



\$~112

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 10240/2024 & CRL.M.A. 39239/2024 INTERIM ORDER**

CHANDER BHAN (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS & ORS.

.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Mohit Mudgal & Mr.Sandeep
Yadav, Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for the State
with SI Madhav, PS Bawana

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **21.05.2025**

CRL.M.A. 15669/2025 EARLY HEARING

1. Because of the urgency explained, the application is allowed and the matter is taken up for consideration of application bearing No. 14589/2025.

CRL.M.A. 14589/2025 RECALL OF ORDER DT. 23.04.2025

2. By virtue of the present application, petitioners seek recall/correction of clerical error in the order dated 23.04.2025.

3. Relevant portion of the order dated 23.04.2025 reads as under:-

“8. For the purpose of protecting the already grown standing crop on land, and to ensure that the crop does not go waste, in the interest of justice, the application is allowed with similar directions to the area SDM

This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 23/05/2025 at 12:58:00



to appoint receiver to supervise the harvesting process of the crop standing on the land and ensure that the money earned by the respondent from the sale of the crop be deposited by way of fixed deposit in the name of the area SDM which will be released to the rightful claimant subject to determination of rights of the parties with regard to the possession of disputed land.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the word “respondent” has been inadvertently used instead of “petitioners”, due to which, the order could not be implemented by SDM, Narela, who appointed Tehsildar as a Receiver to supervise the harvesting process on the petitioners’ land.
5. While passing such order, the Court had allowed the application in favour of the petitioners. In view of the intent of the order, it is evident that the use of the word “respondent” is a clerical error, which therefore, needs to be corrected.
6. In view of the aforesaid, the application is allowed and the word “respondent” in Para No. 8 shall be deemed to be replaced with the word “petitioners”.
7. The application accordingly stands disposed of.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.

MAY 21, 2025

RM