

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

**Civil Revision No. 1715 of 2018(O&M)
Date of decision : 15.03.2018**

Kartar Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

**DRO-cum-Land Acquisition Collector
and others**

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: None .

KULDIP SINGH, J. (Oral)

In the earlier part of the day proxy counsel had appeared seeking adjournment which was declined. Case was passed over. On second call none has appeared. Therefore, this Court considers the case of the petitioner.

Present revision is against the order dated 05.12.2017 passed by learned Additional District Judge, Palwal vide which objection petition filed by the petitioner under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 was dismissed on account of delay. A perusal of the impugned order shows that an arbitration award between the present petitioner and the National Highway Authority of India was passed on 02.09.2015 wherein it is recorded that the counsel for the petitioner was present at the time of passing of the award and it was announced in the open court. The limitation for filing the objection petition under Section 34 of the said Act is three months which can be further extended by 30 days. However, the said

petition was filed only on 09.03.2017. It was claimed that applicant is a villager and does not know about the award. It was stated that the award was reserved and pronounced later on. However, the said assertion was found to be factually incorrect. The said Arbitration Act provides for limitation to challenge the award. The award should be challenged within the said period of three months and the said period could be further extended only by 30 days. Beyond that no objections could be entertained. There is no illegality and infirmity in the impugned order. As such the present revision petition is dismissed.

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**

**15.03.2018
sunita**

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No