

Amrut

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
SECOND APPEAL NO. 15 OF 2009

Pauto Vithoba Velip & Ors	...Appellants
<i>Versus</i>	
Malu alias Molu Babi Velip & Ors	...Respondents

Mr Sudin Usgaonkar, *Senior Advocate with Ms V Palyekar, Advocate for the Appellant.*

Mr RG Ramani, *Advocate for the Respondent.*

CORAM: G.S. PATEL,J

DATED: 18th August 2017

PC:-

1. The Appellants are the original Plaintiffs. The Respondents are the original Defendants. After the matter was heard for some time on the previous occasion last week, it was adjourned to enable the parties and their advocates to arrive at a settlement.

2. I am today informed by Mr Usgaonkar for the Appellants and Mr Ramani for the Respondents that a complete settlement has been worked out. Appellant No 1(e) and Respondent Nos 1 and 4 are personally present in Court. They represent both sides.

3. By consent, the impugned order is substituted with the following:

- (a) The Administration of the suit temple will continue with the Plaintiffs.
- (b) The Plaintiffs do not seek a restraint against the Defendants from visiting the temple or paying respects to the family “purush”.
- (c) Parties are agreed that on all festive occasions the temple will be kept open for the use of both sides.
- (d) On special occasions such as marriages and connected ceremonies, the Defendants will inform the Plaintiffs two days in advance.
- (e) It is agreed that their restraint on timings in the impugned order of the First Appellate Court is no longer necessary. That portion of the order is therefore also substituted and set aside.

4. The Second Appeal is disposed of in these terms.

5. I must express my gratitude to learned counsel on both sides for their efforts in bringing this matter to a close. It could not have been easy.

G. S. PATEL, J