



WEB COPY



C.M.P.No.6438 of 2023 in
Rev.Appl.SR.No.10323 of 2023

C.M.P.No.6438 of 2023 in
Review Application.SR.No.10323 of 2023

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

Heard Mr.P.Srinivasan, learned counsel for the petitioner and
Mr.R.N.Amarnath, learned counsel for respondents 1 to 3.

2. Office endorsement suggests that respondents 4 and 5 are
served, but none appears for respondents 4 and 5 today.

3. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is
that during the pendency of the appeal, the present petitioner was
never served. The original third respondent in the appeal signed the
vakalathnama for himself. He was not authorised to represent the
present petitioner/applicant. The petitioner/applicant was not aware
of the order passed by this Court, as such, the review is filed upon
knowledge of the order in appeal. Hence, the delay is caused.



WEB COPY



C.M.P.No.6438 of 2023 in
Rev.Appl.SR.No.10323 of 2023

4. According to learned counsel for the respondents, no sufficient cause is mentioned.

5. Considering the reasons mentioned in the accompanying affidavit, the delay of 327 days in filing the review application is condoned. Accordingly, the petition stands allowed and is disposed of.

6. The petitioner shall serve the copies of the review application along with the annexures to learned counsel for respondents 1 to 3.

7. List the review application on 02.11.2023.

(S.V.G., CJ.) (D.B.C.,J.)
10.10.2023

drm



WEB COPY



C.M.P.No.6438 of 2023 in
Rev.Appl.SR.No.10323 of 2023

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

(drm)

C.M.P.No.6438 of 2023 in
Rev.Appl.SR.No.10323 of 2023

10.10.2023