

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 37 OF 2011

IN

COMPANY APPEAL NO. 3 OF 2011

SHAMBHU A PAI PANANDIKER AND 5
ORS.,

... Petitioners

Versus

MARPOL PRIVATE LIMITED AND 22
ORS.,

... Respondents

Shri Parag Rao, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Coram:- C. V. BHADANG, J.

Date:- 31st August 2018

P.C.

Heard Shri Rao, the learned Counsel for the petitioner.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has placed on record a copy of the e-mail dated 24.08.2018 from the petitioner. The copy is taken on record and marked 'X' for identification. Shri Rao, the learned Counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, states that all the disputes between the parties relating to the Company, M/s Marpol Private Limited have been settled and therefore, the petitioner does not intend to continue with the contempt petition. It is submitted that the Company, M/s Marpol Private Limited is a closely held Company. The petitioner and the respondent no. 2, against whom the allegations of contempt of Court was made,

are real brothers.

3. The record in the present case does not show that any notice in Form I, under Rule 9 of the Contempt of Courts (Bombay High Court) Rules, 1994, was issued to the respondent no. 2. In that view of the matter and as the parties have settled all their disputes amicably and the petitioner does not intend to prosecute the contempt petition, the same is dismissed.

C. V. BHADANG, J.

EV