

NIA S. 138, 141 - Typographical mistakes should have been rectified by the trial Court, as trial Court has inherent power to rectify such typographical mistakes to do justice between the parties - XYZ through its proprietor was described as an accused and initially the name of the proprietor viz. AK was not mentioned in the complaint - XYZ is the sole proprietary concern and AK is the only proprietor thereof - Whether the accused was described as XYZ through its proprietor AK or whether he is described AK proprietor of XYZ will make no difference - It would not cause any prejudice whatsoever to the petitioner/accused - Revisional Court was fully justified in permitting the complainant to insert the name of AK as the proprietor thereof.

[PLRonline 210500](#)

Maan Agro Centre v. EIDParry (India) Ltd, 2004 PLRonline 0009

[2004-PLRonline-0009Download](#)