

Santosh

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
SECOND APPEAL NO.13 OF 2018**

ROSALINA COUTINHO E
QUADROS (DEC), THR. LR.,APPELLANT.

Versus.

REMIGIO QUADROS (DEC), THR.
LRS. AND ANR.,RESPONDENTS.

Mr. J. Abreau Lobo, Advocate for the Appellants.

Mr. Vishwadh Sardessai, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : M. S. SONAK, J.

DATE : 20th October 2022

P.C.: -

1. The learned Counsel for the parties hand in consent terms, to which annexed, is a plan. The consent terms are marked as “X” for the purpose of identification and the plan is marked as “Y” again, for the purpose of identification. The consent terms, along with the plan, are taken on record.

2. The consent terms have been signed by the Appellant, who is present in the Court and the Respondent No.2, who is also present in the Court. The learned Counsel point out that Respondents No.1(a) to 1(d) are the children of Respondent

No.2. The learned Counsel for the parties state that Respondents No.1(a) to 1(d) are presently living abroad. But Mr. Vishwadh Sardesai holds Vakalatnama on their behalf and has signed the consent terms. Mrs. Antonieta Quadros-Respondent No.2, on a specific query, states that her children are aware of these terms and they have no difficulties in agreeing to these terms.

3. The parties have settled their differences. A Surveyor was also appointed to prepare a plan. The plan is, as per the agreement reached between the parties. The consent terms are not against public policy or otherwise unlawful.

4. Accordingly, the consent terms and the plan annexed to them, are accepted. This Second Appeal is disposed of in terms of the consent terms. The statements made, or the undertakings given by the parties, as recorded in the consent terms, are accepted. The impugned decrees to stand modified in accord with the consent terms.

5. This Second Appeal is disposed of. Decree to be drawn accordingly.

SANTOSH S
MHAMAL

Digitally signed by
SANTOSH S MHAMAL
Date: 2022.10.21 10:37:31
+05'30'

M. S. SONAK, J.