

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

**CR No.2927 of 2016  
Date of Decision: 20.09.2016**

**Ramesh Chander** .....**Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Union of India and others** .....**Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Arun Bansal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. D.K. Prajapati, Advocate for  
Mr. R.S. Madan, Advocate  
for respondents No.1 and 2.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)**

[1]. Petitioner has assailed order dated 03.01.2012 vide which the objections of the petitioner under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 against the award dated 28.01.2009 were dismissed by Additional District Judge, Hoshiarpur as time barred.

[2]. Award was passed by the Arbitrator on 28.01.2009. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the Award was never supplied to the petitioner which was mandatory. The objections could have been filed against the award on receipt of

copy thereof. Since no award was supplied, question of limitation should not have been raked up by the trial Court.

[3]. Learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon decision dated 16.09.2013 passed in **CR No.4828 of 2012** titled as **Tej Kaur Vs. Union of India and others** to contend that the date of award as a starting period of limitation must always be taken as a date of knowledge of the award.

[4]. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 fairly concedes to the aforesaid preposition and says that matter in controversy is squarely covered by judgment rendered in **Tej Kaur's case (supra)**.

[5]. In view of aforesaid, this revision petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 03.01.2012 is set aside. Trial Court is directed to decide the matter on merits.

September 20, 2016

*Prince*

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**Whether reasoned/speaking**      **Yes/No**

**Whether reportable**                **Yes/No**