

112

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Civil Revision No.5629 of 2019

Date of Decision: 30.10.2019

Rockdrill Projects (P) Ltd.

..... Petitioner

Versus

Executive Engineer Public Health Engineering Division and another

..... Respondents

Civil Revision No.5646 of 2019

Rockdrill Projects (P) Ltd.

..... Petitioner

Versus

Executive Engineer Public Health Engineering Division and another

..... Respondents

Civil Revision No.5648 of 2019

Rockdrill Projects (P) Ltd.

..... Petitioner

Versus

Executive Engineer Public Health Engineering Division and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Jatinder Kumar Kamboj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

Notice of motion.

2. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State. Let appropriate number of copies of the paper-book be supplied to him during the course of the day.

3. The objections under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (in short 'the Act') were filed by the respondent on or around 12th October, 2018 as can be seen from the endorsement on the first page of the impugned order (Annexure P-13).

4. To that extent, the time limit for disposal of the objections in terms of Section 34(6) of the Act is already over.

5. It is, however, seen from the very 1st Paragraph of the impugned order that the Ld. District Judge, Ambala had observed, *“Arguments had been addressed in part on the last date of hearing. The case is voluminous and would require further consideration and it would not be possible to decide the case immediately especially when other old cases are also pending.”*

6. It is further asserted that although the matter had been posted for arguments for 2nd August, 2019, but till date arguments have not been heard and the matter is reported to have been transferred to some other Court by the Ld. District Judge, Ambala, where the matter is now fixed for hearing on the 26th November, 2019.

7. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not press for any relief on merits against the impugned order. But the matter ought to be decided finally by the Ld. Court below expeditiously in terms of the provisions of Section 34(6) of the Act.

8. In view of the aforesaid submissions, the present revision petition is disposed off with a direction upon the Ld. Court below before which the matter is now pending to endeavour to dispose off the same as expeditiously as possible and preferably within three months from the date already fixed, and the Court shall refrain from granting any unnecessary

adjournments particularly to the Objector side.

30.10.2019

Bhumika

**(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
2. Whether reportable: Yes/No