



CWP-15708-2024

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

(246-2)

CWP-15708-2024

Date of decision:- 09.09.2025

**Dalmia Cement (Bharat) Limited****... Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****... Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL**

Present:- Mr. Rohit Khanna, Advocate,  
Mr. Saurabh Gautam, Advocate and  
Mr. Siddarth Kohli, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanav Singla, AAG, Punjab

Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate  
for respondent No.3.

\*\*\*\*

**SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. By way of instant petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has approached this Court *inter-alia* for issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus, directing to respondent No.2 to adjudicate application dated 14.12.2023, Annexure P-5, filed by the petitioner, under Section 16 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short "the Act") at the first instance before deciding the claim petition on merits. Another prayer has been made for directing respondent No.2 to follow the procedure as laid down under the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Act, 2006 and also to supply the certified copies of zimini/interim orders to the petitioner.

**CWP-15708-2024****-2-**

2. Although, after issuance notice of motion, response has not been filed by any of the respondents, but counsel for contesting respondent No.3 states that he does not have any objection in case both the prayers are acceded to.

3. In view thereof, writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to decide the application, Annexure P-5, filed by the petitioner, under Section 16 of the Act at the first instance before adjudicating the claim petition on merits. It is also directed that the authority concerned shall supply copies of the interim orders passed to the petitioner on a regular basis.

4. At this stage, counsel for respondent No.3 points out that the claim petition was filed in the year 2023 and is pending for the last three years. He requests that a direction be issued that the claim petition be determined expeditiously in a time bound manner.

5. There is a substance in the prayer made by the counsel for respondent No.3.

6. Respondent No.2 is requested to conclude the proceedings as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of six months.

**(SUVIR SEHGAL)**  
**JUDGE**

09.09.2025

*Kamal*

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No