

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND**

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. KESHA VA RAO

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL No.339 OF 2016

Date:20.12.2018

Between:

Karumajji Sridhar S/o.Satyanarayana,
R/o.Sugar Colony, Palakol, W.G.Dist.

... Appellant

v.

Karumajji Sadhika @ Radhika,
R/o.Balaramunipet, Mahcilipatnam,
Bandar Mandal, Krisna District.

.. Respondent

For Appellant : Mr. Dasari S.V.V.S.V. Prasad

For Respondent : Mr. S. Balamohan

Gist :

Head Note :

Cases Referred : Nil

C/15

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. KESHA VA RAO

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL No.339 OF 2016

JUDGMENT: *(Per V. Ramasubramanian, J)*

This appeal is filed by the husband challenging the dismissal of his petition for divorce on the grounds of cruelty and desertion.

2. Heard the learned counsel on both sides.

3. It appears that the parties had another case in M.C. No.25 of 2014, filed at the instance of the respondent-wife for maintenance. The said matter referred to Lok Adalat. There the parties have compromised the matter on 28.11.2018.

4. The parties are present in Court. They are identified. They have confirmed the terms of compromise. The children of the parties confirmed the receipt of money as per the joint memo of compromise.

5. The parties have filed a joint memo of compromise before us. This joint memo of compromise reads as follows:

JOINT COMPROMISE MEMO

The appellant and respondent arrived at compromise by settling the terms. As per the terms of compromise the following terms are settled:

- (a) Appellant has to pay Rs.10 lakhs to the respondent towards permanent alimony,
- (b) Appellant has to pay Rs.5 lakhs to the daughter Durga Priyanka,

- (c) Appellant has to pay Rs.5 lakhs to the son Pramoda Ramachandra,
- (d) The children by name Pramoda Ramachandra and Durga Priyanka are living with the respondent.
- (e) The son and daughter of the appellant and the respondent reserves their right to prosecute/settle for their property rights separately, the present compromise is no way effected their right s in the property.
- (f) After recording the compromise the appellant and the respondent live separately with their own, no one can interfere with their personal lives in future;

7. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed, the judgment and decree of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Machilipatnam, is modified and there will be a decree in terms of the compromise memo.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

P. KESHA VA RAO, J

December 20, 2018

CTL