

\$~5.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CS(OS) No.39/2016 & IA No.1352/2016 (under Order XXXIX Rules 1&2 of the CPC).

MR RAJ KUMAR GUPTA Plaintiff

Through: Mr. B.B. Gupta, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Udyan Srivastava, Advs.

versus

SMT VISHAN KUMARI & OTHERS Defendants

Through: Mr. Satyam Bhatia, Adv. for Mr.
Virender Rana, Adv. for D-2&3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

22.09.2016

1. The parties in this suit for partition of immoveable property were vide order dated 19th April, 2016 referred to the Mediation Cell of this Court.
2. Mediation has been successful with the efforts of Ms. Veena Ralli, Advocate/Mediator and a Settlement Agreement dated 1st August, 2016 stated to be signed by the plaintiff as well as the defendants no.2&3 Mr. Praphul Kumar and Mr. Atul Kumar as well as by their respective Advocates and the Mediator has been received.
3. The senior counsel for the plaintiff and the counsel for the defendants no.2&3 support the said Settlement Agreement.
4. I have enquired from the senior counsel for the plaintiff whether the parties are willing to pay the Stamp Duty on the decree which will be drawn up of partition of the property in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

5. The senior counsel for the plaintiff and the counsel for the defendants no.2&3 state that the parties are not wanting a decree for partition and merely want disposal of the suit in terms of the Settlement Agreement, without any executable decree being passed and without the decree of this Court constituting a document of title of the parties of their respective portions of the property.

6. Accordingly, the suit is disposed of in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

SEPTEMBER 22, 2016

‘pp’..