

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

CR No.194 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision : January 15, 2018

Ghanshyam (since deceased) through LRs Petitioner

Versus

D.R.O.-cum-Land Acquisition Collector and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Panwar, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 02.12.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Addl. District Judge, Palwal, whereby the application of the petitioner filed under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short 'the Act') for setting aside the Award dated 02.09.2015 passed by the Arbitrator, was dismissed, having been time barred.

A perusal of the lower court order shows that the learned counsel for the parties were present when the Arbitration Award was passed. This fact is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner. The Award was to be challenged within three months. No application for condonation of delay was filed. The present petition was filed on 31.03.2016 i.e. beyond the said period of three months.

Hence, there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order dated 02.12.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Addl. District

Judge, Palwal, that the objections filed under Section 34 of the Act are time barred.

Dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

January 15, 2018
sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No