

102

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RA-CW-561-2014 in CWP-8533-2012

Date of Decision: 13.10.2023

Rajkhushwant Singh Sandhu and others

. . . . Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Ms. Alka Chatrath, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, DAG, Punjab.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. Review Application has been filed by the petitioners pointing out that in the order dated 08.05.2012, a typographical error has crapped in while disposing of the writ petition. The Court has disposed of the writ petition in terms of an earlier judgment passed by this Court. However, the number of the writ petition decided earlier has wrongly been mentioned as '*CWP No.3104 of 2012*', whereas it ought to be '*CWP No.7237 of 1989*' decided on 23.09.2011, which was the basis for deciding CWP No.5072 of 2012 quoted by the Court in the penultimate para.
2. I have considered the submissions and carefully gone through the orders and the relevant judgments, and find that this Court had decided the writ petition on the consent of both the parties that the controversy involved was covered by judgment of this Court passed in CWP No.5072 of 2012, Dev Raj Jindal and others vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 20.03.2012. A look at the judgment passed in CWP-5072-2012 (supra) reflects that the said writ petition was decided based on the decision

rendered by the High Court in *CWP No.7237 of 1989, Ruldu Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others*, decided on 23.09.2011.

3. In view thereof, the writ petition was required to be disposed of in same terms as in CWP No.7237 of 1989. A typographical error has apparently crapped in the order dated 08.05.2012. The order is accordingly modified. The Writ Petition No.8533 of 2012 is disposed of in the same terms as CWP No.7237 of 1989 and the following order shall be treated as part and parcel of the order passed by the Court dated 08.05.2012, for all intents and purposes:

“In these circumstances, this writ petition is disposed of in the same terms as in CWP No.7237 of 1989.”

4. Review Petition is accordingly allowed.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

October 13, 2023

Mohit goyal

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable? | Yes/No |