

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE U. DURGA PRASAD RAO

C.C.C.A.No.2 of 1997

Judgment:

It is seen that suit—O.S.No.526 of 2985 under appeal is a partition suit and the trial Court in its judgment dated 01.08.1996 allowed the same and passed a preliminary decree. Aggrieved, defendant No.4 preferred the instant appeal before the High Court. Pending appeal the parties entered into compromise and filed C.C.C.A.M.P.No.635 of 2012 for recording compromise. This Court in its order dated 19.12.2012 directed both the parties to appear before the trial Court to get the compromise recorded. Accordingly, the trial Court in I.A.No.19 of 2013 in O.S.No.526 of 2985 recorded the compromise and transmitted the file to High Court. Now, learned counsel for both the parties prayed this Court to allow the appeal in terms of compromise.

2) Upon perusal of the terms of compromise recorded by the trial, this appeal is allowed in terms of compromise entered into by the parties as prayed by them. No costs in the appeal.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

U. DURGA PRASAD RAO, J

Date: 07.09.2015

Murthy