



CR-6544-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

-.-

**CR-6544-2025 (O&M)
Decided on :- 17.09.2025**

Shiam @ Shyam Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

Ishri Prasad @ Ishwari Prasad and Others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present: Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

-.-

MANDEEP PANNU J.

1. Present civil revision petition has been directed against the order dated 14.05.2025 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Palwal, whereby the application filed by respondent/decreed-holder under Order VI Rule 17 CPC for amendment of the execution petition has been allowed.

Brief Facts

2. The brief facts necessary for adjudication are that the plaintiff/respondent filed a suit for possession against the present petitioner/defendant, alleging that he is the owner in possession of the agricultural land in dispute and that the defendants, having no right, title or interest therein, were threatening to dispossess him. It was further alleged that about a year prior to filing of the suit, the plaintiff had been forcibly dispossessed from a part of the property. The said suit was decreed in favour of the plaintiff, and the appeal preferred thereagainst was also dismissed. Thereafter, the decreed-holder instituted



an execution petition. During the course of execution proceedings, JD No.2 appeared and the case was adjourned for filing of objections. However, on 20.03.2025, JD No.2 was proceeded against ex parte. Thereafter, the decree-holder moved an application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC seeking amendment of the execution petition so as to rectify certain mistakes. The amendments sought were with respect to correction of the date of judgment, the suit number, and clarification regarding the description of the judgment-debtors and warrants of possession. The learned Executing Court, while observing that such relief did not strictly fall within the domain of pleadings, treated the application under Section 151 CPC and, finding the corrections to be necessary for proper execution of the decree, allowed the same vide the impugned order.

3. Heard.

4. Having gone through the record and the impugned order, I find no merit in the present revision petition. The amendments allowed by the learned Executing Court are only clerical and typographical in nature, such as correction of the date of judgment from 17.10.2018 to 17.01.2018, correction of the suit number, and rectification of the date of decree and description of judgment-debtors. These do not in any manner change the substance of the decree or confer any additional rights on the decree-holder. Rather, they only bring the execution petition in conformity with the decree already passed.

5. It is a settled principle that wrong mentioning of a provision or inadvertent errors in pleadings cannot disentitle a party to relief which he is otherwise lawfully entitled to. The Executing Court has rightly exercised its inherent powers under Section 151 CPC to correct such clerical mistakes in order



to do complete justice. No prejudice has been shown to have been caused to the petitioner/judgment-debtor by the amendments in question.

Conclusion

6. In view of the above discussion, the impugned order dated 14.05.2025 does not call for any interference by this Court. The civil revision petition, being devoid of any merit, is accordingly dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

September 17, 2025
tripti

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Speaking
Whether reportable : Yes/No