

30.11.2022
Item No. 03
BR

CRA 498 of 2018

In the matter of : Tapan Kumar Dutta

Mr. Sourav Chowdhury
... for the O.P. No. 1

Ms. Sujata Das ... for the State

Perhaps because of technical malady paragraph 11 gets incorporated in the judgment of criminal appeal. Paragraph 10 of the judgment unerringly indicates that the appeal was not accepted. Thereafter in paragraph 11 inadvertently it was written " with the aforesaid observation the criminal revision is disposed of without any order as to costs in course of trial".

Paragraph 11 ex facie appears to be in appropriate in the judgment passed in criminal appeal No. 498 of 2018. It is an error that has crept in inadvertently and paragraph 11 shall be considered as non-est as it appears. It is modified in the following manner :

"The criminal appeal is thus disposed. Interim order of stay if any stands vacated". Henceforth the

judgment shall always be read together with order conjointly.

For the Opposite party no. 1 Mr. Sourav Chowdhury submits that on 17th November, 2022 Mr. Chowdhury was present before this Court to represent the O.P. No. 1. His name is not appearing in the order sheet. Let the name of Mr. Chowdhury be incorporated as Learned Counsel for the opposite party no. 1.

(Siddhartha Roy Chowdhury, J.)