



108

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 12.09.2025

(I) CR-1834-2025

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SUNITA GOYAL AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

(II) CR-1890-2025

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

VINOD KUMAR AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Arkash Mani Garg, Advocate for
Mr. K. S. Kang, Advocate
for the petitioner-NHAI.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. Both these Revision Petitions have been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, seeking appropriate directions to the learned Additional District Judge, Patiala, for expeditious disposal of the application under Section 36(2) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), filed in the objection petition under Section 34 of the Act, which is pending adjudication.



2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 12.08.2025, status report was called for from the learned Additional District Judge, Patiala with regard to the status of the case.

3. Today, a report dated 10.09.2025 has been received from the learned Additional District Judge, Patiala in both the cases, wherein it has been stated that in the year 2022, notice was issued to the respondents and thereafter, respondent No.2 had appeared through Counsel, whereas respondent No.1 was proceeded against *ex parte* and now the case is pending for 06.11.2025 for service of the remaining respondents and for awaiting the record of the Arbitration Tribunal. It has been further reported that the reply to the application under Section 36(2) of the Act is yet to be filed by the appearing respondent.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-NHAI submitted that his only limited prayer in the present petitions is for expeditious disposal of the aforesaid application under Section 36(2) of the Act.

5. This Court is of the considered view that since the objections under Section 34 of the Act as well as application under Section 36(2) of the Act are pending for the last three years, the same should be decided as expeditiously as possible and therefore, this Court does not deem it fit and proper, at this stage, to issue notice to the respondents in view of the aforesaid limited prayer made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-NHAI. It was also brought to the notice of this Court by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-NHAI that the learned Executing Court is proceeding with the execution application and in case the application under Section 36(2)



of the Act is not decided then acute prejudice will be caused to the petitioner-NHAI.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances and considering the aforesaid limited prayer made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-NHAI, both the Revision Petitions are disposed of with a direction to the learned Court before whom the application under Section 36(2) of the Act is pending to decide the same as expeditiously as possible and in accordance with law.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

12.09.2025
Chetan Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No