

14.09.2021
Mithun
Sl. No.01
Ct.No.09.

CRA 697 of 2013
(Via Video Conference)

Smt.Mahua Kumar Nee Lahiri
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Subhasish Panchal,
... for the Private respondent.

It is pointed out by Mr.Subhasish Panchal, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the private respondent that his name along with the name of his learned senior, Mr.Sudipto Maitra and learned junior, Mr.Vijay Verma are shown as the Advocates for the appellant but they represented the private respondent. The appellant was represented by the Amicus Curiae, Mr. Dipanjan Dutt.

Such recording in the formal part of the judgment dated 27th August, 2021 is an inadvertent mistake and clerical error.

Mr. Sudipto Maitra, Mr.Subhasish Panchal and Mr. Vijay Verma appeared as the learned Advocates on behalf of the accused/private respondent and Mr.Dipanjan Dutt, learned Advocate appeared on behalf of the appellant.

It is also pointed out that in Paragraph 2 of the judgment, in place of Howrah Police Station, it will be Malipanch Ghara Police Station. The second line of the second paragraph be read as Malipanch Ghara Police Station. This order be read as part of the judgment dated 27th August, 2021.

(Bibek Chaudhuri, J)