



\$~9.

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

+ CRL.A. 713/2017

ASHWINI AGGARWAL

..... Appellant

Through: Ms. Geeta Luthra, Senior Advocate
along with Ms. Shivani Luthra Lohiya
& Ms. Parul Sharma, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajat Katyal, APP for the State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.TEJI

ORDER

18.12.2017

%

Crl.M.A. 20684/2017

At the outset, Ms. Luthra submits that there is a typographical error in paragraph 3(f) of the present application. The said error has been allowed to be corrected by her in Court today under endorsement.

Issue notice. Mr. Katyal accepts notice.

By this application, the appellant seeks clarification of the order dated 14.11.2017, whereby the application preferred by the appellant under Section 391 Cr.P.C. was allowed.

Ms. Luthra submits that while moving the said application, the



additional documents/ evidence sought to be led in the matter were incorrectly described in the application though the documents/ evidence sought to be adduced additionally was correctly placed on record.

Mr. Katyal fairly does not oppose the application since there is a typographical error in the application.

Accordingly, the application is allowed. The order dated 14.11.2017 stands clarified accordingly. The documents mentioned at paragraphs 3(e), (f) & (g), as stated in the application, are allowed to be led in evidence.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

P.S.TEJI, J

DECEMBER 18, 2017

B.S. Rohella