

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.12019 OF 2016

M/s. Avicon Infra LLP through its Partners ...Petitioner
vs.
Shri Bhalchandra Jagannath Koli & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Suresh M. Sabrad I/b Mr. Yuvraj D. Patil for the Petitioner.
Ms. Priyanka Thakur for Respondent Nos.1 to 3.
Mr. Rohit P. Sakhadeo for Respondent No.7.
Mr. Prasad B. Kulkarni for Respondent No.8.

CORAM : SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV, J.
DATE : 10th October, 2017

P.C.:

. Heard respective counsel.

2. It is submitted that the Petitioner and the Respondent Nos.1 to 3 have amicably settled the matter. In fact the Respondent Nos.1 to 3 are the only contesting parties. The Petitioner has sought leave to delete Respondent No.8 since it is not the contesting Respondent. However, it is submitted that the Respondent No.8 had given his consent to the CIDCO Authorities much prior to the drawing of the Consent Terms between the Petitioner and Respondent Nos.1 to 3.

3. Mr. Sakhadeo, Learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.7 i.e. CIDCO has categorically submitted that the Corporation i.e. the CIDCO Authorities is not a party to the Consent Terms and that the Consent Terms may not be binding upon the CIDCO Authorities.

4. In view of the Consent Terms drawn between the parties the Petition deserves to be disposed of as the prayer in the Petition has become

infructuous. In view of this, Petition is being disposed of with no order as to costs. The Consent Terms are taken on record and marked as 'X' for identification.

5. The respective learned counsel appearing for the contesting parties submit that they would abide by the Consent Terms and appear before the Court for necessary steps to be taken in accordance with law.

(SMT. SADHANA S. JADHAV, J.)