

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA : HYDERABAD

MAIN CASE: Writ Petition No.27409 of 2024

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
05.	20.02.2026	<u>CVBR,J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2026</u> This application is filed by the petitioner, appearing as party-in-person, seeking to post the matter under the caption “For Being Mentioned” for the purpose of seeking clarifications/rectification of the order dated 19.11.2024 passed by this Court in W.P. No. 27409 of 2024. Heard the petitioner/party-in-person and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home appearing for the respondents. The records reveal that this Court, after considering the submissions made by both sides, disposed of the Writ Petition No.27409 of 2024 <i>vide</i> order dated 19.11.2024. The relevant portions of the said order are extracted hereunder: <i>“5. This Court, without expressing any opinion, since it is stated that the petitioner has lodged a complaint on the file of respondent No.2, if they have not acted upon the complaint, the petitioner is always having right to file an appropriate private complaint before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.</i> <i>6. Granting liberty to the petitioner to file an appropriate complaint on the file of the concerned Magistrate Court as per the provisions of Act, 2023, this Writ Petition is disposed of.”</i> The petitioner/party-in-person now contends that there are certain technical errors and mistakes	

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		in the aforementioned order which require rectification. It is further contended that this Court ought to have issued specific directions for the protection of his rights instead of merely granting liberty to approach the Magistrate Court. On a careful consideration of the submissions and material on record, this Court finds that the order dated 19.11.2024 was passed on merits after considering the facts and circumstances of the case. The petitioner has failed to point out any error apparent on the face of the record or any clerical mistake that warrants the exercise of the inherent powers of this Court for rectification or clarification. The grievance of the petitioner, in essence, appears to be directed against the conclusion reached by this Court in the final order. It is well-settled that the remedy for a party aggrieved by a final order of a Single Judge lies in filing a Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, but not by way of an application "For Being Mentioned". The present application is fundamentally misconceived and lacks merit. Accordingly, this application is dismissed. <u>CVBR,J</u> scs	