

## Case Description



[Caselaw Search](#)  
Search text "Exact Match"

[Search](#)
[Statutes Search](#)
[Bookmark this Case](#)

[Courtwise Search](#): year 1959 and the property in question have been purchased by the deceased in his name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using [Citation Search](#) names and known as Abdul Ghafoor as well as Abdul Ghaffar.

[Advance Search](#)

On the other hand, the learned Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972.

Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the [Succession Act 1925-384](#). The entry in this regard was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of the Firms on 30-10-1972.

Your Search returned total 27 records from 0 - 27

For the foregoing reasons the appeal has no merits and the same was dismissed in limine. [Bookmark this Case](#)

Mst RAANA ALWI VS DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE EAST KARACHI

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.  
**Mst RAANA ALWI VS DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE EAST KARACHI**  
 Ss. 383 & 384---Constitution of Pakistan, Art. 199---Constitutional petition---Revocation of Succession certificate---Forum---Dispute was with regard to revocation of succession certificate already issued---Validity---Recourse under S. 383 of Succession Act, 1925, was independent of an appeal which could otherwise be filed under S. 384 of Succession Act, 1925, against the grant or refusal of a certificate---Application for revocation would lie to the Court that made the grant and in the event such application was accepted and certificate was revoked, appeal would then also lie to High Court---High Court declined to interfere in the matter---Constitutional petition was dismissed, in circumstances.

[Head Notes](#)
[Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 2022 PLC(CS) 535 QUETTA-HIGH-COURT-BALOCHISTAN

[Bookmark this Case](#)

HATIM AMEER BALOCH VS SHAHBANA KHUDA BAKHSH

R.4(10)(a)---Succession Act (XXXIX of 1925), Ss.372 & 384---Succession of pension---Entitlement---Widow of deceased civil servant sought her succession to pension which was allowed by Trial Court but claim of son was denied---Validity---Widow was dependent on her deceased husband who was a government servant and she was entitled for pension amount---High Court declined to interfere in the order passed by Trial Court as there was no illegality or irregularity committed by the Court---Appeal was dismissed, in circumstances.

[Head Notes](#)[Case Description](#)

## Case Description

**Citation Name:** 2022 PLD 527 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH

[Bookmark this Case](#) 

ABDUL KADER VS SULEMAN

[Bookmark this Case](#) 

Ss. 278 & 384 Civil Procedure Code of 1908, O. VII, R. 10 Letter of Administration Pecuniary jurisdiction---Retirement of the Appellants---Sole partnership filed. The passage by the learned trial court that the deceased was joint filer of the applications and the same were returned to them under Rule 10; as well as the fact that before the Court having pecuniary jurisdiction---Validity---Appellants had filed separate applications and not a joint application, and the entire subject property was not the subject matter of any of the applications as the appellants had sought the Letters of Administration only in respect of the share left by each of the deceased---Every deceased having a separate and distinct share in the subject property falling within the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Trial Court, each of their respective which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed legal representatives was entitled to file a separate application, particularly when there was no bar in law that between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward separate applications in respect of separate and distinct shares or portions in the same property could not be filed---To question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of date of dissolution of the partnership Schedule and 1-8-1972 applications were remanded to the Trial Court with the direction to decide the objections filed therein by all the objectors.

Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can

be easily established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax

**Citation Name:** 2021 CLC 1807 QUETTA HIGH COURT-BALOCHISTAN

[Bookmark this Case](#) 

the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the SHABAN KHUDA BAKHSH VS HATIMA AMEER regard was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of Firms on 30-10-1972.

Ss.373 & 384---Succession certificate, application for---Title to property---Jurisdiction---Son of deceased sought succession to amount lying in Bank account of his deceased father---Widow claimed full amount lying in the account to The texture of the legal heirs that amount was same as the amount claimed by her---Trial Court issued succession certificate to all legal heirs as per their shares---Validity---Petition for grant of succession certificate was filed under S.373 of Succession Act 1925 and such proceedings before Trial Court were summary in nature---Intricate questions could not be resolved in such proceedings---Questions of title to property was to be left to be decided in suit before Court of plenary jurisdiction---High Court declined to interfere in Certificate issued by Trial M.H./C-82/K Appeal dismissed. Court---Appeal was dismissed, in circumstances.

[Head Notes](#)[Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 2021 CLC 1498 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH

[Bookmark this Case](#) 

NATIONAL INVESTMENT TRUST LIMITED (NITL) VS MRS. SADAQAT-E-NISAR

Ss.372&384---Succession certificate---Non-compliance---Bank account---Instructions of account holder---Deceased had invested amount in NIT/CIP (National Investment Trust/Cumulative Investment Plan) Units and authorities did not pay complete amount on the plea that the same was not re-invested after death of account holder---Validity---Authorities instead of honouring their commitment as per terms and conditions applicable at the time of purchase of NIT/CIP Units and option availed by deceased regarding Cumulative Investment Plan (CIP), had attempted to create a dispute either with mala fide intention or to wriggle out from a default on their part, whereupon [Bookmark this Case](#) obligation to reinvest yearly dividend as per Cumulative Investment Plan (CIP) option till its realization---After death of NIT/CIP Unit holder, the terms and conditions applicable to such units could not be changed unilaterally by name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using authorities to the disadvantage of a Unit holder---All assets of deceased automatically stood devolved in favour of his/her legal Heirs as per Islamic Law of inheritance in similar terms as the case of deceased was before his/her death--- Authorities unnecessarily dragged the matter and also failed to comply with the orders already passed by Single Judge of High Court by raising a dispute over the respondent plaintiff before the High Court declined to interfere in the order passed by the Single Judge of High Court as the same did not suffer from any factual error or legal infirmity---Intra Court Appeal was dismissed in circumstances which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972.

**Citation Name:** 2020 CLC 1053 QUETTA-HIGH-COURT-BALOCHISTAN

[Bookmark this Case](#)

Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement was accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Trial Court under S.372 of Succession Act, 1925 by informant before the trial court before District Judge. When an order was passed under S.372 of Succession Act, 1925 by a District Judge, appeal laid before High Court. Appeals were wrongly filed before High Court---Appeal against judgment and order passed by Trial Court under provisions of Succession Act, 1925 lay before District Judge---High Court directed appeals filed by appellant to be returned to appellant to file before the District Judge---Order accordingly.

For the foregoing reasons the appeal has not merits and the same was dismissed in limine.

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.

**Citation Name:** 2020 PLD 563 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH

[Bookmark this Case](#)

M.H./C-82/K Appeal dismissed.  
IDARA-E-NOOR-E-HAQ VS PUBLIC-AT-LARGE

Ss. 272, 269, 299, 300 & 384---Appeal---Probate, grant of---Ownerless property---Application for grant of probate under S.272 Succession Act, 1925, was filed by appellant but Trial Court dismissed the application---Validity---Once it was found that none was available to claim ownership of immovable property in question in his own right or by way of inheritance, such property should be treated as an ownerless property---Once Court was satisfied that the property was rendered ownerless, it was the duty of Court to protect it from being misappropriated or wasted or damaged---Court could appoint Curator under S.195 of Succession Act, 1925, to takeover possession of the property pending final determination of fate of proceedings---Court could have also taken prompt action under S.269 of Succession Act, 1925, for protection of such property---Jurisdiction of High Court under S.300 of Succession Act, 1925, was concurrent with District Judge in exercise of power under Succession Act, 1925---High Court appointed its official as a Curator to protect the property in question and directed him to take over the possession immediately---High Court declined to interfere in the order passed by Trial Court---Appeal was dismissed in circumstances.

[Head Notes](#)

[Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 2018 PLD 325 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH

[Bookmark this Case](#)

Mst. AMINA KHATOON VS Mst. NIGHAT JABEEN

**Case Description**

Ss. 370, 372 & 384---Stepbrother of deceased, entitlement of---Appellant sought succession certificate for assets left by her deceased husband---Grievance of appellant was that stepbrother of her deceased husband could not be arrayed in list of legal heirs under Hanafi law of inheritance---Validity---According to Hanafi law, in the first instance, property of deceased was to go to sharers and if estate was not exhausted by sharers, it was to go to residuaries and if there was no sharer and/or residuary, property was to be distributed among distant kindred---Heirs nearer in degree excluded more remote---Stepbrother of deceased was neither a sharer nor a residuary and he had no right to inherit from estate of deceased---High Court by partnership passed by Trial Court to the extent deceased was name of stepbrother of deceased in list of legal heirs. Appeal was allowed according to Ghaffar.

[Bookmark this Case](#)

**Head Notes** **Case Description**  
 On the other hand, the learned Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972.

[Bookmark this Case](#)

Determination--Term , Presumption--TERM , Procedure--TERM , Requirement--Term , Revocability--Term , Succession Act 1925--373 , Succession Act 1925--384 , Succession Act 1925--387 ,  
 Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can easily be established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Authorities . The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of Respondent and opined that the deceased had divorced the applicant that she is sole and only beneficiary of his brothers and sisters were entitled to the legacy in Respondents (brothers and sisters) share ~~for the sake of the registration claiming themselves as sole legal heirs of the deceased and applicant as his divorcee having no right in legacy---Trial Court~~.  
 Firms on 30/10/1972.

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.

Validity---Safeguard was provided to rightful claimant and liability of holder of succession certificate to rightful claimant under S. 387 of Succession Act, 1925---Trial Court & SC found that applicant would be considered as widow of deceased unless and until her alleged divorce was established by decree of civil court and that in case in the suit the applicant was declared as divorcee of the deceased, she would be bound to return share she would collect from the legacy---Law allowed Court to grant certificate to applicant who appeared to be a person having prima facie the best title thereto, notwithstanding a rival claim appearing intricate and difficult to determine in summary proceedings---Nothing was wrong with impugned order of Trial Court after Nikkah was proved and the divorce could not be proved from record by respondents in summary proceedings for issuance of succession certificate---Appeal was dismissed in circumstances. (b) Succession Act (XXXIX of 1925)---

**Head Notes** **Case Description**

**Citation Name:** 2015 CLC 1719 QUETTA-HIGH-COURT-BALOCHISTAN

[Bookmark this Case](#)

Mst. AISHA VS Mst. MAH GUL

PLD 1991 SC 731,

Succession Act 1925--381 , Succession Act 1925--384 , Succession Certificate--TERM ,

Ss.381 & 384---Succession certificate---Object, scope and purpose---Logic behind S.381 of Succession Act, 1925, is to enable a person to recover debts on estate of a deceased but the certificate issued for the purpose neither declares rights of persons interested, nor determine their shares in recoverable debt---Issuance of certificate is with sole purpose to protect party paying debt to holder of certificate---Duty is imposed on holder of certificate to disburse amount realized under certificate among persons entitled, in accordance with their respective rights---Certificate issued under Succession Act, 1925, does not confer any title upon a person but only enables him to recover debts.

[Bookmark this Case](#)

constituted in the year 1959 and the property in question have been purchased by the deceased in his name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using two different names and known as Abdul Ghafoor as well as Abdul Ghaffar.

**Citation Name:** 2015 CLC 1719 QUETTA HIGH COURT-BALOCHISTAN

On the other hand, the learned Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Mst. AISHA VS Mst. MAH GUL Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed PLD 1991 SC 731 between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972.

Ss. 381 & 384---Succession certificate---Determining right in legacy---Trial Court, jurisdiction of---Appellants were mother, brother and sister of deceased who claimed their shares in the outstanding dues with government Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not department---Trial Court issued succession certificate to widow of deceased for collection of dues of deceased from dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of firms and from the evidence of the said certificate it appears that the appeal cannot pressurized through a suit and to recover amount received on the basis of such certificate to the extent of her share in the business of Trial Court in the present case, without discussing nature of dues and fact that either it covered legacy of deceased and entitlement of parties before it, ordered to exclude claim of appellants (legal heirs) decided that widow was solely and lonely entitled to receive and encash dues of her late husband and appellants (legal heirs) did not deserve to receive any share out of the dues of deceased--- High Court set aside such findings of Trial Court which erred while recording findings and the same could not hold the field---High Court modified the order passed by Trial Court--- These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.

[Read Notes](#) [Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 2015 PLD 132 QUETTA-HIGH-COURT-BALOCHISTAN

[Bookmark this Case](#)

HIFEEZA VS GENERAL PUBLIC

Interpretation and determination--Term , Jurisdiction of court--Term , Succession Act 1925--372 , Succession Act 1925--384 , Succession Act 1925--5 ,

Ss. 5(2), 372 & 384---Application for succession certificate---Appeal under S.384 of Succession Act, 1925 against dismissal of application for certificate---Jurisdiction of court---"Domicile"---Interpretation and determination---

Deceased was temporarily residing out of country and claimed amount lying there---Competent forum---Application for issuance of succession certificate, was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction on ground that predecessor was domiciled of a foreign country and amount claimed was lying abroad---Applicants contended that their predecessor was permanent resident to Pakistan and had gone abroad to earn livelihood where he wa**Bookmark this Case**

Validity---Applicants and their predecessor were permanent residents of Pakistan---Correct criteria for issuance of succession certificate was domicile of the deceased at time of his death---Nothing was available on record that could show that the deceased had intended to abandon Pakistan for ever---Trial court while dismissing application filed under S.372 of Succession Act, 1925, had erred in facts and law while interpreting the word 'domicile'---Word 'domicile' had not been defined in Succession Act, 1925---In ordinary meaning 'domicile' meant the place where a man has his permanent abode and the court held that the appellants had failed to prove that the deceased was a permanent resident of Pakistan at the time of his death---The learned advocate for the respondent argued that the deceased had no right to claim succession in the name of his wife as she was not a member of the partnership firm.

**Head Notes** **Case Description** **Bookmark this Case**   
which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity

**Citation Name:** 2012 CLC 1776 LAHORE-HIGH-COURT-LAHORE

**Bookmark this Case** 

**MUHAMMAD NASEEM AHMAD VS Mst. SHAMA KHATOON**  
Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Ss. 192, 372 & 384---Central Employees Benevolent Fund and Group Insurance Act (II of 1969) S.2(5)---Properties Authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of forming part of deceased's "Tarka" --- "Family" scope of---Recovery of final "service dues" ---Benevolent fund and the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the group insurance---Widow of deceased filed application for issuance of succession certificate in her favour, in respect of final "service dues" of the deceased---Contention of the appellant was that the applicant/widow had not disclosed all legal heirs of the deceased in her application, as the deceased was survived by a wife and daughters, therefore, his brothers and sisters were also legal heirs---Validity---Amounts claimed by the wife in the Succession Application were basically death benefits of the deceased which he could not claim during his lifetime and thus the same did not form part of his "Tarka", and therefore, the same were not divisible among all legal heirs of the deceased-Amount in question, was therefore not inheritable by all his legal heirs, and was to be paid to the family of the deceased for their sustenance and maintenance---Case of the appellant was not that either he or any brothers/sisters of the deceased were residing with the deceased or were wholly dependent on him, therefore, they did not come within the ambit of

**M.H./C-82/K** Appeal dismissed  
These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.  
For the aforesaid reason of the appeal has no merit and the same was dismissed and hence  
Appeal was dismissed, in circumstances.

**Head Notes**

**Case Description**

**Citation Name:** 2012 CLC 1776 LAHORE-HIGH-COURT-LAHORE

**Bookmark this Case** 

NASIM BEGUM VS FARAH ABSAR

Maintainability--TERM , Revision--TERM , Succession Act 1925--383 , Succession Act 1925--384 , Succession Certificate--TERM ,

Ss. 384 & 383--- Succession certificate--- Revision---Maintainability---Application of the respondent-Bank for amendment in its written reply in relation to the Bank Account of the deceased was allowed by the Trial Court---Said order of Trial Court was assailed by the petitioners---Contention of the respondent Bank was that revision against said order was not maintainable---Validity---Proceedings under the Succession Act, 1925, even if carried out by Civil Court, were always deemed to be proceedings before the District Judge---Right of appeal was available under section 384(1) of the Succession Act, 1925 in cases of granting , refusing or revoking of ~~Bookmarked this Case~~  
virtue of section 383(3) the High Court was provided the right to entertain revision from an order of District Judge in ~~constituted in the year 1932 and the property in question have been purchased by the deceased in his cases other than the ones mentioned in section 384(1), Succession Act, 1925--Revision was therefore, competent.~~  
name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using two different names and known as Abdul Ghafoor as well as Abdul Ghaffar.

On the other hand, the learned Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial ~~Citation Name: 2011 PLD 108 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH~~  
~~Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974~~  
~~Bookmark this Case~~  
which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972. Deceased husband of applicant who was residing at place, K had left movable and immovable properties at K as well as at place K---Earlier, a succession certificate was granted application filed at place K. Knowledge application for grant of Letter of Administration for immovable property left by the deceased at place L was dismissed and that property in question was situated at place L and applicant should approach the court having jurisdiction---Under S 371 of Succession Act, 1925 jurisdiction lay with the court where the deceased ordinarily resided---In the present case succession certificate had already been granted by the court at place K which established that the deceased resided at place K at the time of the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the firm on 31-7-1972 and no justification was available for the court at place K to dismiss the application for grant of Letter of Administration in respect of the property left by the deceased at place L---Impugned order was set aside and court Firms on 30-10-1972.

~~Head Notes~~ ~~Case Description~~  
For the foregoing reasons the appeal has not merits and the same was dismissed in limine.

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003  
**Citation Name:** 2010 MLD 1433 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH

**Bookmark this Case**

~~MUHAMMAD SOMA~~ Appellant vs Mst. PARVEEN alias MUNNI

1985 MLD 1559, 1990 CLC 366, 1999 MLD 1481,

Succession Act 1925-278 , Succession Act 1925-299 , Succession Act 1925-372 , Succession Act 1925-384 , West Pakistan Civil Courts Ordinance 1962--9 ,

Ss. 278, 299, 372 & 384---West Pakistan Civil Courts Ordinance (II of 1962), S.9---Succession certificate and Letter of Administration--Consolidation of proceedings--Pecuniary jurisdiction--Two separate proceedings were initiated one for grant of succession certificate and the other for Letters of Administration in respect of immovable property---Both the proceedings were consolidated and by adding up the value of immovable property, rash and saving certificates, the Trial Court concluded that the pecuniary jurisdiction of two subject-matters had exceeded its pecuniary jurisdiction and the same was returned for presentation in High Court---Validity of Succession Certificate was meant for movable property i.e. debts and securities and Letters of Administration for immovable property---Succession of immovable property was regulated by Law of country in which person had his domicile at the time of his death and succession of immovable property in Pakistan of a person deceased was regulated by Law of Pakistan wherever such person might have had his domicile at the time of his death---Grant of Succession Certificate and Letter of Administration were not only governed by separate sections but under separate Chapters under Succession Act 1925 or Partnership of Administration under S.278 of Succession Act 1925 Messrs. Chaudhry & Taseer stood as counsel for administration of assets belonging to deceased which were likely to come to petitioner's hand whereas Succession Certificate which was granted to petitioner under S.372 of Succession Act 1925, was made in respect of debts and securities left by deceased---Application for Succession Certificate could be made in respect of debt or debts due to between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward deceased creditor or in respect of portions thereof which implied that more than one applications for grant of Succession Certificate could be made---Legal heir could make a consolidated claim by including assets and debts of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972 and securities in the same application and if resultantly the valuation had exceeded amount of Rupees Thirty Lacs, the same would have been filed before High Court---Such was true for Karachi only where pecuniary jurisdiction of District Judge had been limited to Rupees thirty lacs and above and in other provinces like Lahore, Multan, Dera Ismail Khan, etc. the jurisdiction of District Judge was limited to Rs. 100/- and above---High Court set aside the order dated 8-4-1972 and Trial Court was directed to hear the matter for final judgment. Application was accordingly dismissed and speedily in accordance with law. Appeal was allowed accordingly.

Authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the firm on 31-7-1972 and the entry in this regard was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of the Firm on 30-10-1972.

[Bookmark this Case](#)

**ASAD SHAUKAT VS Major (Retd) ZAFAR SHAUKAT**  
For the foregoing reasons the appeal has no merits and the same was dismissed in limine.

Appeal--TERM , Succession Act 1925--384 ,

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.

S.384---Appeal--Auction of property--Property offered to appellant having a preferential right to purchase same---Failure of appellant to deposit bid money by specified date---Sale of property to highest bidder through registered deed---Validity---Impugned order showed that appellant had never been ready to make payment of bid money nor he wanted to resolve dispute, but tried to keep same alive till last moment--Appellant sought three months' time for payment of bid money, but had not yet deposited a single penny in Court to show his bona fides to purchase property---Court had sold out property due to such conduct of appellant---Appeal could lie from order of District Judge granting or revoking certificate of sale---By virtue of impugned order, neither certificate had been granted nor revoked---High Court dismissed appeal in limine.

[Head Notes](#)

[Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 2005 MLD 762 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH

[Bookmark this Case](#)

Mst. ANWAR BEGUM VS ABDUL KHALIQ

Succession Act 1925--299 , Succession Act 1925--384 ,

---Ss. 299 & 384---Issuance of letters of administration---Modification and alteration of letters of administration---Initially letters of administration in respect of properties and assets of deceased were allowed in favour of appellant who was widow of deceased, but subsequently on filing application by respondent under S. 12(2), C.P.C. letters of administration granted to appellant were modified to the extent of one Bank account of the deceased---Respondent had claimed that said Bank account was not personal account of the deceased, but was part and parcel of partnership business---Certificate issued by the Bank had clearly shown that said Bank account [Bookmark this Case](#) of deceased---Disputed Bank account having been fully established as personal account of deceased and not covered constituted in the year 1959 and the property in question have been purchased by the deceased in his by alleged partnership of deceased and respondents, no legal impediment existed including said account number in name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using the letters of administration issued in favour of the appellant---High Court allowing appeal directed that disputed two different names and known as Abdul Ghaffoor as well as Abdul Ghaffar personal account of deceased be included in letters of administration issued in favour of appellant.

**Head Notes** [Case Description](#) Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed **Citation Name:** 2004 YLR 1244 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH [Bookmark this Case](#) between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward [Shareen Bano vs. D.U. Central](#) the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972. 1999 CLC 806, PLD 1991 SC 731, PLD 1994 Kar. 237,

**Succession Act 1925--371 Succession Act 1925--384** Any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Authority. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the [firm on 31-7-1972](#) and the entry in this regard was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of the Firms on 30-10-1972.

**Citation Name:** 2003 MLD 1772 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH [Bookmark this Case](#) For the foregoing reasons the appeal has not merits and the same was dismissed in limine.

Messrs COMMERCIAL TEXTILE PRINTERS VS MUHAMMAD YASIN

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.  
Appeal--TERM , Succession Act 1925--384 ,

--[M.YAC](#)--Appeal letter of administration, grant of---Appellant was brother of deceased owner of the suit property--Appellant claimed to be partner in the property in question as the same was a partnership concern---Respondents alleged that the partnership concern stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of partnership---Further contention was that out of four partners, except the appellant, none had come forward to question the ownership of the property---Validity---Appellant had not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution--Such facts could have been established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Authorities--Respondents had produced certificate issued by the Registrar of Firms according to which the appellant had retired from the firm---Entry regarding retirement of appellant was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of the Firms---High Court declined to interfere with the Letter of Administration, issued in favour of the respondents---Appeal was dismissed in circumstances.

**Head Notes** [Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 2000 CLC 585 LAHORE-HIGH-COURT-LAHORE [Bookmark this Case](#)

RUKHSANA KAUSAR VS ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE KHANEWAL

Succession Act 1925--384 ,

Ss. 37, 373 & 384---Succession Certificate, issuance of ---Procedure---Only a summary procedure is provided for issuance of Succession Certificate under S.373 of Succession Act, 1925---If any person wants a detailed determination of rights, remedy lies in shape of suit filed under S.37, Succession Act, 1925---Where a person is dissatisfied or aggrieved by issuance of a Succession Certificate, and appeal under S.384, Succession Act, 1925 lies.

[Bookmark this Case](#)

[Head Notes](#) [Case Description](#)  
 constituted in the year 1959 and the property in question have been purchased by the deceased in his name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using two different names and also PESHAWAR HIGH COURT well as Abdul Ghaffar.

[Bookmark this Case](#)

**Citation Name:** 1997 SLN 140 PESHAWAR HIGH COURT  
**UMAR FAROOQ SHAH VS SHAGUFTA NASREEN**  
 On the other hand, the learned Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial Textile stand dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed Succession Act 1925 Ss. 384 & 388---Provisions of Ss.384 & 388, Succession Act, 1925 were not in consonance between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward with each other in respect of forum of appeal when succession certificate was granted/not granted by any Court to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972. Provisions of Ss.384 & 388 of the Act compared and explained.

[Head Notes](#) [Case Description](#)  
 Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of

**MUHAMMAD HASAN MUSHTAQ VS HAMID JAVED** It appears that the appellant has retired from the firm on 31-7-1972 and the entry in this regard was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of the Succession Act 1925--384 , Firms on 30-10-1972.

Succession Act 1925 S. 384---Letter of Administration relating to movable property of deceased---Validity---Appellant and respondents both being heirs of deceased were issued succession certificates jointly. Letters of Administration were issued to appellants, but were refused to be issued in favour of respondents for the fact that schedule of property was not attached with their application---Letter of Administration issued to respondents subsequently on submission of schedule of property in question, without notice to appellants was valid, in spite of the fact that such notice should have been issued---Issuance of joint letter of , administration to both parties had caused no prejudice to petitioners.

To the foregoing reasons the appeal has no merits and the same was dismissed in prime. These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.

M.H.G-82/K Appeal dismissed.

[Head Notes](#) [Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 1994 PLD 373 LAHORE-HIGH-COURT-LAHORE

[Bookmark this Case](#)

**MUHAMMAD MUSHTAQ VS PUBLIC-AT-LARGE**

Succession Act 1925--384 , Succession Act 1925--388 ,

---Ss. 384 & 388---Punjab Government Notification No.781, dated 17-7-1914--Succession Certificate---Appeal against rejection of application for grant of Succession Certificate---Forum---Order within meaning of S.384, Succession Act, 1925 was passed by a Court inferior to that of District Judge---Forum of appeal---Where any order was passed by a Court subordinate to District Judge, then an appeal from that order granting, refusing or revoking a Succession Certificate by such Court would lie to the District Judge and not to the High Court---Punjab Government Notification No.781 dated 17-7-1914, had invested the subordinate Judges of the first [Bookmark this Case](#), functions of a District Court---Regardless of the limits of pecuniary jurisdiction, any order passed under the delegated authority under S.388, Succession Act, 1925, by a Civil Judge was susceptible to an appeal to the District Judge and name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using not directly to the High Court---Appeal against order of Civil Judge having been directly filed before High court was returned for its presentation to the Court of competent jurisdiction. [Appeal (CIV)].

[Head Notes](#) [Case Description](#) Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward [Bookmark this Case](#)

**Citation Name:** 1992 CLC 2515 LAHORE-HIGH-COURT-LAHORE

**HAMIDA BEGUM VS HUSSAIN A KHATR** property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972. Succession Act 1925-384 ,

**Succession Act 1925 Ss 384 & 388 - Procedure Code (Act of 1908) S. 115 - Revision before High Court - Competency - Petitioner's application before Trial Court was not only confined to revocation of succession certificate which had earlier been granted to respondent but was also for issuance of same in her name in place of the one issued in favour of respondent -- Trial Court's impugned order was thus also an order refusing to grant succession Authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of certificate to petitioner --- Such order was, therefore, appealable under S.384, Succession Act, 1925--Revision against the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the order passed by District Judge in appeal was thus competent.**

firm on 31-7-1972 and the entry in this regard was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of the

[Head Notes](#) [Case Description](#)

For the foregoing reasons the appeal has not merits and the same was dismissed in limine.

**Citation Name:** 1988 MLD 1270 KARACHI-HIGH-COURT-SINDH

[Bookmark this Case](#)

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003  
SA. MASUD AHMAD VS KARACHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

**Succession Act 1925-384**  
M.H.C-829 Appeal dismissed.

----Ss.372 & 384--Succession Certificate--Succession Certificate to receive group insurance amount refused to appellant by District Judge on ground that appellant had failed to establish his entitlement--No denial coming from respondent or anybody else as to relationship between appellant and deceased as averred in application--Nobody had come forward in response to public notice--Question whether application of appellant for issue of succession certificate could have been denied in absence of finding that there was some other relation of deceased, had not been looked into by District Judge--Case remanded to District Judge with direction to dispose of application for issuance of Succession Certificate afresh after hearing parties on the above aspect after giving opportunity to produce further evidence, if any.

[Head Notes](#) [Case Description](#)

**Citation Name:** 1974 PLD 74 PESHAWAR-HIGH-COURT

[Bookmark this Case](#)

NAIM JAN QAZI VS MST. WAZIRZADGAI

Succession Act 1925-384 ,

Ss. 383 & 384-Succession certificate, revocation of-Applicant under S. 383 simply praying that succession certificate be revoked--On petition being dismissed prayer made in appeal that order refusing revocation be vacated and additionally appellants themselves be declared as competent to receive certificate-Held: Such additional relief cannot be granted by appellate Court ; "General or other relief" mentioned in r. 7, O. VII, C. P. C. is one which ensues from relief specially stated in plaint-Civil Procedure Code (V of 1908), O. VII, r. 7.

[Bookmark this Case](#) 

[Head Notes](#) [Case Description](#)

constituted in the year 1959 and the property in question have been purchased by the deceased in his name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using two different names and known as Abdul Ghafoor as well as Abdul Ghaffar.

[Read More](#)

On the other hand, the learned Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972.

[PCrLJ Notes](#)

Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement [Journals](#) accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the firm on 31-7-1972 and the entry in this regard was duly recorded in the [Office](#) of the Registrar of the Firms on 30-10-1972.

[CLD](#)

[PTD](#)

For the foregoing reasons the appeal has not merits and the same was dismissed [PLG](#) in limine.

[CLC](#)

[YLR](#)

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.

[PCrLJ](#)

[GBLR](#)

M.H./C-82/K Appeal dismissed.

### Miscellaneous

- > [Circulars](#)
- > [General Orders](#)
- > [Notifications](#)

### New Statutes

- > [Federal](#)
- > [Punjab](#)

[KPK](#)[Balochistan](#)[Sindh](#)

## Case Description

[Bookmark this Case](#) 

constituted in the year 1959 and the property in question have been purchased by the deceased in his name from the income derived by the partnership firm. He next argued that the deceased was using two different names and known as Abdul Ghafoor as well as Abdul Ghaffar.

Copyrights © 2025 by Oratier Technologies (Pvt.) Ltd. ([oratier.tech](http://oratier.tech))  
This site is developed & maintained Oratier Technologies (Pvt.) Ltd. ([oratier.tech](http://oratier.tech))

On the other hand, the learned Advocate for the respondent argued that the firm Messrs Commercial Textile stood dissolved vide deed of dissolution of the partnership dated 1-8-1974, the authenticity of which has been questioned by the appellant. The alleged partnership dated 1-1-1969 was executed between four brothers including appellant and except the appellant no other partner has come forward to question the ownership of the property owned by the deceased and/or to question the authenticity of the deed of dissolution of the partnership firm dated 1-8-1972.

Before us the appellant has not produced any document to show that the partnership was not dissolved on 1-8-1972 and was carrying on business after the date of dissolution. The said facts can be easily established by producing statement of accounts and/or return submitted to Income Tax Authorities. The learned Advocate for the respondent produced certificate issued by the Registrar of the Firm and from the perusal of the said certificate it appears that the appellant has retired from the firm on 31-7-1972 and the entry in this regard was duly recorded in the Office of the Registrar of the Firms on 30-10-1972.

For the foregoing reasons the appeal has not merits and the same was dismissed in limine.

These are the reasons of our short order dated 30-4-2003.

M.H./C-82/K Appeal dismissed.