

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

1. Letters Patent Appeal No.286 of 2015 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 23.02.2015

The Chairperson, Punjab State Social Welfare Board
Appellant
 versus

Bimla Devi and others

.....Respondents

2. Letters Patent Appeal No.287 of 2015 (O&M)

The Chairperson, Punjab State Social Welfare Board
Appellant
 versus

Sudesh Kumari and others

.....Respondents

3. Letters Patent Appeal No.284 of 2015 (O&M)

The Chairperson, Punjab State Social Welfare Board
Appellant
 versus

Prem Lata and others

.....Respondents

4. Letters Patent Appeal No.285 of 2015 (O&M)

The Chairperson, Punjab State Social Welfare Board
Appellant
 versus

Usha Bhanot and othersRespondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.J. VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Rajinder Sharma, Advocate for the appellant
 ..

S.J. VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral) :

These appeals are against a common order of the learned single Judge dated 01.03.2013 disposing off six writ petitions on the basis of a statement made on behalf of the appellant that in case the benefits wrongly granted to one Naresh Kumari cannot be withdrawn from her within three months, the respondents would be paid the benefits sought in the petitions forthwith. The learned Judge, therefore, disposed off the writ petitions on the basis of the statement.

2. An application was thereafter moved for correction of the name of Naresh Kumari to Smt. Bimla Devi. It is contended that the benefit was inadvertently extended to Smt. Bimla Devi and not Naresh Kumari. The change in name is not a mere typographical error which could have been corrected on a civil miscellaneous application for correction. The entire basis of the statement made before the learned Judge on the basis whereof the order dated 01.03.2013 was passed changes thereby in the event of the statement made in paragraph-4 of the civil miscellaneous application being correct. The learned Judge, therefore, rightly did not make the correction and dismissed the application by the second impugned order dated 12.08.2014.

3. In view of what is stated above, the appellant's remedy is by way of a review petition.

4. The appeal is, therefore, disposed of with liberty to the appellant to file a review petition. Needless to add

that all the contentions in the review petition including as to maintainability of the review petition, if filed, are kept open.

As the appeals have been dismissed, the delay in filing the appeals stands condoned.

(S.J. VAZIFDAR)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

23.02.2015
parkash*

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE