

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**COMPANY APPEAL NO.13 OF 2014
IN
CLB/COMPANY PETITION NO.29 OF 2010**

Rezcom Realty Private Limited & Ors.Appellants

V/s.

Smt. Bina ChawdaRespondent

WITH

**COMPANY APPEAL NO.28 OF 2014
IN
CLB/COMPANY PETITION NO.29 OF 2010**

Mr.Pranesh Gada i/by Dhanuka & partners for appellants in CA No.28/2014 and for respondent no.1 in CA No.13 of 2014.

Smt.Bina Chawda in person.

Adv.Atul Singh i/by PKA Advocates for respondent nos.1 to 10 & 12 to 15 in Comp.Appeal No.28/2014 and for appellant in Comp.Appeal No.13/2014 and for respondent nos.2 to 9 and 11 & 12.

Respondent no.2-Mr.Pratap Bohra, Respondent no.5-Mr.Vivek Bohra and appellant no.2-Mr.Shashikant Patel present in person.

Respondent No.17-Shri Ramnik Chawda in person.

Authorized signatory of respondent no.14-Mr.Abhijeet Awasare and authorized signatory of respondent no.15-Mr.Mangesh Joshi present.

**CORAM : K.R.SHRIRAM,J
DATE : 23.12.2015**

P.C.:-

1 Further to the order dated 10.12.2015 Shri N.M.Shah, Valuer, who is present in court states that his invoices have been settled by the respondent-company by way of cheque issued today.

He states that he has no claim subject to realisation of the cheque.

2 The parties have amicably resolved both the appeals. Mr.Pranesh Gada i/by Dhanuka & Partners appearing for the appellant in appeal no.28/2014 and for the respondent in Company Appeal No.13 of 2014 states that they have not been consulted on these consent terms and hence they would like to be discharged. Dhanuka & partners are discharged.

3 Parties have filed the consent terms dated 4.12.2015 in both the appeals. Mr.Atul Singh i/by PKA Advocates identifies signature of appellant as well as respondents in both the appeals and further states that all the signatories are present in court. Consent terms are taken on record and marked "X" for identification. Order in terms of the consent terms. Both the appeals stand disposed accordingly. Interim application if any, also stands disposed.

4 The counsel further states that the respondent no.11 in Company Appeal No.28 of 2014 who is respondent no.10 in the company appeal no.13 of 2014 is only a formal party and hence his signature has not been taken. The counsel states that even without his signature the matter can be resolved and these consent terms will

not affect any right of the said person Satish Chander Sehgal.
Statement accepted.

(K.R.SHRIRAM,J)

CERTIFICATE

**Certified to be true and correct copy of the original
signed Judgment/Order.**