

\$~

\*

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

16.

+

**O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 131/2016**

GOVERNMENT OF HARYANA & ANR. .... Petitioners  
Through: Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, Advocate.

versus

LT. GOVERNOR OF DELHI & ANR. .... Respondents  
Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Ms. K.  
Kaomudi Kiran Pathak and Mr. Kushal Raj,  
Advocate for GNCTD/R-1.  
Mr. R.V. Sinha, Mr. Ruchir Mishra and Mr. A.S.  
Singh, Advocate for UOI/R-2.

**CORAM: JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR**

**ORDER**

%

**16.03.2017**

1. A detailed order has been passed in Arb. P. No. 366 of 2009 appointing a sole Arbitrator for adjudication of the disputes between the parties. The subject matter of the arbitration is a dispute arising out of a Perpetual Lease Deed dated 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 1975 whereby Petitioner No. 1 was given on lease a parcel of land at Adchini village for a period of 100 years.

2. It was noticed that initially a writ petition was filed by the Government of Haryana soon after the termination of the lease deed by the Respondent. An interim order staying the dispossession of Petitioner No. 1 was passed in the said writ petition on 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2000. That order continued during the pendency of the Arb. P. No. 366 of 2009.

3. In the present petition, an order was passed initially on 3<sup>rd</sup> July, 2009 directing *status quo* to be maintained. That order has continued since then.
4. In the circumstances, the Court directs that the interim order passed by the Court staying the dispossession of Petitioner No. 1 will continue during the pendency of the arbitration proceedings subject to the sole Arbitrator modifying, varying or vacating the order in accordance with law, if the situation so warrants, on an application by either party under Section 17 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.
5. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

**S. MURALIDHAR, J**

**MARCH 16, 2017/dn**