

3. After the matter was argued for some time, learned Counsel for the petitioner on instructions submits that the petitioner is willing to abide by the compromise dated 19/08/2001. His grievance however is that in terms of the compromise the survey that is carried out and the plan for partition prepared by T.I.L.R. is not in consonance with the compromise terms. He has objection to the plan for partition which is prepared. If the petitioner has any grievance regarding the plan prepared by T.I.L.R. as not in conformity with the terms of the compromise, the petitioners are always at liberty to make an appropriate application to the Executing Court which application can be considered by Executing Court on its own merits.

4. With these observations & with liberty to the petitioner to make an appropriate application, Petition is rejected.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)