

\$~ (Special Bench)

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

+ W.P.(C) 11437/2015

SHIKHA SETH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. M.A. Niyazi, Ms. Anamika
Niyazi and Mr. Pulkit Choudhary,
Advocates

versus

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Shubhanshu Gupta, Advocate
for Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, Additional
Standing Counsel for respondent
No.1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

%

22.01.2016

C.M. 2234/2016 (for exemption)

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Review Petition No.27/2016 (u/S 114 CPC r/w Sec. 151 CPC)

Vide order of 9th December, 2015 petitioner was permitted to make a Representation to the first respondent in respect of prayer-‘B’ within four weeks.

By way of this application, petitioner points out that due to inadvertence, prayer-‘C’ is mentioned in the aforesaid order whereas permission was granted to petitioner in respect of prayer-‘B’.

Notice.

Mr. Shubhanshu Gupta, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents.

Since the typographical error pointed out in the order of 9th

December, 2015 is innocuous one, therefore, this application is allowed and petitioner is now permitted to make representation in respect of prayer- 'B' to respondent No.1 within four weeks.

The Review petition is accordingly disposed of.

SUNIL GAUR, J

JANUARY 22, 2016

r