

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

CR No. 1296 of 2016

Date of Decision: 19.02.2016

Charan Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Raj Roop and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Arun Singal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that rectification of the number of the sale deed, at the stage of execution proceedings, after the suit had been decreed and the appeal against that order had also been dismissed, would not be permissible, however, on specific query, he submitted that '*Vasika*' No. 471/1 is not a sale deed or any kind of document relating to either the petitioner or the respondent, i.e. the parties to the suit. Thus, obviously correction at the stage of execution proceedings has been sought by respondent No. 1-plaintiff, in view of the fact that the '*Patwari*' of the '*Halqa*' had submitted before the Executing Court that the decree could not be executed, since '*Vasika*' No. 471/1 pertains to a different land altogether. Once that is so, and that land is also not subject matter of any litigation or any deed of transfer or mortgage etc.

between the parties to the present *lis*, I see no error in the impugned order, allowing rectification of a clerical error even though it may have continued throughout the proceedings, at the stage of the suit before the learned Civil Judge and the appeal, thereafter.

No other point has been urged.

Consequently, I find no merit in the petition, which is dismissed *in limine*, with no orders as to costs.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 19, 2016
nitin