

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
 CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
 I.A.Nos.4-5  
 IN  
 CIVIL APPEAL NO.8031 OF 2001

JAGJIT SINGH & ORS.  
 ELLANTS

.....APP

VERSUS

PAMELA MANMOHAN SINGH  
 PONDENT

.....RES

O R D E R

I.A.No.4 of 2010 in C.A.No.8031 of 2001

I.A.No.4/2000 has been filed for correction of the alleged errors in paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the judgment dated

10.03.2010. The first error is said to have been committed in paragraph 3 wherein it has been mentioned that Mrs.Rasheel Kohli

had filed suit for eviction of Khairati Lal, who had been

inducted as tenant.

In our view, there is no error in paragraph 3 of the

judgment. What has been mentioned in that paragraph is based on

the statement contained at page-R of the appeal paper

wherein it is stated that Raseel Kohli filed suit against

Khairati Lal for recovery of rent and possession. For the

reasons best known to the appellants, they had not placed on

record copy of the complaint filed by Mrs.Rasheel Kohli.

Therefore, the assertion that the description of the suit as

given in the judgment is erroneous is clearly misconceived.

2

The second alleged error is with reference to para 4 of the

judgment. We have carefully gone through the relevant paragraph

and find that there is nothing in the said paragraph from which it can be inferred that the Court had recorded a finding that Rasheel Kohli had actually received Rs.6 lacs in the form of bank guarantee.

It is then said that in para 6 of the judgment, the time mentioned in the context of execution of three registered sale deeds by Shri K.V.Kohli (son of the deceased) is erroneous. To this extent, the applicant is correct. Therefore, we direct that in the first line of para 6 of the judgment, the expression "after about one month" shall be substituted and be deemed to have always been substituted with the expression "after about one year and two months".

Another error pointed out relates to the date mentioned in para 7 of the judgment. According to the applicants, the date is "23.09.1987" and not "07.03.1987". This mistake also deserves to be corrected. Accordingly, it is directed that the date mentioned in para 7 of the judgment shall be read as "23.09.1987" instead of "07.03.1987".

The application is accordingly disposed of.

I.A.No.5 of 2011 in C.A.No.8031 of 2001

This is an application for correction of the number of suit in para 3 of the judgment. This mistake deserves to be corrected. Accordingly, it is directed that in para 3 of the judgment, the number of suit shall be read as "1080 of 1979" instead of "180 of 1979".

The error with reference to the date mentioned in para 6 of the judgment has already been directed to be corrected while disposing of I.A.No.4 of 2010. The so-called error mentioned in para 2 of the judgment cannot be termed as an error warranting any correction.

The application is accordingly disposed of.

.....J.

