

ARVIND BALYAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

Present: Mr. Ishnoor Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Additional A.G., Haryana.

The present application has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 114 and Order XLVII Rule 1 CPC for recalling/review of judgment dated 12.08.2025 passed in CWP-23358-2025.

Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that inadvertently a typographical mistake has been occurred instead of directing respondent No.1 who is a competent authority to consider and decide the representation (Annexure P-18), a direction was issued to respondent No.3.

In view of the averments made in the application, the same is allowed and a direction is issued to respondent No.3 that the representation submitted by the petitioner, which was erroneously placed before respondent No.3 due to a *bona fide* mistake on the part of the learned counsel for the petitioner, be treated accordingly. However, it is clarified that the said representation pertains to the matter for which respondent No.1 is competent to adjudicate the controversy involved in the present case. Therefore, the representation shall be deemed to have been duly submitted before respondent No.1 for appropriate consideration and decision in accordance with law.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

08.09.2025

Neha