

**CM No.15618 of 2015,
CM No.9986 of 2015 and
RA No.323 of 2015 in
CWP No.15485 of 1995**

Nahani Devi and others
Vs.
The State of Haryana and others

Present: Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate
for the applicants-petitioners.

Mr. Sidharth Sanwaria, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana,
for the non-applicants/respondents.

CM No.15618 of 2015

Prayer in this application is for permission to place on record
written statement Annexure P-10.

Application is allowed subject to just exceptions.

Written statement is taken on record as Annexure P-10.

CM No.9986 of 2015

Prayer in this application is for condonation of delay of 249
days in filing the review application.

Counsel for the non-applicants/respondents has opposed the
prayer.

However, keeping in view the reasons mentioned in the
application that the delay has occurred because the applicants-petitioners
had sought information under the Right to Information Act, 2005, and after
obtaining the same, had filed the present review application, which appears
to be just and reasonable. The prayer made in the application is allowed.

Delay of 249 days in filing the review application stands
condoned.

Prayer in this application is for review of the order dated 23.08.2013 passed by this Court.

It is the contention of learned counsel for the applicants-petitioners that this Court by order dated 23.08.2013 disposed of the writ petition relying upon the order dated 19.12.2011 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in *Civil Writ Petition No.17551 of 1999* titled as *Reeta Bansal Versus State of Haryana and others*. It was stated in the order passed by this Court that the writ petition is disposed of in same terms as held in *Reeta Bansal's case (supra)*. Counsel contends that the said judgment would not cover the claim of the applicants-petitioners. In support of this contention, he has brought to the notice of this Court the said judgment which has been appended as Annexure P-5.

Perusal of the same indicates that the assertion of the counsel for the applicants-petitioners is correct.

In view of the above, the present review application is allowed.

Order dated 23.08.2013 is reviewed.

The writ petition is restored to its original number and the Registry is directed to list the same as per Roster.

January 13, 2016
Puneet

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE