

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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 418 OF 2000

P.J. KURIEN
t (s)

Appellan

VERSUS

RANJITHA AND ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date: 21/03/2006 This appeal was mentioned today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. AGRAWAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. MATHUR

For Appellant(s)

Mr. Sushil Kumar, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Bina Madhavan, Adv.

Mr. P.H. Parekh, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the appellant.

tain errors

It appears that due to typographical mistakes, cer

have been made in our order dated 8th March, 2006. In the fourth line of
the order, the expression "Sub" be deleted and it should be read as "Judicial

n mentioned Magistrate, First Class". Further in paragraph 2, it has been

that "...directed to summon the appellant to face trial under Sections 363, 365, 366, 368, 372, 376 and 392 read with Sections 109 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code in case No. C.M.P. 1436/99". It appears that the Court has

summoned the appellant only under Section 376 and not under any of the aforesaid Sections and the correct Case No. is "CW 21/99" instead of "C.M.P.1436/99".

Let the order be read accordingly.

[Alka Dudeja]

Court Master

[Om Prakash]

Court Master

[Signed order is placed on the file]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 418 OF 2000

P.J. Kurien

...Appellant(s)

Versus

Ranjitha and Ors.

...Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the appellant.

It appears that due to typographical mistakes, certain errors have been made in our order dated 8th March, 2006. In the fourth line of the order, the expression "Sub" be deleted and

it should be read as "Judicial Magistrate, First Class". Further in paragraph 2, it has been mentioned that "...directed to summon the appellant to face trial under Sections 363, 365, 366, 368, 372, 376 and 392 read with Sections 109 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code in case No. C.M.P. 1436/99". It appears that the Court has summoned the appellant only under Section 376 and not in any of the aforesaid Sections and the correct Case No. is "CW 21/99" instead of " C.M.P.1436/99".

Let the order be read accordingly.

.....J.

[B.N. AGRAWAL]

.....J.

[A.K. MATHUR]

New Delhi,
March 21, 2006.