

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

I.A. No.01/2025 in CRP No.23/2025 (DO)

Fortuna Agro Plantations Ltd., A company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956 having its registered Office at P.O.-Sadhanashram, Kailashahar, District-Unakoti, Tripura, Pin-799277, represented by its Authorized Signatory Sri Ajoy Malakar, S/O. Late Sarbaram Malakar.

..... Petitioner/Applicant(s).

V E R S U S

1. The State of Tripura, Service through the Secretary, Ministry of Revenue, Government of Tripura having office at New Secretariat, Agartala, PIN-799010.

2. The Land Acquisition Collector, Gournagar, Kailashahar, District-Unakoti, Tripura, Pin-799277.

..... Respondent(s).

For Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. Dhrubajyoti Saha, Advocate,
Mr. Samrat Sarkar, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mangal Debbarma, Addl. G.A.

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO

Order

28/11/2025

This application is filed to correct the judgment dt.25.04.2025 in CRP No.23 of 2025.

Counsel for the petitioner states that in 3rd paragraph in the said judgment, certain errors of fact has been committed which requires correction.

According to the petitioner, against the judgment in WP(C) No.277 of 2009, the petitioner filed SLP No.11770 of 2016 in the Supreme Court of India and that the said SLP is still pending. But in the judgment rendered by the learned Single Judge in paragraph-3, this fact is omitted.

Counsel for the petitioner also states that in the judgment rendered on 25.04.2025, there is a reference to Review Petition No.36 of 2011 and that the same had nothing to do with the instant case and that the portion in

paragraph-3 starting with the words "Being aggrievedAgartala Bench" is required to be deleted.

He further states that in the 3rd paragraph in the judgment, there is a reference to Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No.13749/2012 and an order passed therein but those facts also have no relevance to the revision which was decided. He, therefore, contends that the portion in paragraph-3 starting with the words "Being aggrieved enhanced amount" also requires deletion.

Counsel for the respondents states that he has no objection to these corrections in the judgment dt.25.04.2025 in the manner sought by the counsel for the petitioner.

Therefore, this application is allowed and after the first sentence of paragraph-3, the following shall be added:

"Against the judgment in WP(C) No.277 of 2009 the petitioner filed SLP(C) No.11770 of 2016 which is pending."

Thereafter, the words "Being aggrieved.....enhanced amount" contained in the next two sentences shall be deleted.

Application is disposed of as indicated above.

(M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, CJ)

Pulak

PULAK BANIK Digitally signed by PULAK BANIK
Date: 2025.12.01 15:35:18
+05'30'