

227

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

FAO-1328-2014 (O&M)

Date of decision : 30.05.2016

Kamlesh Yadav and another

... Appellants

Versus

Mahindra and Mahindra Financial Services Ltd., Mumbai and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. J.S. Yadav, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

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?

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

It is conceded position on record that the Arbitrator has announced the Award at Mumbai, whereas the objections have been filed at Faridabad.

In view of the provisions of Section 42 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 Act (hereinafter called 'the 1996 Act'), the objections would not be maintainable at Faridabad as the Award has been pronounced at Mumbai. This view of mine is fortified from the judgment rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **“State of West Bengal and others V/s Associated Contractors”, AIR 2015 SC 260** .

Mr. J.S. Yadav, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants submits that he may be permitted to file the objection petition before the competent Court at Mumbai within a period of two months and he would also seek the leave of the Court for moving an application seeking condonation of delay by taking the aid of Section 14 of the Indian Limitation Act, 1963.

In view of the aforementioned statements, the appeal is disposed of.

However, liberty is granted to the appellants to file the objection petition before the Competent Court at Mumbai within a period of two months from today, accompanied by an application seeking condonation of delay under Section 14 of the Indian Limitation Act, 1963.

30.05.2016
yogesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE