

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

R E V I E W P E T I T I O N ( C R L . ) N O ( s ) . 1 8 2 O F 2 0 1 3  
I N  
S L P ( C R L ) N O . 9 1 5 3 / 2 0 1 2

KARAM SINGH Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA Respondent(s)

(With condonation of delay in filing review petition and exemption from filing certified copy)

Date: 03/04/2013 This Petition was circulated today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATNAIK  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.L. GOKHALE

By Circulation

UPON perusing papers the Court made the following  
O R D E R

| Delay condoned.  
| The review petition stands disposed of in terms of the signed order.

| [KALYANI GUPTA] | [SHARDA KAPOOR]  
| COURT MASTER | COURT MASTER

[SIGNED ORDER IS PLACED ON THE FILE.]  
I N T H E S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
C R I M I N A L A P P E L L A T E J U R I S D I C T I O N

R E V I E W P E T I T I O N ( C R L . ) N O . 1 8 2 O F 2 0 1 3  
I N  
S P E C I A L L E A V E P E T I T I O N ( C R L . ) N o . 9 1 5 3 o f 2 0 1 2

KARAM SINGH PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA RESPONDENT

O R D E R

1. There is a delay of 39 days in filing the review petition which we are inclined to condone.
2. We find no merit in the review petition filed by the review petitioner seeking review of the order of this Court dated 30th November, 2012 by which SLP(C) No. 9153 of 2012 was dismissed.

3. However, we find an inadvertent mistake in the aforesaid order dated 30th November, 2012. The word "anticipatory" should not have been typed and is, accordingly deleted from the said order dated 30th November, 2012.

4. The review petition stands disposed of accordingly.

.....J  
[A.K. PATNAIK]

.....J  
[H.L. GOKHALE]

NEW DELHI  
APRIL 3, 2013.