

We have gone through the compromise petition. In our view, the compromise is lawful. Accordingly, while maintaining our order dated 14th July, 2008, granting leave, we recall other portions of that order and disposed of the criminal miscellaneous petition and the appeal in the following terms:

- (a) The husband has agreed to pay to the wife a sum of Rs.2,60,000/- by way of permanent alimony, out of this Rs.60,000/- have already been paid. For the balance amount of Rupees two lakhs, two Banker's cheque drawn in favour of the wife have been made over by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the husband to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the wife in court today.
- (b) Prosecution of husband-Chitranjan Gaur and others in case 2743 of 1998 titled State vs. Chitranjan Gaur and Others pending in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Agra, within the state of Uttar Pradesh, is quashed.
- (c) Prosecution of husband-Chitranjan Gaur in Case No.474 of 2006, pending in the Court of Judicial Magistrate-III, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, is quashed.
- (d) Prosecution of husband-Chitranjan Gaur in Case No.12740 of 2006, pending in the Court of First Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Agra, within the state of Uttar Pradesh, is also quashed.
- (e) Prosecution of wife-Minakshi Gaur and others in Case No.1000 of 2000, pending in the court of Special Chief Judicial Magistrate, Agra, within the State of Uttar Pradesh, is also quashed.

....3/-

(f) Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.4250 of 2002, Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.534 of 2006 and Criminal Miscellaneous Application No.20600 of 2007, pending before the Allahabad High Court shall stand disposed of.

(g) First Appeal No.613 of 2003, titled as Meenakshi Gaur vs. Chitranjan Gaur, pending before the Allahabad High Court, shall stand withdrawn as infructuous.

[B.N. AGRAWAL]J.

[G.S. SINGHVI]J.

New Delhi,
February 06, 2009.