

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1625 of 2009

POONAM KHANNA

..... APPELLANT

VERSUS

V.P. SHARMA & ANR.

..... RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. We have heard the parties appearing in person very carefully.

2. The primary grievance of the appellant wife is that despite the comprehensive deed of settlement dated 2nd April, 2003, the respondent had continued to pursue the litigations that were pending and has infact filed some additional cases as well. We put it to the respondent as to whether he would be willing to withdraw all the cases which had been initiated by him. He categorically stated that he would do so but when a similar query was put to the appellant she, at the

initial stage, said that she would not withdraw them but when told that we were inclined to dismiss the appeal, she said that she would withdraw the cases that she had filed but would continue to pursue some of the applications that had been filed on behalf of the child and would continue to seek additional maintenance.

3. In the circumstances, we are not inclined to interfere in this matter. The appeal is dismissed.

.....J
[HARJIT SINGH BEDI]

.....J
[CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD]

NEW DELHI
MARCH 17, 2011.

JUDGMENT