

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No.12758/2019

HARVINDER SINGH & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PARUPKAR SINGH (SINCE DEAD) THR LRS & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 08-05-2024 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH
[IN CHAMBER]

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Santosh Kumar Pandey, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Aman Preet Singh Rahi, Adv.
Mr. A. Venayagam Balan, AOR
Mr. Puneet Thakur, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Pal, Adv.
Mr. R.V. Kameshwaran, Adv.
Mr. C.M. Sundaram, Adv.
Mr. Ashray Behura, Adv.
Mr. Kiritkumar Govindlal Sheth, Adv.
Mr. Deepak Parashar, Adv.UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E RI.A. No.36302/2023

This has been put up by the Registry pointing out therein that because of an inadvertent typographical error in the Order dated 01.11.2023, name of respondent No.11 has been wrongly mentioned as 'Jagdish Kaur' whereas it should have been 'Surjit Kaur' and similarly, name of respondent No.12 has been mentioned as 'Surjit Kaur' whereas it should have been 'Balbir Kaur'.

Learned counsel for the applicants has pointed out that in the Application for Substitution of the legal representatives, it was rightly mentioned and on perusal of the said application, the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant is found to be correct.

In the light of the above, the Order dated 01.11.2023 is corrected by replacing the name of respondent No.11 as 'Surjit Kaur' and that of respondent No.12 as 'Balbir Kaur'. Let the corrections in the cause title be accordingly made.

Notice be now issued to the substituted respondent Nos.11 and 12, respectively. It has been pointed out by learned counsel that the spare copies have already been submitted but because of this error, notices could not be issued. If that be so, the Registry to proceed with the matter, as per rules.

It has been pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the Orders passed by this Court on 17.03.2023, as well as on 01.11.2023 have been duly complied with and not once has notice been issued to respondent No.2 who is residing abroad. His submission is that in the light of there being no report with regard to notice ever having been issued to respondent No.2, there is no question of he being unserved at the given address.

If that be so, Registry to proceed and issue notice to respondent No.2 at the given address and on the cheque already submitted, if valid.

(VIJAY KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)