



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **TEST.CAS. 100/2015 & I.A.5077/2024**

SHRI RAJINDER SINGH BEDI

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sonali Malhotra & Ms. Jyoti Jha,
Advts.

versus

THE STATE & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mrinal Kishor, Advocate for R-4
(M: 9958520733).

Ms. Binisa Mohanty, Advocate for
Respondent No. 5(a) (M:
9999176557).

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

ORDER

% **05.04.2024**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

I.A. 5077/2024 (for correction)

2. The present application has been filed seeking to correct the typographical error in the evidence by way of an affidavit of Mr. Preet Pal Singh filed on 20th March, 2023. The correction that is sought to be made in paragraph 8 wherein it is stated as under:-

“8. I say that the signature of Late Shri Jaswant Singh Bedi on the alleged will does not match with his specimen signature on his bank opening form and photocopy of voter ID card. In fact, his signature on the alleged will is completely different from his signatures available on his bank opening form and photocopy of voter ID card. I further say that signature of a person would not refine with advancement of age and passing of time but would become shaky and



sloppy. True copy of bank opening form, true copy of voter ID card and true copy of voter ID card are marked and being exhibited as Ex.R5(a)W1/1, Ex.R5(a)W1/2 and Ex.R5(a)W1/3 respectively.”

3. Ld. Counsel for the Applicant/Respondent submits that inadvertent voter ID card has been mentioned twice, in fact, R5(a)W1/3 is a FSL report.

4. The Court has heard ld. Counsel for the parties. Respondent is permitted to correct the error in the evidence by way of affidavit. The description of the said exhibit-R5(a)W1/3 shall read as FSL report and not a voter ID card in view of the fact that the voter ID card has been mentioned twice.

5. This application is allowed subject to payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- to the Petitioner, inasmuch as this Court had considered various applications and other appeals in a detailed judgment dated 18th January, 2024 which were filed on behalf of the Respondent. Despite such a detailed order and schedule being fixed for evidence again the delay has happened due to the Respondent.

6. Costs to be paid within two weeks.

7. Application is disposed of.

TEST.CAS. 100/2015

8. The Local Commissioner may fix a date in April-2024 itself for recording of the evidence of the Respondent i.e. Respondent No. 5(a).

9. The cross examination shall be conducted on one day. No further opportunity shall be given to the Respondent.

10. List on 12th July, 2024, the date already fixed.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

APRIL 5, 2024/mr/bh