

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(1) CR No. 4012 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of decision: July 21, 2015

Reliance Infratel Ltd. and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Sube Singh

...Respondent

(2) CR No. 4014 of 2013 (O&M)

Reliance Infratel Ltd. and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Satish Kumar

...Respondent

(3) CR No. 4065 of 2013 (O&M)

Reliance Infratel Ltd. and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Satish Kumar

...Respondent

(4) CR No. 4066 of 2013 (O&M)

Reliance Infratel Ltd. and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Sube Singh

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr. DK Singhal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of the above titled four revision petitions as they arise out of the same set of facts. Two revisions arise out of the dismissal the applications for a reference under Section 8 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act and the other two are against the subsequent orders striking off the defence.

2. It is not in dispute that there is an arbitral agreement between the parties. However, the court declined to make the reference on the ground that the place of arbitration has not been mentioned in the arbitral clause. I find the order of the court below to be erroneous, for, the place of arbitration shall be the place which is possible under the Act, if there is no specific place mentioned.

4. The impugned orders are set aside and the revisions are allowed. Either party may apply for appointment of arbitrator in the manner contemplated under the Arbitral agreement.

July 21, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE