

3 EX CIVIL 62/24
ANUP KUMAR JHA Vs. VEERMATI

16.03.2026

VC is not working today.

Present: Ld. Counsel for DH.
Ms. Vishwa Bharti, Sh. Gaurav Gill and Sh. Divyansh Jain,
Ld. Counsel for JD alongwith JD Sadaram Kadian.

Ld. Counsel for DH submits that there was some typographical error in the original judgment and decree passed by the Trial Court.

The present execution petition was filed alongwith the said copy of the original judgment and decree. It was subsequently, on 04.04.2024, an application for correction was allowed by the Trial Court correcting the address of the suit property in the judgment and decree.

Thereafter, in the present pending execution petition, the said corrected judgment was filed. However, on the date when the Local Commissioner was appointed by the court i.e., 14.11.2025, the corrected judgment and decree was not brought to the notice of the court by both the sides. The Decree Holder should have waited for the correction before filing the execution.

Be that as it may, the Local Commissioner went to the wrong address, which was mentioned in the original judgment and decree filed. Therefore, Local Commissioner is requested to once again execute the commission, albeit, at the address i.e., RZD-80, Khasra No.84/7/2, Village Palam, now known as Mahavir Enclave, New Delhi. The error could have been brought to the notice of the court, immediately.

In these circumstances, the fees of the Local Commissioner for the visit shall be borne by the DH. However, the same shall form part

of the costs of the proceedings and whichever party is successful, would be entitled to receive the same from the other side.

Since the Local Commissioner was appointed, but the commission was not executed on the last date, the Local Commissioner is requested to execute the commission at a fees of Rs.8,000/- only.

Copy of order be given dasti for communicating to the Local Commissioner.

List on 17.04.2026.

(HARJYOT SINGH BHALLA)
DJ-03, SOUTH-WEST, DWARKA
NEW DELHI/16.03.2026