes were made in the revenue records in the year 2000-2001. So, Bhumiswami rights accrued to the possession holder as per the pleadings of the respondent/plaintiff much prior to 1994 and on the basis of that the sale deeds were executed. Thereafter, again revenue records were changed in the year 2000-2001. The plaintiff has challenged the validity of the sale deeds, which were executed in the year 1994.

23. From perusal of the sale deeds, which were filed along with the plaint and list of documents, it is found that the fees for obtaining the certified copy of the sale deeds was paid on 02.06.2024 and the same was obtained on 07.06.2024. Therefore, it is not the case of the respondent/plaintiff that the certified copy was applied in the year 2015 when the respondent/plaintiff gathered the knowledge or when the revenue records were changed in the year 2000-2001. The respondent/plaintiff has challenged the validity, legality and propriety of the sale deeds executed in the year 1994 by asserting his title over the suit property in the year 2024 i.e. after about 30 years. The respondent/plaintiff slept over his right and woke up from his deep slumber only in the year 2024 and to concoct a cause of action, it is averred that the respondent/plaintiff gathered knowledge in the year 2015, but he obtained certified copies of the revenue records in the year 2024. From the holistic reading of the plaint averments, it is found that the cause of action, which has been tried to be portrayed, is fictitious and vexatious to file a suit belatedly, when admittedly the respondent/plaintiff has sold his part of land in the year 2015 itself.

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

24. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Dahiben Vs. Arvindbhai Kalyanji Bhanusali (Gajra) Dead through legal Representatives and Others***, ***(2020) 7 SCC 366*** has held that for determining the question whether the suit is barred by law or not under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC, the holistic reading of the plaint is necessary.

> "23.2. The remedy under Order 7 Rule 11 is an independent and special remedy, wherein the court is empowered to summarily dismiss a suit at the threshold, without proceeding to record evidence, and conducting a trial, on the basis of the evidence adduced, if it is satisfied that the action should be terminated on any of the grounds contained in this provision.
> 23.3. The underlying object of Order 7 Rule 11(a) is that if in a suit, no cause of action is disclosed, or the suit is barred by limitation under Rule 11(d), the court would not permit the plaintiff to unnecessarily protract the proceedings in the suit. In such a case, it would be necessary to put an end to the sham litigation, so that further judicial time is not wasted.
> 23.5. The power conferred on the court to terminate a civil action is, however, a drastic one, and the conditions enumerated in Order 7 Rule 11 are required to be strictly adhered to.
> 23.6. Under Order 7 Rule 11, a duty is cast on the court to determine whether the plaint discloses a cause of action by scrutinising the averments in the plaint [Liverpool & London S.P. & I Assn. Ltd. v. M.V. Sea Success I, (2004) 9 SCC 512] , read in conjunction with the documents relied upon, or whether the suit is barred by any law.
> 23.8. Having regard to Order 7 Rule 14 CPC, the documents filed along with the plaint, are required to be taken into consideration for deciding the application under Order 7 Rule 11(a). When a document referred to in the plaint, forms the basis of the plaint, it should be treated as a part of the plaint.
> 23.9. In exercise of power under this provision, the court would determine if the assertions made in the plaint are contrary to statutory law, or judicial dicta, for deciding whether a case for rejecting the plaint at the threshold is made out.
> 23.10. At this stage, the pleas taken by the defendant in the written statement and application for rejection of the plaint on the merits, would be irrelevant, and cannot be adverted to, or taken into consideration. [Sopan Sukhdeo Sable v. Charity Commr., (2004) 3 SCC 137]
> 23.11. The test for exercising the power under Order 7 Rule 11 is that if the averments made in the plaint are taken in entirety, in conjunction with the documents relied upon, would the same result in a decree being passed. This test was laid down in Liverpool & London S.P. & I Assn. Ltd. v. M.V. Sea Success I [Liverpool & London S.P. & I Assn. Ltd. v. M.V. Sea Success I,

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

(2004) 9 SCC 512] which reads as : (SCC p. 562, para 139)

> "139. Whether a plaint discloses a cause of action or not is essentially a question of fact. But whether it does or does not must be found out from reading the plaint itself. For the said purpose, the averments made in the plaint in their entirety must be held to be correct. The test is as to whether if the averments made in the plaint are taken to be correct in their entirety, a decree would be passed."

23.12. In Hardesh Ores (P) Ltd. v. Hede & Co. [Hardesh Ores (P) Ltd. v. Hede & Co., (2007) 5 SCC 614] the Court further held that it is not permissible to cull out a sentence or a passage, and to read it in isolation. It is the substance, and not merely the form, which has to be looked into. The plaint has to be construed as it stands, without addition or subtraction of words. If the allegations in the plaint prima facie show a cause of action, the court cannot embark upon an enquiry whether the allegations are true in fact. D. Ramachandran v. R.V. Janakiraman [D. Ramachandran v. R.V. Janakiraman, (1999) 3 SCC 267; See also Vijay Pratap Singh v. Dukh Haran Nath Singh, AIR 1962 SC 941] .

23.13. If on a meaningful reading of the plaint, it is found that the suit is manifestly vexatious and without any merit, and does not disclose a right to sue, the court would be justified in exercising the power under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC.

23.15. The provision of Order 7 Rule 11 is mandatory in nature. It states that the plaint "shall" be rejected if any of the grounds specified in clauses (a) to (e) are made out. If the court finds that the plaint does not disclose a cause of action, or that the suit is barred by any law, the court has no option, but to reject the plaint."

25. Recently, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **N. Asha Devi vs. R. Arvind Kumar-Civil Appeal No. 11194/2026** decided on 17.08.2026 has held as under :-

> "6. Shri Mukund Bhavan Trust v. Shrimant Chhatrapati Udayan Raje Pratapsinh Maharaj Bhonsle and Another, reiterated the trite principle that 'when an application to reject the plaint is filed, the averments in the plaint and the documents annexed therewith alone are germane'. This Court, keeping in mind the position of law that limitation is a mixed question of fact and law, found the facts arising therein, glaring from the plaint averments itself and held the suit to be hopelessly barred by limitation. It was held that the Court cannot be hesitant in granting relief of rejection of a plaint when it is so obvious from the pleadings itself."

26. Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Shobha Vasant Bhoir & Ors. vs. Soni @Vandana Gurumukhdas Jagiasi & Ors-SLP (C) No. 27748/2025** decided on 01.07.2026 has held as under :-

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

"20. More recently, this Court in Correspondence, RBANMS Educational Institution v. B. Gunashekar and Anr. 7 had observed to similar effect:

"14.1. Thus, it is clear that the above provision viz., Order VII Rule 11 CPC serves as a crucial filter in civil litigation, enabling courts to terminate proceedings at the threshold where the plaintiff's case, even if accepted in its entirety, fails to disclose any cause of action or is barred by law, either express or by implication. The scope of Order VII Rule 11 CPC and the authority of the courts is well settled in law. There is a bounden duty on the Court to discern and identify fictitious suit, which on the face of it would be barred, but for the clever pleadings disclosing a cause of action, that is surreal. Generally, sub-clauses (a) and (d) are stand alone grounds, that can be raised by the defendant in a suit. However, it cannot be ruled out that under certain circumstances, clauses (a) and (d) can be mutually inclusive. For instances, when clever drafting veils the implied bar to disclose the cause of action; it then becomes the duty of the Court to lift the veil and expose the bar to reject the suit at the threshold. The power to reject a plaint under this provision is not merely procedural but substantive, aimed at preventing abuse of the judicial process and ensuring that court time is not wasted on fictitious claims failing to disclose any cause of action to sustain the suit or barred by law."

(emphasis supplied)

21. It is settled law that the contents of the plaint have to be read as a whole, to ascertain the application of conditions enumerated under Order 7 Rule 11. This Court in Madansuri Sri Rama Chandra Murthy v. Syed Jalal8 had observed:

> "7. The plaint can be rejected under Order 7 Rule 11 if conditions enumerated in the said provision are fulfilled. It is needless to observe that the power under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC can be exercised by the Court at any stage of the suit. The relevant facts which need to be looked into for deciding the application are the averments of the plaint only. If on an entire and meaningful reading of the plaint, it is found that the suit is manifestly vexatious and meritless in the sense of not disclosing any right to sue, the court should exercise power under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC. Since the power conferred on the Court to terminate civil action at the threshold is drastic, the conditions enumerated under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC to the exercise of power of rejection of plaint have to be strictly adhered to. The averments of the plaint have to be read as a whole to find out whether the averments disclose a cause of action or whether the suit is barred by any law. It is needless to observe that the question as to whether the suit is barred by any law, would always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The averments in the written statement as well as the contentions of the defendant are wholly immaterial while considering the prayer of

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

> the defendant for rejection of the plaint. Even when the allegations made in the plaint are taken to be correct as a whole on their face value, if they show that the suit is barred by any law, or do not disclose cause of action, the application for rejection of plaint can be entertained and the power under Order 7 Rule 11CPC can be exercised. If clever drafting of the plaint has created the illusion of a cause of action, the court will nip it in the bud at the earliest so that bogus litigation will end at the earlier stage."
>
> (emphasis supplied)

27. When the facts of the present case have been tested on the envil of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex court in the case of the **Dahiben, N. Asha Devi and Shobha Vasant Bhoir (supra)**, this court is of the considered opinion that just to get the suit within limitation, the respondent/plaintiff has made a fictitious cause of action by pleading that he gathered knowledge in the year 2024 when he received the certified copy of the sale deeds. From bare perusal of certified copy of the sale deeds, it is found that the certified copy was applied on 02.06.2024 and the same was obtained on 07.06.2024, however, the knowledge has been said to be gathered in the year 2015. Therefore, for about nine years, the respondent/plaintiff did not file any application to even obtain the certified copy. The sale deeds have been executed in the year 1994 for which the challenge has been made in the year 2024 i.e. after 30 years. Therefore, ex-facie, in the considered opinion of this court, the suit is barred by limitation, which cannot be allowed to be prosecuted further just to harass the defendants.

28. This Court has also considered the judgments relied upon by learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff in the light of the facts and circumstances of the present case. However, the principles laid down therein are neither attracted to the facts of the present case nor do they advance the

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

case of the respondent/plaintiff.

29. The judgment in **Biswanath Banik (supra)** does not help the respondent/plaintiff as the principle that the plaint must be read as a whole does not preclude the Court from considering the specific admissions and averments contained therein for determining the question of limitation. In the present case, upon a holistic reading of the plaint and the documents accompanying it, the respondent/plaintiff's own pleadings clearly disclose knowledge of the subdivision and the defendants' revenue entries in the year 2015 and execution of sale deeds in the year 1994, whereas the suit was instituted only in 2024. Thus, the said judgment does not advance the case of the respondent/plaintiff.

30. In the case of **Chhotanben (supra)**, the plaintiffs after acquiring the knowledge of the fraudulent sale deed immediately obtained its certified copy and instituted the suit within two days of the defendants refusing to honour their claim. Similarly, in **Daya Singh (supra),** the right to sue accrued only when the defendants gave a clear and unequivocal threat to infringe the plaintiffs' rights shortly before institution of the suit. The facts of the present case are distinguishable, as the respondent/plaintiff himself has pleaded that he acquired knowledge of the subdivision of the land and the recording of the defendants' names in the revenue records in the year 2015, but instituted the suit only in the year 2024.

31. The judgment in **P. Kumarakurubaran (supra)** is also distinguishable, as in that case the plaintiff had immediately initiated proceedings and raised objections upon acquiring knowledge of the disputed

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

transactions and thereafter instituted the suit within the period of limitation. In the present case, despite acquiring knowledge of the subdivision and the defendants' entries in 2015, the respondent/plaintiff did not obtain the certified copies of the relevant documents until June 2024. The mere subsequent procurement of certified copies cannot, in the facts of the present case, automatically extend or revive the period of limitation.

32. Similarly, in **Karam Singh (supra)**, the mutation proceedings had culminated in the year 2017 and the suit was instituted within three years thereof. Further, the suit included a substantive relief of recovery of possession based on title. In the present case, the respondent/plaintiff has not sought recovery of possession and the principal reliefs are declaration of title and challenge to the sale deeds executed in 1994. Therefore, the said judgment is distinguishable on its facts and the nature of reliefs claimed.

33. The judgment in **Hussain Ahmed Choudhury (supra)** deals primarily with the requirement of seeking cancellation of an instrument under Section 31 of the Specific Relief Act by an executant or a non-executant. It does not lay down any proposition that a non-executant is exempted from the law of limitation while seeking a declaration that a sale deed is void or not binding upon him. Therefore, the said judgment does not advance the case of the respondent/plaintiff on the question of limitation.

34. Therefore, having regard to the specific pleadings and documents accompanying the plaint, this Court finds that the judgments relied upon by the respondent/plaintiff do not alter the conclusion already arrived at by this Court regarding the suit being barred by limitation.

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33

35. Consequently, the revision petition is allowed. The order dated 12.12.2025 passed by the Civil Judge-I, Junior Division, Rampur Baghelan, District in RCSA-118/2024 is set aside. The application filed by the petitioner under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC is allowed. The suit is dismissed as barred by limitation.

(DEEPAK KHOT)
JUDGE

RAGHVENDRA

Signature Not Verified
Signed by: RAGHVENDRA SHARAN SHUKLA
Signing time: 05-11-2026 17:04:33