



\$~43

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **C.R.P. 166/2024**

YOGESH KUMAR GOEL & ANR.Petitioners

Through: In person with Ms. Sarita Sharma,
Advocate

Versus

SAURABH BHARDWAJRespondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

27.11.2024

%

CM APPL. 69243/2024

1. Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CM APPL. 69242/2024

2. The present Application under Section 152 CPC has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner/ revisionist for correction of typographical error in the Order dated 22.10.2024 passed by this Court.

3. It is submitted that in Para-3 of the judgment dated 22.10.2024, in Para-3 it has been erroneously mentioned that the “*Revisionist (plaintiff)* had filed a Suit for Recovery of Rs.3,50,000/- against the Respondent-Defendant”, whereas the actual amount was Rs.3,05,000/-.

4. For the reasons stated in the Application, it is allowed. The typographical error in Paragraph -3 of Order dated 22.10.2024 is corrected and it is directed that it shall be read as “*Revisionist (plaintiff)*



had filed a Suit for Recovery of Rs.3,05,000/- against the Respondent-Defendant”.

5. With aforesaid modification, the Application is accordingly disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

NOVEMBER 27, 2024

r