

ITEM NO.101

COURT NO.12

SECTION IX

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No(s). 1528/2007

KAMAL B. DEVAL

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

MAHENDRASINHJI ZORAVARSINHJI SANDHU &amp;ANR

Respondent(s)

(with appln. (s) for stay and office report)

WITH

C.A. No. 1531/2007

(With Office Report)

Date : 01/09/2016 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVA KIRTI SINGH

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE R. BANUMATHI

For the parties:

Mr. Sushil Kumar Jain, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Christi Jain, Adv.

Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Ankita Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Apurv Taran, Adv.

Ms. Pratibha Jain, Adv.

Mr. R. N. Poddar, Adv.

Mr. Ashish Dholakia, Adv.

Ms. Sumita Hazarika, Adv.

Mr. D. Kishore Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Gautam Bajaj, Adv.

Ms. Ipsita Behura, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

On hearing the parties, we find that the dispute arises out of a partnership business and is mainly for settlement of accounts including amount of stock in hand

and cash on hand for the years 1973-1974 to 31<sup>st</sup> October, 1982. Presently the parties are at variance on the issue whether the award of the arbitrator in favour of the respondent entitling him to an amount of approx. Rs.3,00,000/- (Rupees three lakhs) plus interest, even after some interference by the High Court, should be accepted as valid or not.

On account of long passage of time, and as we are told the partnership business has also closed since quite sometime, we have indicated to the parties that they should try first to settle their dispute through amicable efforts made by friends or the lawyers, so that there may not arise any occasion for further litigation between the parties in such old stale matter. With that in mind, since the parties have agreed to make an effort for amicable settlement, we adjourn both the matters. List the matters after three weeks.

(NEELAM GULATI)  
COURT MASTER

(MADHU NARULA)  
COURT MASTER