

GAHC020000592024



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH) KOHIMA BENCH

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/16/2024

THE UNITED INDIA INSURANCE CO. LTD
REPRESENTED BY ITS BRANCH MANAGER
DIMAPUR NAGALAND

VERSUS

SHRI. JAGDISH SINGH AND 2 ORS
R/O NST COLONY
DIMAPUR NAGALAND

2:SHRI. HENMINGAN KIPGEN
VILLAGE- HIDIPI
SPO KALAPAHAR
KARBI ANGLONG
(DRIVER OF THE VEHICLE)

3:TRANSKING CARRIER PVT. LTD
6
RAMLOCHAN MULLICK STREET
KOLKATA-700073
(OWNER OF THE VEHICLE)

Advocate for the Petitioner : TAYONGCHUBA

Advocate for the Respondent :

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN
ORDER

19.03.2024

Heard Mr. Tayongchuba, learned counsel for the

applicant.

2. This interlocutory application under Section 152 of the C.P.C., is preferred by the applicant namely, The United India Insurance Company Limited, for correction of typographical error in the judgment and order passed by this Court, dated 19.01.2024, in MAC Appeal No. 10/2019.

3. Mr. Tayongchuba, learned counsel for the applicant submits that this interlocutory application may be disposed of today itself, without hearing the other sides, as no prejudice will be caused thereby to any of the parties, as only some typographical errors in the judgment and order dated 19.01.2024, are required to be corrected here. Mr. Tayongchuba further submits that at Page No. 2 of the said judgment, the name of the advocate for the appellant has been mentioned as Mr. Pfoseko Pfotte and the same ought to have been Tayongchuba; at Page No. 3, in para No. 3, the name of the appellant has been mentioned as The National Insurance Company Limited and it ought to have been The United India Insurance Company Limited; at Page No. 4, in para No. 4 the name of the counsel for the appellant has been mentioned as Mr. Pfoseko Pfotte and it ought to have been Tayongchuba; at Page Nos. 4 & 5, in para No. 5, the name of the counsel for the appellant has been mentioned as Mr. Pfoseko Pfotte and Mr. Pfofte, which ought to have been Tayongchuba; at Page No. 13, in para No. 24, on the 13th line, the name of the counsel for the appellant has been mentioned as Mr. Pfofte, which ought to have been Tayongchuba; and at Page No. 13, in para No. 25, on the 5th line, the name of the counsel for the appellant has been mentioned as Mr. Pfofte, which ought to have been Tayongchuba, and therefore, it is contended that these

typographical errors, may be corrected.

4. Having heard the submission of learned counsel for the applicant and also having considered the facts and circumstances on the record, this Court is inclined to dispose of this interlocutory application at this motion stage itself, by directing that at Page No. 2; Page 4, in para No. 4; Page Nos. 4 & 5, in para No. 5; Page No. 13, in para No. 24, on the 13th line; and Page No. 13, in para No. 25, on the 5th line, of the said judgment, the name of the counsel for the appellant shall henceforth be read as Mr. Tayongchuba, instead of Mr. Pfoseko Pfotte or Mr. Pfotte, for all purposes. And it is further provided that in page No. 3, in para No. 3, the name of the appellant shall henceforth be read as 'The United India Insurance Company Limited' instead of 'The National Insurance Company Limited', for all purposes.

Sd/-

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant