

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 8693 of 2015(O&M)
Date of decision : March 18, 2016

Sita Rani

..... Petitioner

Versus

Bhupinder Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Gulzar Mohammad, Advocate
for the petitioner.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

The petitioner-judgment debtor is aggrieved of the impugned order whereby two fold relief sought by the respondents-plaintiffs has been allowed viz-a-viz amendment of the plaint after passing of the judgment and decree owing to the fact that certain particulars of the property agreed to be sold reflected in the agreement to sell have been inadvertently omitted while passing the judgment and decree and decree has been modified.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that such an act cannot be permitted as there is no provision for amendment of the plaint and rectification of the decree. The decree becomes unexecutable.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

appraised the paper book and of the view that once the agreement to sell gives the correct description of the property which could not inadvertently be incorporated in the judgment and decree, such an error has been rectified vide impugned order, thus, no valuable right can be said to be taken away, prejudicial to his interest.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order and the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits.
Accordingly the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

March 18 , 2016
archana