

Urmila Ingale

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
SECOND APPEAL NO. 351 OF 2013

Shri Khandu Shripati Birdawade and anr. .. Appellants
Vs.
State of Maharashtra and ors. .. Respondents

Mr.Yatin Malwankar I/b Mr.Sugandh Deshmukh a/w appellant
No.2 - Mr.Shivaji Khandu Birdawade, for the Appellants.
Mr.Y.Y.Dabake, AGP for State.
Mr.S.A.Rajeshirke, for Respondents No. 2A to 2C, 2E(2), 3,
4(A)(I) to 4(A)(III) & 4B.

CORAM : M.S.KARNIK, J.

DATE : 29th JULY, 2019

P.C. :

Learned Counsel for the parties have submitted the consent terms duly signed by the parties. On behalf of the appellants, appellant No.2 who is power of attorney holder of appellant No.1 is present and states that Consent Terms are duly signed by him. Respondent No.4a - Ramchandra is personally present in Court and states that he has signed the Consent Terms. Learned Counsel for the respondents states that the

Consent Terms are duly signed by other respondents as well. The Consent Terms are signed by the respective Advocates for the parties. Learned Counsel states that clauses in the Consent Terms are explained to the parties in local language – Marathi. Appellant No.2 and respondent No.4a state that the terms have been explained to them and they agree what is stated in the Consent Terms. Learned Counsel for the parties identified the appellant No.2 & respondent No. 4a who are present in the Court.

Second Appeal is disposed of in terms of the Consent Terms. Respondent no.1 is State of Maharashtra. Respondents No.1a and 1b are Revenue Authorities and hence, it is not necessary for them to sign the Consent Terms in view of clauses mentioned in the Consent Terms.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)