

\$~11 & 12

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

+ CO.PET. 785/2014 and CO.A. 2970/2014 (u/s. 433 (3) and 536(2) of the Companies Act r/w R. 6 & 9 of the Company Court Rules)

HEMA AGGARWAL Petitioner

Through: None

versus

M/S M-TECH DEVELOPERS LTD. Respondent

Through: Ms. Aayushi Gupta for Mr. Raman
Duggal, Advocate

+ CO.PET. 787/2014 and CO.A. 2974/2014 (u/s. 433 (3) and 536(2) of the Companies Act r/w R. 6 & 9 of the Company Court Rules)

ASHOK KUMAR BHARTI Petitioner

Through: None

versus

M/S M-TECH DEVELOPERS LTD Respondent

Through: Ms. Aayushi Gupta for Mr. Raman
Duggal, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

12.01.2016

A perusal of the record shows that on 03.02.2015, the court had recorded that a settlement had been arrived at between the parties in respect of the captioned matters, which is dated 02.02.2015.

Ms. Gupta, who appears for the respondent, says that the respondent has discharged its obligations under the settlement and paid the amounts to the petitioners in each of the captioned matters.

It is also the submission of the learned counsel for the respondent that the petitioners were, consequently, obliged to withdraw the captioned petitions.

There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners. It appears that since a settlement has been arrived at between the parties and, the amounts payable under it, have been received, the petitioners are no longer interested in pursuing the captioned petitions.

Accordingly, the captioned petitions and the pending applications are dismissed for non-prosecution.

The Registry will, however, despatch a copy of this order to the aforementioned petitioners, without insistence on process fee.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

At this stage, Mr. Rakesh K. Goswami, Advocate appeared for the petitioners. He has been apprised of the order passed today.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 12, 2016

yg

CO.PET. 785/2014 & 787/2014

page 2 of 2