

\$~Appellate-1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 3555/2013

THOMAS PAUL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil Mittal, Advocate with Ms.
Komal Aggarwal, Advocate.

versus

INDIAN LAW INSTITUTE AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajat Brar, Advocate for
respondent No.1.
Mr. Manoj R. Sinha, Advocate for
respondent No.2.
Ms. Abha Malhotra, Advocate with
Mr. Kushal Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Gaurang Bindra, Advocate for
respondent No.3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

% **20.01.2016**

Review Petition No.391/2015 adn C.M. No.15335/2015(condonation of delay)

1. Counsel for the review petitioner states that the language used in para 3 of the review petition was not intended to convey anything against the Court but by mistake it appears to be so, although it is the respondent no.2 who relied upon the judgment in the case of ***P. Suseela & Ors. Etc. Etc. Vs. University Grants Commission & Ors. Etc. Etc.*** decided by the Supreme Court on 16.3.2015 and it was

the petitioner who withdrew the case accordingly, and which withdrawal did not affect the petitioner because petitioner was given right to file the suit with additional benefit of being granted exemption under Section 14 of the Limitation Act, 1963 with respect to filing of the suit.

2. At this stage, during the course of arguments, counsel for the petitioner states that the review petition and application are not pursued and the petitioner will act in accordance with the order dated 20.4.2015 which may be treated as final.

3. Review petition and application are disposed of as not pressed in terms of the aforesaid observations.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

JANUARY 20, 2016

Ne