

FA 104 of 2017

Mandira Chowdhury and Ors.
Vs.
Ram Devi Chowdhury and Ors.

Mr. Indranath Mukherjee
...For the Appellants.

1. Learned Counsel for the appellants points out some clerical errors in the judgment dated February 24, 2025 passed in the appeal.
2. In paragraph no. 6 of the same, instead of “substituted respondent no.1 Durga”, it has been transcribed as “substituted defendant no.1 Durga”.
3. Also, in paragraph no. 9 thereof, the date on which the order was passed by the Officer-on-Special Duty of the CIT has been mentioned as “October 25, 1990” whereas it should be “June 27, 1994”.
4. In paragraph no. 45, the date mentioned as “October 25, 1990” shall be read as “February 10, 1994”.
5. In paragraph no. 47 of the said judgment, it has been recorded that “corroborative evidence by the plaintiffs/appellants”, which shall be read as “corroborative evidence by the defendants/appellants”.

6. In the third and fourth lines of paragraph no. 57, the expressions “DW2” and “DW1” shall respectively be read as “PW2” and “PW1”.

7. Let these corrections be deemed to stand incorporated in the judgment dated February 24, 2025 and this order be treated to be a part of the said judgment for all practical purposes.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)

(Uday Kumar, J.)