

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I N D I A

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 17325/2015

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 05/02/2015 in CR No. 4106/2012 passed by the High Court Of Punjab & Haryana At Chandigarh)

GURSHARAN SINGH

Petitioner

(s)

VERSUS

MANMOHAN SINGH

Respondent

(s)

(With interim relief and office report)

Date : 10/07/2015 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Lakshmi Raman Singh, Adv.  
Ms. Malavika Rajkotia, Adv.  
Ms. Arpita Rai, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

n the It is argued by the learned counsel that i  
the written submission filed by the petitioner herein,  
the petitioner had referred to the family settlement and, inter alia, had stated that as per the settlement, the sum of Rs.13 lakhs was to be paid by his party to party No. 3, i.e., Manmohan Singh, at the time of purchasing the stamp papers. She points out that the only amendment which was

Signature Not Verified

sought

Digitally signed by  
Meenakshi Kohli

was to correct the typographical errors

which  
Date: 2015.07.15  
17:39:26 IST

Reason: occurred in the aforesaid assertion inasmuch as, as per the family settlement which is already a part of record, payment made was Rs.10 lakhs and not Rs. 13 lakhs and party No. 3 is

Raminder Kaur and not Manmohan Singh. Further, the address mentioned was H.No. 305-L Model Town, Karnal, however, it is H.No.305-R, Model Town, Karnal.

We are of the opinion that since family settlement is already on record which is an admitted document, it is still permissible for the petitioner to point out the correctness of the particulars from the said document. With these observations the special leave petition is dismissed.

(Nidhi Ahuja)  
COURT MASTER

(Suman Jain)  
COURT MASTER