

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 1682 of 2018**

Tulsiram Dewangan S/o Shri Kanhaiya Lal Dewangan, Aged About 48 Years
 R/o Doctor Dewangans Niwas, Ward No. 25, Main Road, Birgaon, Near
 Adwani School, Tahsil And District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur,
 Chhattisgarh **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. Union Of India Through The Secretary, Department Of Road, Transport And National Highway, Mantralaya, New Delhi., District : New Delhi, Delhi
2. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The Sub Divisional Officer (Rev.), Cum- Land Acquisition Officer, Competent Authority, National Highway Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Project Director, National Highway Authority Of India, Project Execution Unit, Behind B.T. College, House No. 5196, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. The Additional Collector And Arbitrator (NHA) Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Sanjay K. Dewangan Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, G. A.
For Respondent No. 1	:	Mr. B. Gopa Kumar, ASG.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****25/06/18**

1. The Arbitrator appointed under National Highways Act, 1956 (for brevity, 'Act of 1956') has rejected the case of the petitioner by order dated 22.03.2018, aggrieved against which this writ petition has been preferred by the petitioner.

2. Mr. B.Gopa Kumar, learned Assistant Solicitor General appearing for respondent No. 1 would submit that remedy of the petitioner lies under Section 34(2) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1996 (hereinafter referred to as 'Act of 1996') by virtue of provisions contained in Section 3G (6) of the Act of 1956.

3. Since the petitioner has remedy of filing the application under Section 34(2) of the Act of 1996 by virtue of provisions contained in Section 3G (6) of the Act of 1956, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to proceed in accordance with the provisions of Act of 1996.

4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge