

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 5686 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 2383 OF 2014**

Sau Tarabai Ananda Phatangre ...Applicant

Versus

Sahebrao Karbhari Phatangare ...Respondent

...

Mr. Kulkarni Sanket S. , Advocate for applicant
Mr. R. V. Gore, Advocate for R/sole

...

CORAM: SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.

Date: 9th December, 2016.

PER COURT:

1. Learned counsel has moved the matter for '*speaking to minutes*' in respect of order dated 29th April, 2016.
2. Learned counsel submits that there is omission to refer to prayer clause (A) in the order and granting only prayer clause (B) would not serve the purpose which is in respect of continuance of interim relief whereas, prayer clause (A) is vital which is in respect of revival of writ petition, and unless prayer clause (A) would be granted, prayer clause (B) would not be meaningful.
3. Other side has no objection.

4. Having regard to aforesaid, the order dated 29th April, 2016, reading as under;

“Having regard to the contents of civil application, the same stands allowed in terms of prayer clause “B” and stands disposed of.”

stands corrected and would read as under;

“Having regard to contents of application, same stands allowed in terms of prayer clauses (A) and (B) and stands disposed of”.

5. The order dated 29th April, 2016, as such, stands corrected accordingly.

6. Certified copy, if already issued, shall be deemed to be corrected accordingly.

7. Motion stands disposed of.

(SUNIL P. DESHMUKH)
JUDGE

VDK