

\$~7

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ C.R.P. 41/2017

AKASH BHAL & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms.Herinder Kaur Brar, Advocate.

versus

DAYAWATI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

08.05.2017

C.R.P. 41/2017

1. Petitioner has filed this revision petition aggrieved by the order dated 30th November, 2015 whereby the application under Section 152 read with Section 153 CPC filed by the petitioner who was plaintiff in Civil Suit No.98/2014, to correct the address mentioned in the decree and the judgment, has been declined by the learned Trial Court for the following reasons:-

“Perusal of the file shows that the address mentioned in the decree and judgment is as per the plaint filed by the plaintiffs therefore there is no ground for amendment of the decree.

In these circumstances, application of applicant is dismissed.

File be consigned to record room.”

C.R.P. 41/2017

page 1 of 2

2. Had there been error in recording the address, the learned Trial Court was vested with the ample power under Section 152 & 153 CPC to correct the same. Any such correction cannot be made in exercise of revisional jurisdiction by this Court.

3. It is well settled that revisional jurisdiction can be exercised where questions of jurisdiction is involved i.e. question regarding the irregular exercise or non-exercise of jurisdiction or the illegal assumption of jurisdiction by a Court and is not directed against conclusion of law or fact in which questions of jurisdiction are not involved.

4. Since, in the instant case, the question of jurisdiction is not involved, the revision petition is dismissed.

CM No.6485/2017 & CM No.6486/2017

Dismissed as infructuous.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

MAY 08, 2017

'hkaur'