123 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CR-3809-2026
Date of Decision: 06.05.2026

GEETANJALI ALIAS GULSHAN

....Petitioner

Versus

LEELA RANI (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. G.S. Punia, Senior Advocate,
Ms. Harveen Kaur, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Anupreet Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Saksham Kaushik, Advocate
Mr. Vipul Thakur, Advocate
Mr. Aakash Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent No.1(v).

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been preferred under Article 227 of Constitution of India by petitioner/plaintiff being aggrieved by impugned order dated 07.02.2026 (Annexure P-1), vide which application filed under Sections 152, 153, 153-A read with Section 151 for Correction of error in the judgment and decree dated 24.09.2009 and also in the plaint moved by the decree holder, was dismissed.

2. Petitioner/plaintiff had filed a suit for possession and specific performance of agreement dated 24.05.2005 claiming suit property comprised with khasra No.6070, 2264, 872 and 368. It is the case of petitioner/plaintiff that actually agreement to sell was for 6070, 2264, 1812

CHIRANJEEV SINGH
2026.05.07 13:27
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

and 368, however, by mistake in the plaint, on account of typographical mistake, khasra No.1812 was mentioned as 872 and, therefore, even judgment and decree passed in favour of petitioner/plaintiff suit regarding khasra Nos.6070, 2264, 872 and 368 was allowed. At the time of execution of judgment and decree dated 24.09.2009 (Annexure P-5) objections were taken by judgment debtors that in proposed sale deed khasra number as mentioned in judgment and decree has not been mentioned and instead it is mentioned as 1812, where it ought to have been 872 as per judgment and decree dated 24.09.2009 (Annexure P-5). An application for correction of judgment and decree dated 24.09.2009 (Annexure P-5) was preferred by petitioner/plaintiff which has been dismissed by impugned order dated 07.02.2026 (Annexure P-1) by the Executing Court on the ground that it has no jurisdiction to correct the judgment and decree and only the Court which had passed the judgment and decree could have corrected the same.

3. On consideration, I do not find any error in the conclusion drawn by the learned Executing Court that Executing Court cannot make any corrections in judgment and decree passed by Court of competent jurisdiction. It is the same Court which has passed the decree can correct the decree if there is any error on record or any error due to clerical/typographical mistake. It is also not in doubt that Courts have ample power to correct clerical as well as typographical mistakes brought before it or which comes to its notice. Prima facie it appears that in agreement to sell the correct number was mentioned as 1812, however, in suit as well as decree it was mentioned as 872. Prima facie it appears to be a clerical/typographical mistake on the part of petitioner/plaintiff which got carried in the judgment and decree. Though the Executing Court has no

CHIRANJEEV SINGH
2026.05.07 13:27
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

power to correct judgment and decree and the petitioner/plaintiff cannot be left remediless. The remedy to get correction by the Court passing the decree is always available to decree holder.

4. Accordingly, present revision petition is disposed of with liberty to petitioner/plaintiff to approach the successor Court to seek appropriate correction in accordance with law and then proceed with the execution.

5. Pending application(s), if any, is/are disposed of accordingly.

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
chiranjeev

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No

CHIRANJEEV SINGH
2026.05.07 13:27
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document