

\$~31.

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

+ TEST.CAS. 36/2013 & IAs No.19756/2014 & 24765/2015

MEENAKSHI SHUKLA & ANR. Petitioners
Through: Mr.Hari, Advocate and
Mr.Sanjeev K.Tyagi, Advocates

versus

STATE & ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Aman Preet Singh Rahi, Advocate
for R-2 & R-6
Mr.R.K.Yadav, Advocate for R-3 & R-4

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

% **ORDER**
03.12.2015

1. Vide order dated 4.12.2014, the parties, being family members, were referred to mediation. Pursuant thereto, a Settlement Agreement dated 30.11.2015 has been forwarded by the learned Mediator.
2. Counsels for the parties clarify that the Settlement Agreement has been signed by all the parties, except for the respondent No.5. The court is informed that the respondent No.5 had to be served by substituted mode and despite service through publication, she did not enter appearance or file any objections. As a result, vide order dated 13.8.2014, the right of the respondent No.5 to file objections to the probate petition was closed.

3. Counsel for the petitioners states that in view of the settlement recorded in the Settlement Agreement, his clients do not wish to proceed further with the present petition. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of, along with pending applications.

DECEMBER 3, 2015

mk/ap

HIMA KOHLI, J