

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 463 OF 2015
IN
CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO.417 OF 2007**

Shanta Govind Khawaskhan

..Applicant

Vs.

Shantaram Vasudeo Mantri & Anr

..Respondents

None for the Applicant

Mr. S.S.Patwardhan for the Respondents original Applicants

CORAM : R. M. SAVANT, J.

DATE : 2nd MARCH, 2016

P.C.

1 The office has placed the above matter in view of the incongruity in the order dated 24-2-2016 passed in the above Civil Application. The said incongruity has arisen in view of the fact that at one place in the order it is recorded that the above Civil Application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (b), whereas at another place the said prayer is rejected. Though there is no substantive prayer by way of prayer clause (c), the order inadvertently refers to prayer clause (c) which is only a formal prayer. The Learned Counsel Mr. Patwardhan appearing for the original Applicants in the Civil Revision Application states that the Applicants would file a precipe for speaking to the minutes of the order dated 24-2-2016. Hence for the present removed from board.

[R.M.SAVANT, J]