

SHEPHALI

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
SUIT NO. 678 OF 2016
WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1985 OF 2016**

Khursheed Anwar Mohammadali & Anr. ...Plaintiffs
Versus
Syncom Formulations (I) Ltd. ...Defendant

Mr. Alankar Kirpekar, *i/b MAG Legal for the Plaintiff.*
Mr. Pradeep Vade, *i/b Pradeep Vade Associates, for the Defendants.*
Mr. M. M. Jariwala, *Legal Manager of the Plaintiff, present.*
Mr. Ramyash Raghunandan Vishwakarma, *representative of the Defendant Company, present.*

CORAM: G.S. PATEL, J
DATED: 17th November 2016

PC:-

1. The Suit is settled. Consent Terms are tendered. These are signed by the Authorized Signatory for the Defendant and the 1st Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the 2nd Plaintiff. They are also signed by their respective Advocates.

2. I have seen the Consent Terms. They are in order. They are not contrary to law and they appear to reflect the parties' true intention and have been drawn by the parties of their own volition.

The Consent Terms are taken on record and marked “X” for identification. The undertakings in the Consent Terms, if any, are accepted as undertakings to the Court.

3. The Suit is disposed of in accordance with the Consent Terms. There will be no order as to costs.

4. The drawn up decree is dispensed with. However, if for the purpose of implementation of these Consent Terms, should the parties require a drawn up decree, they will be entitled to apply to the Department for one without having to make a separate application in that behalf and on production of an authenticated copy of this order. Drawn up decree is to be strictly in accordance with these Consent Terms only.

5. Refund of court fee, if any, in accordance with the Rules.

6. In view of this, the Notice of Motion does not survive and is disposed of accordingly.

7. All concerned to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

(G. S. PATEL, J.)