

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. _____ OF 2025
(@ Diary No. 54540/2025)

IN

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 11786/2025

VANEETA PATNAIK

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

NIRMAL KANTI
CHAKRABARTI & ORS.

APPLICANT/RESPONDENT(S)

ORDER

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The Civil Appeal No. 11786 of 2025, titled as "*Vaneeta Patnaik Vs. Nirmal Kanti Chakrabarti & Ors.*", was decided *vide* judgment and order of this Court dated 12.09.2025.
3. The applicant/respondent, 'Nirmal Kanti Chakrabarti' has moved this application (M.A. D. No. 54540 of 2025) for expunging paragraph Nos. 33 and 34 of the aforesaid judgment but particularly, the sentence beginning from 'Thus' and ending with 'personally' contained in paragraph No. 34 of the aforesaid judgment.
4. The submission of Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi,

Senior Counsel is that the applicant/respondent has not been held guilty and therefore, casting a stigma, as referred to in the above sentence amounts to a punishment without holding him to be guilty of any misconduct or an offence.

5. The application has been strongly opposed by Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant on the ground that it is not maintainable and the proper remedy, if any, is of the review. The Court has incorporated the above sentence with conscious mind and that there is no reason to expunge the same.

6. Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Senior Counsel and Ms. Madhavi Divan, Senior Counsel appearing for the applicant/respondent submit that the applicant does not want any review of the judgment in question rather only an expunction of the stigmatic sentence and as such, the miscellaneous application is the right remedy.

7. We do not intend to enter into the question of maintainability of the application. However, treating it to be a miscellaneous application or a review application, as the case may be, we proceed to decide the same.

8. The intention of the Court in adding the

above sentence was only to apprise the public with regard to the incident which had taken place involving the applicant/respondent. But nonetheless, as there is no finding on merits against him, we consider it appropriate to delete the same as probably the incident is under investigation/trial pursuant to an FIR.

9. Accordingly, we delete the aforesaid sentence beginning from 'Thus' and ending with 'personally' contained in paragraph No. 34 of the judgment and order dated 12.09.2025 for the reason that we have not indicted the applicant/respondent on merits in any manner though the matter may have been argued on merits.

10. Accordingly, I.A. No. 242096/2025 stands allowed and the miscellaneous application stands disposed of.

.....J.
[PANKAJ MITHAL]

.....J.
[PRASANNA B. VARALE]

NEW DELHI;
NOVEMBER 17, 2025.
SD

ITEM NO.47

COURT NO.11

SECTION XVI

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

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION..... Diary No. 54540/2025

**[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 12-09-2025
in C.A. No. 11786/2025 passed by the Supreme Court of India]**

VANEETA PATNAIK**Appellant(s)****VERSUS****NIRMAL KANTI CHAKRABARTI & ORS.****Applicant/Respondent(s)**

(IA No. 242096/2025 - MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDER)

Date : 17-11-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ MITHAL****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE**

For appellant(s) **Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.**
Ms. Madhavi Divan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, Adv.
Mr. Vishnu Kant, AOR
Mr. Amit Bhandari, Adv.
Mr. Ankush Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Kautilya Birat, Adv.
Ms. Aandrita Deb, Adv.
Ms. Rajnandini, Adv.
Mr. Vishwadeep Chandrakar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) **Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Sr. Adv.**
Mr. Rishad Ahmed Chowdhury, AOR
Mr. Rohit Das, Adv.
Ms. Kishwar Rahman, Adv.
Ms. Sohini Sanyal, Adv.

Mr. Kunal Chatterji, AOR
Ms. Maitrayee Banerjee, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Bansal, Adv.
Mr. Varij Nayan Mishra, Adv.

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

1. The operative portion of the order is *inter alia* held as under:

" 9. Accordingly, we delete the aforesaid sentence beginning from 'Thus' and ending with 'personally' contained in paragraph No. 34 of the judgment and order dated 12.09.2025 for the reason that we have not indicted the applicant/respondent on merits in any manner though the matter may have been argued on merits."

2. The application being I.A. No. 242096/2025 stands allowed and the miscellaneous application stands disposed of in terms of the signed order which is placed on the file.

(SNEHA DAS)
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(NIDHI MATHUR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)