ORDER SHEET

Civil Revision Application No.18 of 2014

Date Order with signature of Judge

Present: Mr. Justice Nazar Akbar

Applicant : Abdul Fateh Bhumbro,

Through Mr. Nazir Ahmed Shah, advocate.

<u>Versus</u>

Respondent : Muhammad Yaseen. (Nemo).

Date of hearing : **07.02.2020**

Date of judgment : **21.02.2020**

JUDGMENT

NAZAR AKBAR, J: This Revision Application is directed against the concurrent findings. The Ist Senior Civil Judge, Malir Karachi by judgment dated **26.09.2011** decreed civil suit No.285/2004 filed by the Respondent and the Ist Additional District Judge, Malir Karachi by judgment dated **17.12.2013** dismissed civil appeal No.67 of 2011 preferred by the applicant against the said judgment and maintained the findings of the trial Court.

2. To be very precise the facts of the case are that The Respondent/ Plaintiff filed a civil suit against the applicant/ Defendant for specific performance of contract and permanent injunction stating therein that by way of agreement of sale dated **3.08.2003**, the applicant agreed to sell the property i.e residential ground floor on plot No.A6/1227, Gulshan-e-Hadeed, Phase-II, Karachi (the suit property) to the Respondent/ Plaintiff for total sale consideration of Rs.600,000/-. It was further averred that the Respondent/Plaintiff paid Rs.5,50,000/- on **26.10.2003** as agreed

between the parties in sale agreement and possession of the suit property was handed over to him. It was further averred that on **01.11.2003** the Respondent/ Plaintiff approached the applicant/ Defendant and requested him to receive the balance amount of Rs.50,000/- and transfer/convey the suit property in his name but the applicant/Defendant avoided to perform his part of contract to transfer the suit property in the name of the Respondent/Plaintiff. Therefore, the Respondent/Plaintiff had filed the said suit for specific performance of contract and permanent injunction.

- 3. After service of notice, Applicant/Defendant filed his written statement wherein he contended that no such agreement was signed between the parties and the said agreement is bogus and managed by the Respondent/Plaintiff. He further contended that he has given possession of the suit property to the Respondent/Plaintiff for temporary residence on a request of a state agent namely Ali Associates subject to deposit certain amount for security purpose which was refundable whenever the Respondent/Plaintiff gets his own house. He further contended that the said Ali Associates has got four signatures from the Respondent/Plaintiff on blank paper in good faith he has signed the same. The said Ali Associate had given assurance to the applicant/Defendant that if the Respondent/Plaintiff failed to purchase new house, then the amount of Rs.265,000/- may be adjusted by the applicant/Defendant as rent.
- 4. The trial Court after framing issues, recording evidence and hearing learned counsel for the parties, decreed the suit filed by the Respondent by Judgment dated **26.09.2011**. The applicant/ Defendant preferred civil appeal No.67/2011 against the said judgment which was dismissed by the appellate Court by judgment

dated 17.12.2013. The applicant/Defendant has impugned both the

concurrent findings herein this civil Revision Application.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant and perused the

record as well as written arguments filed by him.

6. Learned counsel for the applicant has reiterated his

contentions which have been discussed in the impugned orders. The

Respondent has claimed possession under agreement of sale and

very payment of Rs.5,50,000/- which he has accounted for in the

plaint and produced all receipts in evidence. The applicant has not

denied payment of total money through Ali Associates containing his

signatures and has not denied receipts filed by the Respondent

alongwith his plaint. However there was no rent agreement and he

himself has not produced any rent receipt in case of default since

2003 against the respondent. Not only this applicant has not even

filed suit for recovery of possession declaration and cancellation of

sale agreement which has come in his hand through the plaint way

back in 2004 when he filed written statement. Both the Courts below

on the basis of the evidence of the applicant himself has come to the

conclusion that the case of appellant/respondent for specific

performance is made out since he was in possession and agreement

of payment has been established by him.

7. In view of the above, both the Courts below have rightly

decreed the suit of the Respondent and no case is made out for

interference by this Court in revisional jurisdiction. Therefore, instant

Revision Application is dismissed.

JUDGE