



2026:CGHC:10449-DB



2026:CGHC:10449-DB

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCC No. 143 of 2026**

Noore Aalam S/o Shri Habibulla Aged About 37 Years (Presently 53 Years), R/o Village Gelhapani, 9 Number, Koriya, District Koriya, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Home Affairs Government of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, Distt. Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Director General of Police Jail Headquarters, Raipur, Distt. Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector District Koriya Chhattisgarh
4. The Jail Superintendent Ambikapur Central Jail, District Surguja Chhattisgarh

...Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from Case Information)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. S.S. Baghel, Government Advocate.



Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

28.02.2026

1. Heard Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. S.S. Baghel, learned Government Advocate appearing for the State/respondents.
2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner had earlier filed WPCR No. 491 of 2025, which was allowed by this Court vide order dated 08.09.2025. However, in paragraph 05 of the said order, owing to an inadvertent typographical error, it has been recorded that “....*the authority concerned is directed to decide the application of the petitioner for release on parole....*”.
3. Learned counsel submits that the relief sought in the writ petition was with regard to consideration of the petitioner's application for **remission** and not **parole**. The use of the word “parole” in place of “remission” is purely accidental and contrary to the pleadings, prayers, and the intent reflected in the order as a whole. It is further submitted that this clerical error is creating a serious legal impediment, as the Jail Authorities are construing the direction as one relating to parole, thereby frustrating the object and purpose of the earlier order.
4. Learned Government Advocate fairly submits that he has no



objection if the typographical error is corrected.

5. Upon perusal of the record of WPCR No. 491 of 2025 and the order dated 08.09.2025, this Court finds that the reference to “parole” in paragraph 05 is an inadvertent clerical/typographical mistake, which does not reflect the actual controversy involved or the relief sought and granted. The error is apparent on the face of the record and falls within the ambit of correction of accidental slips or omissions.

6. Accordingly, in exercise of inherent powers to correct clerical and typographical errors in judicial orders, the present MCC is **allowed**. It is directed that in paragraph 05 of the order dated 08.09.2025 passed in WPCR No. 491 of 2025, the words “....*the authority concerned is directed to decide the application of the petitioner for release on parole....*” shall be read as “....*the authority concerned is directed to decide the application of the petitioner for release on remission....*”.

7. It is clarified that this order merely corrects an accidental typographical error and does not modify, review, or alter the substantive part of the judgment dated 08.09.2025.

8. Let a copy of this order be placed along with the record of WPCR No. 491 of 2025 for necessary compliance.

Sd/-
(Bibhu Datta Guru)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice