

Ritu Kumari **Appellant**
Versus
Mukul Ranjan **Respondent**

For the Appellant : Mr. Manoj Kumar Sah, Advocate
For the Respondent : Mr. Peeyush Krishna Choudhary, Advocate

1. Appearance has already been made on behalf of the respondent in pursuance of the notice issued vide order dated 14.11.2025.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the appellant has sought for leave of this Court to make correction in paragraph-11 of the instant interlocutory application as due to typographical error, the date “11.03.2025” has wrongly been typed as “11.03.2055”.
3. Considering the same, let the necessary correction be made in course of the day.
4. Heard the parties on the issue of limitation.
5. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the delay occurred in filing the present appeal may be condoned so that the matter may be decided on merit.
6. There is no objection on behalf of the respondent to such submission advanced on behalf of the appellant.
7. Considering the reasons as referred in paragraphs-10 & 11 of the instant interlocutory application, the delay in filing the present appeal deserves to be condoned.
8. Accordingly, the instant interlocutory application stands allowed, as such, disposed of and the delay of 79 days in filing the instant appeal is hereby, condoned.

9. Heard.

10. Admit.

11.Call for the trial court records.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

05th January, 2026
Saurabh/