

\$~34

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7889/2016**

MEERA SYAL

..... Petitioner

Through **Mr. Pawan Madan, Adv.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

.....Respondents

Through

**Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with
Mr. Harsh Pandit and Mr. Rajeev
Ranjan Shahi, Advs. for R-1
Ms.Trisha Nagpal,Adv.for R-4 & 5**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

23.02.2018

CM No.6907/2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of applicant no.1/respondent no.1. Ms. Trisha Nagpal accepts notice on behalf of the non-applicants/respondents no.4 and 5.

2. This is an application moved on behalf of the petitioner seeking correction of typographical errors which, according to her, the applicant, have crept in the order dated 1.2.2018.

3. Insofar as paragraph 2.2 of the order dated 1.2.2018 is concerned, the error is pointed out in two parts of the said paragraph. These read as follows:

(i) "since the petitioner is being harassed by respondent no.4 and her husband",

(ii) “she wishes to seek cancellation of the said gift deed”. 3.1.

According to the counsel for parties, the abovementioned two parts should read as follows:

(i) “since the petitioner is being harassed by respondent no.4 and her son i.e., respondent no.5”.

(ii) “the husband of the petitioner wishes to seek cancellation of the said gift deed”. These two parts of paragraph 2.2 of the judgment are corrected accordingly.

4. Insofar as correction in paragraph no.3 is sought, according to me, there is no error. It is not suggested that the relationship between the petitioner and her husband has soured. What is generally said is that the relationship of the petitioner and husband, *vis-a-vis*, other family members and respondent no.4 has soured.

4.1 Accordingly, the prayer made to this extent is not allowed.4698

5. The application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 23, 2018

rb