

Powers Of Collector Stayed, Non-Muslims On Boards Limited: Waqf Case Recap

New Delhi Sept. 15 (UNI): The Supreme Court temporarily halted key provisions in the federal government's contentious new Waqf laws, including one demanding potential donors be a 'practicing Muslim' for five years and another nominating non-Muslim individuals to federal and state Waqf boards. The third halted provision granted District Collectors sweeping powers to decide if a property can be considered waqf; "the Collector cannot be permitted to adjudicate the rights of personal citizens, and this will violate the separation of powers..." the Supreme Court ruled. A bench of Chief Justice BR Gavai and Justice AG Masih said these provisions would lead to an 'arbitrary exercise of power', and paused them till pleas challenging the constitutional validity of amendments to laws governing Waqf, i.e., charitable donations by Muslims, are settled. But the court refused to stay a requirement for registration of waqf properties; the judges reasoned this aspect was present in law before it was amended but never enforced. Petitioners challenging waqf law changes had argued implementing this now would discount 'waqf by user' properties, i.e., those claimed by historical possession rather than documentary evidence. "We have held registration existed since 1995 to 2013... and again now. So we have held registration is not new," the Chief Justice said as he dictated an early interim order. In April the court said it initially consider arguments on these points - the 'waqf

by user' clause, non-Muslims on waqf boards, and status of disputed properties - before the interim order. **What Is Waqf Bill** In August last year a proposal to amend 44 sections of the Waqf Act of 1955 - with the stated aim of better managing waqf properties, which refer to land set aside, under Islamic law, for religious or charitable purposes - was tabled in Parliament, and kick-started a legal and political row, which included violent protests in parts of the country and three deaths in Bengal. Apart from the 'five-year' rule and nominating non-Muslim members to each Waqf board, other proposals included appointing a Union Minister and persons of 'national repute' to the boards and allowing a District Collector the final word on issues related to waqf property ownership. The proposals were sent to a joint committee - and more drama followed, including opposition MPs accusing the committee chair, Jagdambika Pal of the BJP, of ignoring their views, and the Trinamool's Kalyan Banerjee actually smashing a glass bottle on the table (and cutting himself). The BJP refuted claims of manipulation; panel member Aparajita Sarangi said Mr Pal "tried to hear everybody out and gave sufficient time for everybody to move amendments..." The committee eventually greenlit 14 changes, all of which were made by the BJP, and the amendments became law in April this year, after yet more stormy face-offs in both Houses. **Waqf Bill In Supreme Court**

After the bill was passed several petitioners, including Muslim religious groups, individuals, and political leaders, challenged the constitutional validity of the law and its provisions. They argued the amendments undermined the rights of Muslims - as laid out in the Constitution. In response, there were petitions filed - some by BJP MPs - in support of the amendments. In April the Supreme Court clubbed some of these and discarded the other, noting the sheer volume of petitions filed made it "impossible to deal with..." The government was given a week to file a reply and told the court would not 'trespass into the domain of the legislature', and that the separation of powers had been made clear by the Constitution. However, as the final arbiter on issues involving the Constitution, the Supreme Court agreed to hear petitioners who insisted that the changed Waqf laws trampled fundamental rights, including the right to equality and the right to pursue religious practices. **Waqf Case Supreme Court: 'Waqf By User'** In early hearings senior advocate Kapil Sibal argued that many of these provisions violate Article 26 of the Constitution, which guarantees the freedom to manage religious affairs. Specifically, the 'waqf-by-user' clause attracted spirited legal discussions, with Mr Sibal pointing out it is unreasonable to want documented proof of ownership for historical structures; "The problem is, if a waqf was created 3,000 years

ago, they will ask for the deed," he said. But the court then pointed to various reports about modern government buildings being claimed as 'waqf', including the ground on which the Delhi High Court stands. "We are not saying all waqf by user is wrong, but there is genuine concern..." then-Chief Justice Sanjiv Khanna said. Solicitor-General Tushar Mehta, appearing for the government, rebutted by pointing to cases of fraud and protracted legal tussles over encroachment. Proper legal ownership needs to be demonstrated rather than simply recognising waqf purely on long-term usage, Mr Mehta said. But the court countered by asking, "How will you register such 'waqfs by user'... what documents will they have? Yes... there is some misuse. But there are genuine ones too. 'Waqf by user' is recognised. If you undo it, then it will be a problem," then-Chief Justice Khanna said. The government then told the court no waqf property would be denotified till the court ruling. In its interim orders Monday, the 'waqf by user' point was not deleted or halted, but the court granted temporary protection to such properties. The court ruled the government could not alter the status of disputed waqf property immediately, and had to first approach a waqf tribunal. The tribunal's decision can then be challenged in the High Court. **Waqf Case Supreme Court: Non-Muslim Members** The composition of waqf boards has been a huge

flashpoint in this matter. In April then-Chief Justice Khanna asked the government a pointed question - "... are you saying you will allow Muslims to be part of Hindu endowment boards?" The government had said nominating women and Muslims from different sects would promote gender equality and ensure representation from across the spectrum of Islam. On nomination of non-Muslim members the government said it would bring 'oversight' to board operations. Mr Sibal, however, repeated what the court had asked earlier; pointing to Hindu and Sikh religious bodies, he said, "... not a single person is a Muslim or non-Hindu" and complained the revised constitution of the Central Waqf Council would make Muslims a minority. Senior advocate Huzefa Ahmadi asked how someone could be identified as a 'practising Muslim' to fulfil the criterion under the new law. "Can someone ask me,



do you pray five times a day... and then someone will ask me if I drink... is that how it will be judged?" The petitioners also argued that nominating women to waqf boards is a 'token' act since actual decision-making power would be vested with political appointees. The government, meanwhile, argued that waqfs are not a religious pre-requisite of Islam and, therefore, regulation does not violate religious freedom. Solicitor General Mehta argued that since waqf boards discharge only secular functions 'having non-Muslims won't change anything'.

In its interim order the court did not eliminate the provision to appoint non-Muslims, but limited the number to three of 11 members on state waqf boards and four of 22 in the central council. **Waqf Case Supreme Court: 'Practicing Muslim' Rule** The rule for potential donors to be 'practicing Muslims' for five years has been stayed fully, representing a big win for the petitioners. The court red-flagged potential abuse of power in this case, and called for a discussion on framing of rules to establish a person's

religiosity. Across hearings in April and May various petitioners had criticised this amendment, arguing it runs completely counter to the idea of India as a secular nation. Senior advocate Rajeev Dhawan, appearing for one such petitioner, said. "One of my clients is a Sikh... he says, 'I want to contribute to waqf... the question also goes to the root of secularism.'" "Endowments are there in every religion. Which religious endowment asks you to prove you have been practising it? Who asks for 'proof of religion'?" senior advocate Abhishek Singhvi asked.

BMW driver took Navjot Singh to Hospital 19 Km Away. Reason: Father Owns It

New Delhi Sept. 15 (UNI): In a crucial development in the Delhi BMW crash case, police have found that the hospital where central government officer Navjot Singh was taken to after he was seriously injured in the accident was co-owned by the family of the accused, Gaganpreet. Navjot Singh (52), a Deputy Secretary in the Department of Economic Affairs under the Union Finance Ministry,

died yesterday after a BMW hit his two-wheeler near the Delhi Cantonment metro station. Mr Singh and his wife, Sandeep Kaur, were returning from Bangla Sahib Gurdwara when the crash took place. The BMW was being driven by Gaganpreet and her husband, Parikshit, was in the car. The couple took Navjot and Sandeep to a Nulife Hospital in GTB Nagar, about 19 km from the accident spot. This raised questions: why would they

not rush the injured to the nearest hospital? It has now emerged that Nulife Hospital is co-owned by Gaganpreet's family. Her father is among the three partners who own it, according to sources. The couple was rushed to Nulife Hospital in a Maruti Eeco porter car. Gulfam, the driver, said he spotted Navjot and Sandeep at the crash site and rushed to help. The injured couple and Gaganpreet got into the car and she asked

Gulfam to drive towards Azadpur. "Over the phone, she was asking someone to keep beds ready," he told. Asked why he did not drive to the nearest hospital, Gulfam said, "I did not know the area well, so I went where I was told to. It took us half an hour to reach the hospital." Earlier, Navjot Singh's son, Navnoor Singh, told that his father may have survived if he had been rushed to a nearby hospital. "Time is critical.

"He Was Due For Promotion In 6 Months": BMW Crash Victim's Father



New Delhi Sept. 15 (UNI): Retired Flying Officer Balwant Singh - father of the finance ministry official mowed down by a BMW --- said his son was a careful and cautious driver and had recently got the Triumph motorbike he was riding that day. "I cannot believe that my son is no more... He was to get promoted in six months' time... Everything is over," he said. Navjot Singh, working as Deputy Secretary in the Finance Ministry, died on Sunday after his bike was hit by a speeding BMW car near south Delhi's Dhaura Kuan. He and his wife were

on way home from Gurdwara Bangla Sahib. The BMW was being driven by a woman named Gaganpreet. She and her husband, who was also in the car, took the couple to a nursing home that belongs to her father and located over 19 km away. The official's son has questioned why his father was taken so far, contending that had he been taken to a super-specialty hospital located closer, his life could have been saved. Balwant Singh said his son was fond of riding a bike sometimes. ""He used to

ride a bike sometimes, his hobby was to ride bikes. Recently I bought a Triumph bike for him, worth Rs 3.2 lakh... Earlier he had a Royal Enfield. He used to ride the bike very gracefully on the road," he said. He was on the Triumph the day he died. Navjot Singh was a promising officer in the ministry, who was in charge of the work done by the UNDP (United Nations Development Program) in the country. A seasoned traveller, he was involved with other international projects in the ministry and had recently met the World Bank chief

Ajay Banga. "My son was a topper from the beginning. He was to be promoted after six months. He used to ride a bike very well, yet I lost him," Balwant Singh said. **"My Father Did Not Get Proper Treatment"** The accident happened on Sunday afternoon between 1 and 1:30 pm. Navjot Singh's son Navnoor said he had called his parents after he returned from a friend's house, "but they did not pick up". "After some time, an acquaintance called to say that my father had met with an accident. I do not understand why he was taken to New Life Hospital in GTB Nagar, 20 km away, instead of a big hospital nearby," he said. **Questions Raised About Hospital** Navjot Singh's family alleges that after the accident, the injured were taken to the hospital in a delivery van instead of an ambulance. When Mr Singh's wife regained consciousness, she saw that she was sitting on the seat of the van and her husband was lying unconscious in the back.

Big Supreme Court Order On Waqf Amendment Act, Key Provisions Stayed

New Delhi Sept. 15 (UNI): Key provisions in the Waqf (Amendment) Act, which sparked nationwide protests, have been paused as the Supreme Court flagged that some of them will lead to "arbitrary" exercise of power. The bench of Chief Justice of India BR Gavai and Justice AG Masih said it found no case was made out to stay the whole statute, but "some sections need some protection". These provisions have been paused till the petitions challenging the constitutionality of the Act are decided. Flagging the sweeping powers granted to a district Collector in the new law, the court said, "The Collector cannot be permitted to adjudicate the rights of personal citizens,



and this will violate the separation of powers. Till adjudication happens by the tribunal, no third-party rights can be created against any party. The provision dealing with such powers to the Collector

shall remain stayed." The new law had empowered the District Collector as the final arbiter in issues related to Waqf property ownership. "Where the Collector in his report mentions that the

property, wholly or in part, is in dispute or is a Government property, the waqf in relation to such part of property shall not be registered, unless the dispute is decided by a competent court," the law says.

Rajasthan Woman Drove 600 Km To Convince Lover To Marry Her. He Killed Her



Barmer (Rajasthan) Sept. 15 (UNI): A 37-year-old woman drove 600 km to meet her lover and insisted

that he marry her. The next day, her lifeless body was recovered from her car. Her lover, a school teacher, has

now been arrested for allegedly murdering her with an iron rod. Mukesh Kumari, an anganwadi supervisor in Rajasthan's Jhunjhunu, separated from her husband about a decade ago. In October last year, she connected with Manaram, a schoolteacher in Barmer, on Facebook. The two started meeting, and a relationship began. Mukesh would often drive from Jhunjhunu to Barmer -- about 600 km away -- to

meet Manaram. She wanted to settle down with him. While Mukesh had divorced her husband, Manaram's divorce case was pending in court. According to police, Mukesh had been pressuring Manaram to move forward on the marriage plan, and this led to frequent altercations. On September 10, Mukesh drove her Alto car from Jhunjhunu to Manaram's village in Barmer.

TRUHOME FINANCE LIMITED (Formerly Shriram Housing Finance Ltd.)
Head Office: Level -3, Wockhardt Towers, East Wing C-2, G Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai 400 051;
Tel: 1800 102 4345 ; Website: http://www.truhomefinance.in
Reg.Off.: Srinivasa Tower, 1st Floor, Door No.5, Old No.11, 2nd Lane, Cenatoph Road, Alwarpet, Teynampet, Chennai-600018

APPENDIX-IV-A [SEE PROVISION TO RULE 8(6)] SALE NOTICE FOR SALE OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTIES
E-Auction Sale Notice for Sale of Immovable Assets under the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 read with provision to Rule 8(6) of the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002.
Notice is hereby given to the public in general and in particular to the Borrower/s and Guarantor/s that the below described immovable properties mortgaged/ charged to Truhome Finance Limited (formerly M/s Shriram Housing Finance Limited), the Physical Possession of which have been taken by the Authorized Officer of Truhome Finance Limited, will be sold on "As is where is", "As is what is" and "Whatever there is" basis in e-auction on 26.09.2025 between 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. for recovery of the balance due to Truhome Finance Limited from the Borrowers and Guarantors, as mentioned in the table.
Details of Borrowers and Guarantors, amount due, Short Description of the immovable property, reserve price and earnest money deposit and date of Inspection are also given as:

Name of Borrowers/ Co-Borrowers/ Guarantors/Mortgagers	Amount of Recovery and date of Demand Notice	Reserve Price (Rs.) & Bid Increment	Date & Time of Auction	Contact Person Details -- (AO and Disposal team)
1.MR.PEEVADA AJAY KUMAR & 2. MRS.PIVAD SRAVANI Both are R/O H NO 5 411 2 MAIN ROAD CHOUTUPPAL NAVTAS TRANSPORTS BACK SIDE CHOUTUPALA NALGONDA TELANGANA INDIA 508252. Loan Account No. SBTHVGRM0000012 & STUHVGRM0000025	DEMAND NOTICE 08-02-2025 Rs 77,510 /- (Rupees Seven Lakhs Seventy Thousand Five Hundred And Ten Only) the amount mentioned in the 13(2) demand notice you all are hereby called upon to repay in full and discharge your liabilities to Tru home finance Ltd, as on 28-02-2025	Rs18,00,000/- (Eighteen Lakhs Only) Bid Increment: Rs. 10,000/- and in such multiples. Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) (Rs.) Rs. 180000/- (Rupees One Lakh Eighteen Thousand Only)	23rd Oct. 2025 Time : 11.00 A.M. to 01.00 p.m.	Customer Care No. 022-40081572 Mr. Ashfaq Patka +91 9819415477 Mr. SATISH & Anjibabu 9849225412(M) &9966365296
Date of Possession & Type 09th Sep , 2025 & Physical Possession Encumbrances known Not known		Last date for submission of EMD : 22nd Sep, 2025 Time 10.00 a.m. to 05.00 p.m.		Property Inspection Date : 22-Oct -2025
Description of Property All that the House and partly constructed along with open plot admeasuring an extent of 213 sq.yards or equivalent to 178.06 sq.mtrs in sy no 343/4 block V hanuman nagar, Residential zone located at choutuppal village, choutuppal mandal, yadadri bhuvanagiri district, under choutuppal municipality, choutuppal zilla parishad yadadri bhuvanagiri, under registration, sub-district choutuppal, registration dist Nalgonda bounded by EAST : Plot of Kasoju yadallah, WEST : Plot of Kasoju yadallah, NORTH : land of sericulture dept, SOUTH : 19-5' wide road..				
1) For detailed terms and conditions of the sale, please refer the website of Truhome Finance Limited (Formerly Shriram Housing Finance Limited) website. 2) The intending bidders have to submit their EMD amount to be deposited by way of RTGS/NFT to the account details mentioned herein below: BANK NAME: AXIS BANK LIMITED BRANCH: BANDRA KURLA COMPLEX, MUMBAI BANK ACCOUNT NO. Current Account No. 911020045677633 IFSC CODE: UTIB0002030.				
Place : Nalgonda/ CHOUTUPPAL, TG Date : 16-09-2025		Sd/- Authorised Officer- Truhome Finance Limited (Formerly Shriram Housing Finance Limited)		