

01.7. 2024
item No.1
n.b.
ct. no. 24

(Via Video Conference)
WPA 16304 of 2021

Ananta Kumar Jena & ors.
Vs.
Indian Institute of Engineering,
Science & Technology & Ors.

Mr. Nandini Mitra,
... for the petitioners.
Mr. Subrata Mukhopadhyay,
Ms. Basabi Raichoudhury,
... for the respondent nos. 1 to 4.

This matter appears for correction.

The Cause Title of the judgment dated 18.6.2024 has been erroneously recorded. The cause title would be corrected as “Ananta Kumar Jena & Ors. Vs. Indian Institute of Engineering Science & Technology & Ors.”

The representation on behalf of the petitioners in respect of learned counsel “Mr. Sital Samanta” was also erroneously mentioned. It has to be omitted.

The first paragraph at 2nd line the “Bengla” should be read as “Bengal”.

In the 2nd page at paragraph 2 in the first line “petitioner is” should be read as “petitioners are”.

In the same page at 3rd paragraph in line 6 the “Politechniques” should be read as “Polytechniques”.

In the same page at 4th paragraph in the line 5 the term “ decaled” should be read as “detained”.

At page 3 paragraph 5 in the first line “petitioner” should be read as “petitioners”.

In the same paragraph in the 4th line “constitute” should be read as “constituted”.

In the same paragraph at the 5th line “extent” should be read as “extend”. In the same line “recommned” should be read as “recommended”.

At page 4 in paragraph 8 at 12th line the date should be correctly read as “16.1.2018” instead of “16.1.2014”. In the same paragraph at line 14 the term “introduce” should be read as “introduction”.

In paragraph 9 page 4 the “revision should be read as “writ petition”.

At page 5 paragraph 11 at the last line “are” should be read as “have”. In the same page at paragraph 12 the word “petitioner” should be read as “petitioners”. In the same page paragraph 13 at the first line “congesting” should be read as “contesting”. At line 3 at same paragraph “Debashis Bose” should be correctly read as “Dibashis Basu”. At the same paragraph before the 6th line, the word “of” should be inserted. At the 7th line of the same paragraph “NITSCR” should be correctly read as “NITSER”. In the same paragraph, in the 9th line, the title “Bose” should be read as “Basu”.

At page 6 in the 1st line the word “became” should be correctly read as “because”. At the same paragraph 6th

line from the top, the word “NITSR” should be correctly read as “NITSER”.

At paragraph 14 at the last line the word “got” should be correctly read as “get” and the word “release” should be correctly read as “relief”.

In the same page, paragraph no.15 at the 9th line after the employees the word “of” should be inserted. At the end of the same line, the word “make” should be correctly read as “made”. In the same paragraph at page no.7 in the 1st line, the word “as” should be correctly read as “has”. In the same paragraph of page no.7 4th line from the top the word “concern” should be read as “concerned” and in the same paragraph 5th line from the top the word, “legible” should be correctly read as “legitimate”.

At paragraph no.17, line no.2, the word “NITSAR” should be correctly read as “NITSER”. At the line no.3 of paragraph 17, the word “became” and “employee” should be read as “because” and “employees” respectively. In the same paragraph at page no.8 2nd line from the top, the word “he” should be replaced by the word “they” and in the 3rd line from the top, the word “hold” should be read as “held”. At the 5th line, “his” should be read as “their” and at the end the word “is” should be correctly read as “are”.

At the 6th line from the top of page 8 “were” should be read as “did” and the word “received” should be read as “receive”. At the same page at line no.15 from the top

“has” should be read as “had” and 17th line after petitioners “are” should be incorporated.

At paragraph no.18 at 7th line, the term “dated” should be correctly read as “the date”. At the 9th line of the same paragraph, the word “accptation” should be read as “acceptance” and at the same paragraph, at 17th line of paragraph no.18 the word “port” should be read as “post”.

It appears that there are several typographical errors in the said judgment, the office is directed to incorporate the corrections in the body of the judgment before issuance of certified copy.

Remaining portion of the order shall remain unaltered.

(Subhendu Samanta, J.)