

ITEM NO.1710

COURT NO.16

SECTION III-A

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

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S). 8040/2019

THE STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH &amp; ORS.

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

RAVINDRA NATH TAIGOR &amp; ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

OFFICE REPORT FOR DIRECTIONS IS TO BE LISTED

Date : 28-03-2025 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN  
[IN CHAMBER]

For Appellant(s) Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tyagi, AOR  
Mr. Mridul Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Sandeep Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Anjani Kumar Mishra, AOR  
Mr. Praveen Mishra, Adv.  
Dr. P N Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Saurav Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Chatanya Siddharth, Adv.  
Mrs. Vijay Singh, Adv.  
Mrs. Prakrati Purnima, Adv.  
Mr. Kartikey, Adv.  
Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, AOR

Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, AOR  
Mr. Yatharth Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Divesh Kumar, Adv.  
Mrs. Moulishree Pathak, Adv.

Mr. Ilin Saraswat, Adv.  
Mrs. Anita Rani Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Ilma Irfan Saifi, Adv.  
Mrs. Poonam Seth, Adv.  
Mr. M. M. Kashyap, AOR

Mr. Sumit Teterrwal, AOR  
Mr. Ajay Choudhary, AOR  
Mr. Nagarkatti Kartik Uday, AOR

M/S. Mukesh Kumar Singh And Co., AOR  
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Jeetendra Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Naveen Yadav, Adv.  
Mr. Ikshit Singhal, Adv.  
Mr. C M Dwivedi, Adv.

Mr. Purushottam Sharma Tripathi, AOR  
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Amit, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Divyesh Pratap Singh, AOR  
Mr. Ashu Bhindwar, Adv.  
Mr. Jay Veer Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Robin Khokhar, AOR

Mr. Rajendra Beniwal, Adv.  
Mr. Ashkrit Tiwari, Adv.  
Mr. Sunil Beniwal, Adv.  
Ms. Richa, Adv.  
Ms. Bano Deswal, Adv.  
Mr. R. C. Kaushik, AOR

Dr. Vinod Kumar Tewari, AOR  
Mr. Pramod Tiwari, Adv.  
Mr. Vivek Tiwari, Adv.  
Ms. Priyanka Dubey, Adv.  
Mr. Abhishek Tiwari, Adv.  
Mr. Bhavya Goyal, Adv.

Mr. Anantha Narayana M.g., AOR  
Mr. Arvind Gupta, AOR  
Mr. Sumit Teterrwal, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. The interlocutory application being IA No. 206458 of 2024 was filed seeking deletion of Respondent No.135-*Sanjeev Kumar Singh* (deceased), from the array of parties in Civil Appeal No. 8040/2019. The same was allowed by order dated 30.09.2024,

which reads as under :

*"I.A. No.206458/2024*

*5. Interlocutory Application No. 206458/2024 stands allowed. Cause title be amended, accordingly.*

*6. As regards respondent No.121, she submits that she has moved an application for deletion of the said respondent on the ground that the said respondent has since expired and his wife has refused to come on board."*

2. Further, while referring to Paragraph No. 6 of the order as quoted above, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioners inadvertently mentioned "Respondent No. 121" in place of "Respondent No. 135". Therefore, Respondent No. 121 was typed instead of Respondent No. 135 in Paragraph No. 6 of the above-mentioned order.
3. Considering the statement made on behalf of the Petitioners, Respondent No. 135 is directed to be deleted from the array of parties. Paragraph No. 6 of the said order, shall be read accordingly.
4. Another aspect which has come to light before this Court is that this matter was again listed before this Court on 13<sup>th</sup> November, 2024 and an order of the same date was passed and Paragraph Nos. 2 & 3 of which read as hereunder:

*"Learned counsel further submits that in so far as Respondent No. 121 is concerned, there is an error in the Office Report. The Office Report reads as under:*

*"As regards respondent No. 121, she submits that she has moved an application for deletion of the said respondent on the ground that the said respondent has since expired and his wife has refused to come on board."*

*"Learned counsel further submits that the deletion is sought for of respondent No. 135 and an application to that effect was filed. It is typographical error referring to respondent No. 121 in the office report is the submission of learned counsel."*

The above quoted portion of the said order reflects that there is an error in the office report (dated 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2024), whereas on perusal of the material placed on record, it is quite evident that there is a typographical error in the quoted portion of the said order i.e. Paragraph Nos. 2 and 3. The term "Order dated 30.09.2024" should have been typed in place of "office report", in the above-mentioned paragraphs.

5. In view of the submissions made on behalf of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and the material placed on record, this Court is of the view that there are some typographical errors committed in the orders dated 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2024 and 13<sup>th</sup> November, 2024, which need to be corrected or modified, accordingly.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is pleased to pass the following order:

(A) Paragraph No. 6 of the order dated 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2024 shall now be read as:

*"I.A. No.206458/2024*

*5. Interlocutory Application No. 206458/2024 stands allowed. Cause title be amended, accordingly.*

*6. As regards respondent No.135, she submits that she has moved an application for deletion of the said respondent on the ground that the said respondent has*

*since expired and his wife has refused to come on board."*

AND

(B) Paragraph Nos. 2 and 3 of the order dated 13<sup>th</sup>

November, 2024, shall now be read as:

*"Learned counsel further submits that in so far as Respondent No. 121 is concerned, there is an error in the Order dated 30.09.2024. The Order dated 30.09.2024 reads as under:*

*"As regards respondent No. 121, she submits that she has moved an application for deletion of the said respondent on the ground that the said respondent has since expired and his wife has refused to come on board."*

*"Learned counsel further submits that the deletion is sought for of respondent No. 135 and an application to that effect was filed. It is typographical error referring to respondent No. 121 in the Order date 30.09.2024 is the submission of learned counsel."*

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners requests for and is granted two weeks further time to effect service of notice to the unserved respondent(s).

(JAGDISH KUMAR)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(MAMTA RANI)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)