

102

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CR No.6637 of 2014

Date of decision: March 20, 2015

Kabul Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Rohtash and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SABINA, J

Petitioners have filed this petition challenging the order dated 30.08.2013, whereby application dated 10.09.2012 moved by the defendants for correction in the decree, was allowed.

Relevant Para-8 of the impugned order reads as under:

“8. As far as the application dated 10.9.2012 is concerned, the defendants have claimed that in Annexure-I, Row no.17, column no.1, the property situated at village Khera Khemawati comprised in Khewat No.5, Khata No.89 has been wrongly mentioned as 17 kanals 12 marlas, whereas it should have been mentioned as 10 kanals 12 marlas. In this regard, a careful perusal of jamabandi for the year 2009-10 pertaining to Khewat No.5, Khata No.89 shows that the total land comprised in this Khewat is 10 kanals 12 marlas and therefore, it seems only a typographical mistake

and therefore, the same is allowed. Resultantly, it is ordered that the suit property as mentioned in Annexure-I, Row no.17, Column no.1 comprised in Khewat No.5, Khata No.89 situated at village Khera Khemawati be read as 10 kanals 12 marlas.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the trial Court while passing the decree on the basis of compromise had placed reliance on compromise dated 14.06.2012, whereas the compromise-deed was dated 04.05.2012.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners has admitted that the compromise deed dated 04.05.2012 is not part of the record, nor the petitioners had moved an application seeking amendment of the decree on the basis of the said compromise.

In these circumstances, no ground for interference by this Court, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

March 20, 2015

m.singh