



WEB COPY

WMP.No.4040 of 2025
in
W.P.No.22318 of 2024

R.N.MANJULA, J.

This petition is filed to clarify the observation/directions in para No.5 of the order in so far as the use of the word petitioner instead of respondent has inadvertently crept in the order dated 17.10.2024 in WP.No.22318 of 2024.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner who has filed this clarification petition submitted that the appellate authority's order is very much clear and the petitioner does not require any clarification. It is only the respondent who has raised doubts about the order of the appellate authority. The concluding order passed in the writ petition in W.P.No.22318 of 2024, dated 17.10.2024 is as under:

"5. If the impugned order creates doubts in the minds of the petitioner that the order has been passed only in respect of the adhoc payment ordered to be paid, the petitioner ought to have filed a clarification petition to clarify the same before the appellate authority and get an order to that effect. Hence, the petitioner is at liberty to file a clarification petition before the



WEB COPY



R.N.MANJULA, J.

jrs

appellate authority and the appellate authority shall dispose the same within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of such petition received from the petitioner."

3. So the clarification needs to be made by the petitioner only if the petitioner gets any doubt as to the orders passed by the appellate authority. The petitioner is very much clear about the orders, there is no obligation caused on the petitioner to file any clarification petition before the appellate authority. Since the order passed by this order is very clear, it does not require any further clarification. Hence, this miscellaneous petition is closed.

20.02.2025

jrs

WMP.No.4040 of 2025
in
W.P.No.22318 of 2024