

**“Fast Forward Justice and Law Audience’s 1st
National Online-Cum-Offline Judgement Writing
Competition-2026”**

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL CIVIL JUDGE
(SENIOR DIVISION), NARAYANPUR

Civil Suit No. 312 of 2026

Ananya Sharma & Others

...Plaintiffs

Versus

Rohit Sharma

...Defendant

FACTS OF THE CASE:

1. **Late. Mr. Mahesh Sharma**, aged 72 years, was a retired government officer and permanent resident of Narayanpur. He was the absolute owner of a residential house, two agricultural lands, and certain bank deposits and mutual fund investments.
2. Mr. Mahesh Sharma died on 18 June 2024, leaving behind four legal heirs—three daughters, **Ananya Sharma, Meera Sharma, and Kavita Sharma** (the Plaintiffs), and one son, **Rohit Sharma** (the Defendant).
3. The Plaintiffs contend that during his lifetime, their father repeatedly expressed his intention to **divide his properties equally** among all his children and had cordial relations with all of them.
4. On 25 July 2024, the Defendant produced an **unregistered Will dated 12 May 2024**, allegedly executed by Late Mr. Mahesh Sharma, bequeathing **the entire movable and immovable property exclusively to the Defendant**, while making no provision for the Plaintiffs.
5. The Defendant applied for **probate** of the said Will before the competent court, claiming that the Will was duly executed in the presence of two attesting witnesses and that the testator was in a sound state of mind.

“Fast Forward Justice and Law Audience’s 1st National Online-Cum-Offline Judgement Writing Competition-2026”

6. The Plaintiffs filed objections to the probate application, alleging that the Will is **forged, fabricated, and surrounded by suspicious circumstances**, including:
 - o The Will was executed barely a month before the death of the testator, who was suffering from serious age-related ailments;
 - o The testator’s signature on the Will does not resemble his admitted signatures on official records;
 - o The Will was allegedly discovered in the exclusive custody of the Defendant;
 - o No reasons have been assigned in the Will for **disinheriting the daughters**.
7. The Plaintiffs further allege that the Defendant had **exclusive access and control** over the testator during his final months and exercised undue influence over him.
8. The Defendant denies all allegations and contends that:
 - o The Will reflects the **true and voluntary intention** of the testator;
 - o The Plaintiffs were financially well-settled and married, whereas the Defendant took care of the testator during his illness;
 - o Registration of a Will is **not mandatory under law**.
9. During trial, one attesting witness supported the Defendant’s case, while the other witness turned hostile. A handwriting expert submitted a report stating that the signatures on the Will show **significant variation** from admitted signatures but stopped short of conclusively terming them forged.
10. The Trial Court dismissed the objections and allowed the probate, holding that the Will had been duly proved. Aggrieved by the said order, the Plaintiffs have filed the present **civil suit challenging the validity of the Will**.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION:

1. Whether the Will dated 12 May 2024 was duly executed and proved in accordance with law.
2. Whether the Will is surrounded by **suspicious circumstances** sufficient to invalidate it.
3. Whether exclusion of natural heirs without recorded reasons creates a presumption against the genuineness of the Will.

“Fast Forward Justice and Law Audience’s 1st National Online-Cum-Offline Judgement Writing Competition-2026”

4. What is the **evidentiary value** of a handwriting expert's opinion in cases of alleged forged Wills.
5. Whether undue influence or coercion can be inferred from the facts and conduct of the Defendant.

PRAYER:

The Plaintiffs respectfully pray that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to:

- a) Declare the Will dated 12 May 2024 as **null and void**;
- b) Set aside the probate granted in favour of the Defendant;
- c) Direct distribution of the estate of Late Mr. Mahesh Sharma in accordance with the law of intestate succession;
- d) Pass any other order(s) as deemed fit in the interest of justice.

NOTE FOR PARTICIPANTS:

- Applicable laws include the **Indian Succession Act, 1925** and the **Indian Evidence Act, 1872**.
- Participants may rely on judicial precedents relating to proof of Wills and suspicious circumstances.
- Any factual ambiguity may be resolved through judicial reasoning.

Note:

Please submit only one judgement, it is not a moot competition.