

\$~26

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **FAO 14/2016**

**JAGDISH KUMAR SIKKA**

..... Appellant

Through: Petitioner in person

versus

**THE BOMBAY STOCK EXCHANGE LTD.  
AND ORS.**

..... Respondents

Through:

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER**

**ORDER**

%

**11.01.2016**

CM No.713/2016 (Exemption)

Allowed subject to just exceptions.

FAO 14/2016

This is an appeal against the order dated 23.11.2015. The aforementioned order was passed in a petition preferred under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (in short the 1996 Act). The record shows that the appellant had also moved an application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 alongwith the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act.

The record further shows that the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act was filed on 16.10.2015 to assail two awards dated 13.04.2011 and 11.05.2011.

It appears that upon dismissal of the award dated 11.05.2011, the

FAO 14/2016

page 1 of 2

petitioner had filed a writ petition in this court bearing no.4881/2014. This writ petition was, however, dismissed on 05.08.2014.

The aforementioned dates clearly show that the petition under Section 34 of the 1996 Act was filed after more than a year of the writ petition being dismissed. This is the position in so far as the award dated 11.05.2011 is concerned.

As regards the earlier award, the petition filed was way beyond the period of limitation.

According to me, no error can be found in the impugned judgment. The appeal is accordingly, dismissed.

**RAJIV SHAKDHER, J**

**JANUARY 11, 2016**

yg

FAO 14/2016

page 2 of 2