



CR-7079-2025

-1-

117

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

CR-7079-2025

Date of Decision: 01.10.2025

Chandigarh Housing Board

..... Petitioner

Versus

M/s Aggarwal and Aggarwal and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. G.S. Wasu, Senior Standing Counsel with
Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India challenging the impugned order dated 03.09.2025 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh in Arbitration No.482 of 2023 praying that the same may kindly be modified to the extent of imposition of the condition of furnishing 100% security of the awarded amount in the shape of bank guarantee or FDR with the lien of the Court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner filed an objection petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') against the award which is still pending and in the aforesaid petition, an application has also been filed for staying the operation of the award in which the impugned order dated 03.09.2025 (Annexure P-2) has been passed whereby the operation of the award has been stayed subject to the condition of furnishing of security in the shape of Bank Guarantee or FDR with lien of the Court equivalent to the



CR-7079-2025

-2-

awarded amount to be furnished within 30 days. He further submitted that although the petitioner is a Public Sector Undertaking, but the aforesaid order may be modified only to the extent that instead of the full amount, half of the amount be directed to be deposited.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. In the application filed by the petitioner under Section 36(2) of the Act for staying the execution of the award, the learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh has stayed the award subject to the condition of furnishing the security in the shape of Bank Guarantee or FDR with lien of the Court equivalent to the awarded amount to be furnished within 30 days. This Court is not able to find any ground or justification for intervention in its revisional jurisdiction since there is no perversity in the aforesaid order. So far as the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to the modification of the impugned order (Annexure P-2) to the extent that instead of full amount, half of the amount be directed to be deposited is concerned, there is no justification for the same since the amount is only being secured and as per the impugned order, it is not to be disbursed to any of the parties. Therefore, there is no justification or any ground for reducing the aforesaid amount.

5. In view of the above, this Court does not find any perversity or illegality in the impugned order dated 03.09.2025 (Annexure P-2). Consequently, the present revision petition is hereby dismissed.

01.10.2025
Bhumika

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
2. Whether reportable: Yes/No