

\$~S- 5 to 8

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9361/2018**

M/S PREM SUKH BOTHRA (HUF) THROUGH KARTA PREM
SUKH BOTHRA Petitioner

Through Mr.Saurav Agarwal, Advocate.

versus

OFFICE OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing Counsel for
LAC with Ms.Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate.
Mr.Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Ms.Manisha Saroha, Advocate for
UOI.

Mr.Sanjay Poddar, Sr.Advocate with
Ms.Padma Priya, Mr.Dhruv Nayar
and Mr.Shivam Goel, Advocate for
NHAI.

WITH

+ **W.P.(C) 9372/2018**

MOTI LAL BOTHRA (HUF) THROUGH KARTA SHRI MOTI
LAL BOTHRA Petitioner

Through Mr.Saurav Agarwal, Advocate

versus

OFFICE OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY (LAND
ACQUISITION) UNDER THE NATIONAL HIGHWAYS ACT,
1956 & ORS Respondents

Through Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing Counsel for
LAC with Ms.Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate.

Mr.Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Ms.Manisha Saroha, Advocate for
UOI.

Mr.Sanjay Poddar, Sr.Advocate with
Ms.Padma Priya, Mr.Dhruv Nayar
and Mr.Shivam Goel, Advocate for
NHAI.

WITH

+ W.P.(C) 9373/2018

M/S DHANRAJ BOTHRA (HUF)
THROUGH KARTA KUSHAL KUMAR BOTHRA..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Saurav Agarwal, Advocate
versus

OFFICE OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing Counsel for
LAC with Ms.Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate.
Mr.Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Ms.Manisha Saroha, Advocate for
UOI.

Mr.Sanjay Poddar, Sr.Advocate with
Ms.Padma Priya, Mr.Dhruv Nayar
and Mr.Shivam Goel, Advocate for
NHAI.

WITH

+ W.P.(C) 9417/2018

MASTER ESTATE PRIVATE LIMITED Petitioner

Through Mr.Saurav Agarwal, Advocate.

versus

OFFICE OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY
(LAND ACQUISITION) & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Yeeshu Jain, Standing Counsel for
LAC with Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate.
Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Ms. Manisha Saroha, Advocate for
UOI.
Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Padma Priya, Mr. Dhruv Nayar
and Mr. Shivam Goel, Advocate for
NHAI.

%

Date of Decision: 08th January, 2021

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ASHA MENON

J U D G M E N T

MANMOHAN, J: (Oral)

C.M.No.32195/2020 in W.P.(C) 9361/2018 (for vacation or fixing the matter for final hearing by R-3)

C.M.No.32194/2020 in W.P.(C) 9417/2018 (for vacation or fixing the matter for final hearing by R-3)

Keeping in view the averments in the applications and with consent of parties, the matters are taken up for hearing.

Accordingly, the applications stand disposed of.

CM APPL. 32621/2019 in WP(C) 9372/2018 (by R-3)

Keeping in view the averments in the application, the delay in filing the reply to CM No. 12611/2019 is condoned.

Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 9361/2018

W.P.(C) 9372/2018 & C.M.Nos.46518/2018 (for stay by petitioner)

W.P.(C) 9373/2018 & C.M.No.46523/2018 (for stay by petitioner)

W.P.(C) 9417/2018

1. Present writ petitions have been filed by the petitioners *inter alia* seeking appointment of an independent and impartial Arbitrator in accordance with Section 3G(5) and (6) of the National Highways Act, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') read with Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015 and the Schedules appended thereto, more particularly, Fifth and Sixth Schedule.

2. At the outset, Mr.Sanjay Poddar, learned senior counsel for respondent no.3/NHAI states that the present writ petitions are infructuous as the District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner has been appointed as Arbitrator in accordance with Section 3G(5) of the Act on 09th October, 2018.

3. However, Mr. Saurav Aggarwal, learned counsel for the petitioners states that the present writ petitions are for appointment of an independent and impartial Arbitrator under Section 3G(5) of the Act. He states that this fact had been duly noted by the learned predecessor Division Bench in its order dated 25th September, 2018 in which two judgments passed by learned Single Judges of this Court had been referred to. Since considerable reliance is placed upon the order dated 25th September, 2018 by learned counsel for the petitioners, the same is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“Issue notice to show cause as to why petitions be not admitted. Counsels for the respondents accept notice. Since none is present on behalf of the UOI, Ms Saroj Bidawat, Advocate who is present in court is requested to look into the matter and ensure that the concerned

counsel appears in the matter on the next date. Let a complete set of paper book be supplied to Ms Bidawat.

We are informed by learned counsel appearing for NHAI that they are in the process of appointing an Arbitrator under Section 3G(5) of the NH Act, 1956. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners relies on Section 3G(5) and 3G(6) of the NH Act, 1956 to contend that while making the appointment, the respondents will have to take into consideration the Schedule V of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and the judgments rendered in the case of Devendra Kumar Gupta vs Union of India; O.M.P.(T) 5/2017, Dream Valley Farms Private Limited vs Religare Finvest Limited & Ors; ARB. 635/2016 decided on 19.10.2016 and ASSIGNIA-VIL JV vs Rail Vikas Nigam Limited; ARB. P. 677/2015 decided on 29.04.2016, more particularly paragraphs 9 and 10, which we reproduce below:-

“9. In Dream Valley Farms Private Limited vs. Religare Finvest Limited & Ors. ARB. 635/2016 decided on 19.10.2016 which runs as under:

20. While in the normal course, that would be one option, in the present case not only are Clauses 22 and 24 of the Fifth Schedule attracted giving rise to justifiable doubts as to the independence and impartiality of the Arbitrator, but the conduct of the Arbitrator in seeking to mislead the Petitioner and suppress in the first instance the fact of his being a presiding Arbitrator in 27 arbitration matters relating to the Respondent smacks of dishonesty that is unbecoming of an Arbitrator.

21. The Court is satisfied that for the purposes of Section 14 (1) (a) of the Act the Arbitrator becomes de jure disqualified from continuing as an arbitrator. His mandate is accordingly terminated.

10. ASSIGNIA-VIL JV vs Rail Vikas Nigam Limited ARB.P. 677/2015 decided on 29.04.2016 by the Court as under:

“43. The Fifth Schedule i.e. supplementary provision read with Section 12 (1)(b) mandates that the appointment made by any party which would give rise to justifiable doubts as to the independence or impartiality of arbitrator if he has relationship with the parties or counsel or the arbitrator is an employee, consultant, advisor or has any other past or present business relationship with a party, the same would

give rise to justifiable doubts. Similarly the Seventh Schedule read with Section 12 (5) mandates that there shall not be any arbitrator's relationship with the parties or counsel who should also not be an employee, consultant, advisor or has any other past or present business relationship with a party. If the answer is yes, the person should not be appointed as arbitrator in the said matter. In the present case, the suggestion of the respondent to appoint its own employee who is either present employee or retired employee, the request cannot be accepted as the arbitration is invoked after amended Act has come into operation. In case the said request is allowed, the very purpose of amending the Act would be defeated. 44. I am clear in my mind that under the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015, if any such case is covered as referred above in earlier para which cover the supplementary provision of schedule Fifth and Seventh, under those circumstances, the Court is duty bound to secure the appointment of an independent and impartial arbitrator as per Section 12 of the Act (as amended in 2015). As the arbitration is being an employee of one of the parties would definitely give rise to justifiable doubt as to his independence and impartiality.”

Counter affidavits be filed within four weeks. Rejoinder(s), if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter. The counter affidavits will address the issues raised and reflected in the order passed by this court today.

List on 07.12.2018.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners also states that the petitioners have filed additional documents, received in response to queries under the Right to Information Act, 2005, in the present batch of writ petitions to show that there was ‘fettering of jurisdiction’ inasmuch as the Arbitrator had been appointed at the instance and behest of respondent no.3/NHAI and the note appointing the Arbitrator had been signed by Chairman, NHAI. In support of his contention, he refers to the following documents:-

- (i) Copy of the letter dated 14th June, 2018 written by Mr.Niraj Verma, IAS, NHAI to Ms.Manisha Saxena, Secretary (Revenue), Govt. of Delhi.

“For acquisition of Dwarka Expressway, ADM (South West) has already declared land award and some of the land holders may like to go for arbitration under provisions of NH Act. In this connection, it is requested to nominate a suitable Authority as Arbitrator (preferably District Magistrate) u/s 3G (5) of NH Act, 1956. The proposal for the same has already been submitted by NHAI in March, 2018, to your department (copy enclosed).

I would request for early nomination of an officer to act as Arbitrator u/s 3G (5) of NH Act, 1956.”

- (ii) Copy of letter dated 05th September, 2018 written by Mr.Akash Padhi, Manager (T), NHAI to Dy. Secretary (LA), Govt. of NCT of Delhi.

“As the Arbitrator has not yet been nominated by Delhi Govt, the letter of ADM (SW) along with all enclosures (in duplicate) is being forwarded to your good office for further urgent necessary action.”

- (iii) Coy of the letter dated 11th September, 2018 Written by Mr.Alok Sharma, Dy. Secretary (LA), Land & Building Department to the General Manager (T)/Project Director, NHAI.

“This is with reference to your office letter No. NHAI/PIU/DWE/01/08/269 dated 14.03.2018 on the subject cited above, whereby it was requested that suitable authority may be nominated as arbitrator (preferably District Magistrate) under Section 3G (5) of NH Act, 1956 for respective districts in state of Delhi.

In this regard, it is informed that Competent Authority is pleased to nominate District Magistrates/ Deputy Commissioners

of North, North-West and South-West district as arbitrator under NH Act, 1956 for their respective jurisdictions. ”

(iv) Copy of letter dated 13th September, 2018 written by Mr.Udeep K.Singhal, GM(T)/Project Director, NHAI to Mr.Vimal, DGM (LA), NHAI HQ, New Delhi.

“4. Meanwhile, this has led to various litigations in Hon’ble High Court of Delhi with prayer to appoint arbitrators. As on date there are about 20 petitions pending in Hon’ble High Court of Delhi for appointment of Arbitrator i.r.o aforesaid award in which NHAI has been made a respondent. The Court has repeatedly directed NHAI, while hearing the Petitions, to take expeditious action for appointment of Arbitrator or else the same would be appointed by High Court. This has led to embarrassing situations.

*5. Considering the urgency of the matter and widespread repercussions in case Hon’ble High Court of Delhi appoints an Arbitrator on its own because of further delay volition. **It is necessary that order for appointment of Arbitrator is issued expeditiously.***

6. Accordingly, this office has prepared draft notification/order (based on the nomination received from GNCTD) for appointment of Arbitrators under section 3G (5) of NH Act, 1956.

7. In view of the above, it is requested that the matter may be taken up with Ministry of Road Transport and Highways for appointment of Arbitrator on priority. As the next date of hearing in Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in related case is 25/09/2018. ”

(v) Copy of the internal note dated 24th September, 2018 issued by NHAI (LA Division) with regard to appointment of Arbitrators under NH Act, 1956.

“The Proposal under consideration is for appointment of following State Officers to Act as Arbitrator for land acquisition proceeding in the Revenue Districts of North, North-West & South-West in National Capital Territory of Delhi.

Sl. No.	Designation of the Officer	Revenue District	State
<i>(1)</i>	<i>(2)</i>	<i>(3)</i>	<i>(4)</i>
1	District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner	North	National Capital Territory of Delhi
2	District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner	North-West	National Capital Territory of Delhi
3	District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner	South-West	National Capital Territory of Delhi

2. The Govt. of NCT of Delhi has given its consent to appoint above Officers as Arbitrator vide letter no. 9(12)LA/L&B/2017/4466-71 dated 11.09.2018 (C/P-08).

3. The Central Govt. (MORT&H) has to issue order appointing above officers as Arbitrator for District of North, North-West & South-West for land acquisition proceedings u/s 3G (5) of NH Act, 1956 in the National Capital Territory of Delhi.

4. In view of the above, kind approval of the Hon'ble Minister of State (MORT&H) is solicited for Appointment of Arbitrators for land acquisition proceedings as mentioned above, as per DFA (F/X) & (F/Y) placed in the file. Mayapuri Press letter is placed at F/1. ”

(vi) Copy of office Notification dated Nil/2018 issued by the Deputy Secretary, GOI.

“In pursuance of Sub – Section (5) of Section 3G of the National Highways Act, 1956 (48 of 1956), the Central Government

hereby appoints the Officers mentioned in Column (2) of the Table below, to be Arbitrator for the purpose of the said Sub-Section who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed, on Arbitrators by or under the said Act within the local limits of their respective jurisdiction as specified in column (3) and (4) of the said table. Sub – Section (6) & (7) of Section 3G of the Act shall be taken into consideration while passing awards by the Arbitrator.

Table

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Designation of the Officer</i>	<i>Revenue District</i>	<i>State</i>
<i>(1)</i>	<i>(2)</i>	<i>(3)</i>	<i>(4)</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>National Capital Territory of Delhi</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner</i>	<i>North-West</i>	<i>National Capital Territory of Delhi</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner</i>	<i>South-West</i>	<i>National Capital Territory of Delhi</i>

5. Mr. Saurav Agarwal points out that the District Magistrate who has now been appointed as an Arbitrator was actively involved in the monitoring and supervision of Dwarka Expressway Project as he was present in all the meetings in which progress of the project was monitored. He further states that as respondent no.3/NHAI is going to bear the expenditure of the office set-up of the Arbitrator, there is reasonable apprehension of bias on the part of the Arbitrator. He, accordingly, prays that an independent person be appointed as an Arbitrator.

6. *Per contra*, Mr. Sanjay Poddar, learned senior counsel for the respondent no. 3/NHAI states that as NHAI is a party to the litigation, it has

every right to seek expeditious appointment of an Arbitrator to avoid making payment of additional interest.

7. He emphasises that respondent no. 3/NHAI indicated its preference to Government of NCT of Delhi for appointment of District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner as the arbitrator as the office of the District Magistrate is in possession of all the relevant land records. He clarifies that the respondent no. 3/NHAI's Chairman has signed the file of appointment of the arbitrator in his capacity as Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways. Therefore, according to him, there is nothing wrong in NHAI approaching the Delhi Government for appointment of an Arbitrator.

8. He submits that all the submissions advanced by the petitioners regarding partiality of the District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner have been rejected by this Court in *Anubhav Chand Kathuria v. Union of India*, **MANU/DE/0746/2019** and *Manju Arora v. Union of India*, **MANU/DE/1561/2020**.

9. Mr. Sanjay Poddar denies that respondent no. 3/NHAI has appointed its own staff to assist the Arbitrator. He states that respondent no. 3/NHAI has only offered secretarial assistance to the Arbitrator with intent to facilitate early conclusion of the arbitration proceedings.

10. He prays that the petitioners be put to terms as it was only on account of the interim order passed at the instance of the petitioners that the arbitration proceedings have not commenced for more than two years.

11. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that the issue involved in the present batch of writ petitions is no longer *res integra* as two Division Benches of this Court in *Anubhav Chand Kathuria v. Union of India* (supra) and *Manju Arora v. Union of India* (supra) have

rejected similar arguments challenging the appointment of District Magistrate/ Deputy Commissioner as the Arbitrator. It is pertinent to mention that in *Manju Arora v. Union of India* (supra), the Division Bench had reiterated the earlier view, even when the order dated 25th September, 2018 passed by the learned predecessor Division Bench in the present batch of writ petitions was pointed out. The relevant portion of the said judgments are reproduced hereinbelow:-

A) *Anubhav Chand Kathuria v. Union of India* (supra) :-

“18. Mr Yadav expressed the apprehension that the remedy of arbitration would not be efficacious as far as the Petitioners are concerned. According to him, the objections in this regard are three-fold. First, he states that the DM appointed by the Central Government would not be impartial. The Petitioners cannot expect to get a satisfactory order in the arbitration proceedings. He submitted that the DM is disqualified from acting as an Arbitrator in terms of Section 12 (5) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (‘AC Act’) read with the Entry 1 in the Seventh Schedule to the AC Act. Secondly, Mr. Yadav submitted that the only remedy available to the Petitioners against the Award of such Arbitrator would be a petition under Section 34 of the AC Act, where the scope of challenge would be extremely limited. Thirdly, it is submitted that the Arbitrator may not be able to go behind what is stated in the notifications under Sections 3A and 3D of the NH Act, as far as the type and nature of the land is concerned.

xxx

xxx

xxx

24. As regards the plea that the DM as appointed by the Central Government under Section 3G (5) of the NH Act will not act impartially, this Court notes that under Entry 1 of the Seventh Schedule to the AC Act, an employee of one of the parties would be disqualified to act as an Arbitrator. Here, the Central Government itself is not a party to the arbitration. It is the NHAI which is acquiring the land and which is going to be paying compensation for such acquisition, and is a party to the proceedings. Admittedly,

the DM is not an employee of the NHAI. Consequently, the Court is unable to agree with the submissions of learned counsel for the Petitioners that the DM is disqualified from acting as an Arbitrator in terms of Section 12 (5) of the AC Act read with the Seventh Schedule thereof.

25. On the general plea that the remedy of arbitration is not efficacious and that the further challenge under Section 34 of the AC Act would be on very narrow grounds, the Court notes that the Petitioners have not challenged the constitutional validity of either Section 3G (1), (5) or (6) of the NH Act. It is, therefore, not open to the Petitioners to argue that the remedy of arbitration is not efficacious.

26. The Court also notes that where an efficacious alternative remedy is provided under the statute itself, in this case the NH Act, the High Court exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution would generally be reluctant to interfere. In the present case, this Court for the reasons aforementioned, is of the view that the Petitioners should pursue their remedy before the learned Arbitrator in terms of Section 3G (5) read with Section 3G (6) and (7) of the NH Act."

B) *Manju Arora v. Union of India* (supra) :-

"1. This petition was filed with the following prayers: -

xxx xxx xxx

(c) issue a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature thereof, thereby quashing the appointment of District Magistrate, District New Delhi, by the Central Government, as an Arbitrator under Section 3 G(5) of the NH Act."

xxx xxx xxx

5. The counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, has contended that another petition namely, W.P. (C) 9372/2018 titled Moti Lal Bothra (HUF) Through: Karta Shri Moti Lal Bothra v. Office Of The Competent Authority (Land Acquisition) Under The National Highways Act, 1956 & Ors., also challenging the appointment of the District Magistrate as the Arbitrator, under Section 3G(5) of the

National Highways Act, was also scheduled to be listed for today, but has not been listed for hearing, in the absence of an order therein for virtual hearing. It is contended that the petitioner in that writ petition has filed certain replies received to the queries under the Right to Information Act, 2005 and which help the case of the petitioner herein also and the present petition be also thus ordered to be taken up on whichever date W.P. (C) 9372/2018 stands adjourned, as per the general notification during the pandemic in this regard.

6. The counsel for the respondent No.2 National Highways Authority of India (NHAI) has opposed the request of adjournment contending that the arbitration proceedings are held up. It is further stated that the question of the challenge to the District Magistrate acting as Arbitrator under Section 3G(5) of the National Highways Act has already been negated in Anubhav Chand Kathuria v. Union of India, 2019 SCC OnLine Del 7307 (DB), in which also the counsel for the petitioner herein was the counsel for the petitioners and the said judgment has attained finality. It is thus contended that as far as the prayer in the present petition challenging the nomination by the Central Government of the District Magistrate, to act as Arbitrator is concerned, in view of the judgment in Anubhav Kathuriasupra, does not survive.

xxx

xxx

xxx

13. The counsel for the respondent No. 2 NHAI, in addition to Anubhav Kathuriasupra has also drawn attention to Vishwasrao Dattatray Kachare Vs. Union of India, Surendra Kumar Chhabda Vs. State of Chattisgarh MANU/CG/0693/2017 and National Highways Authority of India Vs. Sayedabad Tea Company Ltd. & Ors., to contend that therein also, the Courts have held that since the appointment of Arbitrator under Section 3G(5) of the National Highways Act is by Central Government and not by NHAI, which has acquired the land, the appointment of Arbitrator by the Central Government is not bad under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act and merely because the District Magistrate has been appointed as the Arbitrator, there is no presumption that would be biased in favour of NHAI.

14. We thus dispose of this petition, declining the reliefs claimed in prayer paragraphs in terms of Anubhav Kathuriasupra and by

clarifying that the disposal of this petition and the description of the land as agricultural in Sections 3A, 3D and 3G notifications, would not come in the way of the petitioner contending in the arbitration proceedings under Section 3G(5) of the National Highways Act, that the land is commercial and that the petitioner is entitled to compensation at commercial and not agricultural rates, and by reiterating the statements of the counsels for the NHAI and CALA as contended in Anubhav Kathuriasupra, that they would not object to such claim of the petitioner on the ground of Arbitrator not having the jurisdiction to go into the said question. ”

12. Keeping in view the aforesaid judgments, this Court is of the view that the petitioners' reliance on the order dated 25th September, 2018 is untenable in law, especially when it refers to orders passed by two learned Single Judges, whereas two Division Benches have subsequently specifically rejected similar arguments advanced by the petitioners in the present batch of writ petitions.

13. This Court is further of the opinion that respondent no.3/NHAI by asking a separate constitutional authority like Delhi Government to nominate its officer as an Arbitrator had committed no wrong. It is the duty of every litigant to pre-empt litigation and to ensure speedy disposal of matters to reduce the interest burden.

14. In fact, the respondent no. 3/NHAI's preference for appointment of District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner as the Arbitrator is perfectly understandable inasmuch as the office of the District Magistrate is in possession of all the relevant land records and in the event of any dispute with regard to measurement of the land, the District Magistrate has the authority to decide the same under Sections 27 and 64 of the Delhi Land Revenue Act.

15. It is pertinent to mention that the appointment of the Arbitrator is not by name but by office. Accordingly, there is no merit in the allegation that a specific individual has been appointed as an Arbitrator at the instance and behest of the respondent no.3/NHAI.

16. This Court is also of the view that just because the District Magistrate was engaged in the progress of Dwarka Expressway Project, it cannot lead to the apprehension that he would not give adequate compensation to the petitioners and/or that he would be biased in favour of the NHAI.

17. Further, this Court is of the view that just because secretarial assistance is provided to the Arbitrator by one of the parties, it cannot be assumed and presumed that he would be biased in favour of that particular party.

18. This Court is of the opinion that the petitioners have an alternative efficacious remedy under Sections 12 and 13 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, in the event, the petitioners have an apprehension of bias on the part of the Arbitrator.

19. The Chairman of respondent no. 3/NHAI has signed the Note of appointment of the Arbitrator in his capacity as Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways as at that time he was holding a dual charge both as Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways and Chairman, NHAI. Accordingly, the doctrine of necessity is attracted in the present batch of writ petitions.

20. This Court is also in agreement with the contention of learned senior counsel for respondent no.3/NHAI that contemporaneous correspondence shows that the Arbitrator in the present batch of writ petitions has been nominated by Govt. of NCT of Delhi and appointed by the Central

Government. Further, the Delhi Government applied its mind and took its own time in giving its consent to appointment of the District Magistrate as the Arbitrator.

21. Moreover, as pointed out by the two Division Benches in the aforesaid two judgments i.e. *Anubhav Chand Kathuria* (supra) and *Manju Arora* (supra), the District Magistrate is not under the control and supervision of NHAI and his appointment is at the behest of the Central Government.

22. Consequently, this Court is of the view that the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners are contrary to facts and untenable in law. In view thereof, the present writ petitions and stay applications are dismissed and the interim order dated 13th November, 2018 is vacated.

23. Further, as the arbitration proceedings were stayed at the request of the petitioners, this Court directs that no interest for the period 13th November, 2018 till date shall be payable to the petitioners by the respondent no.3/NHAI, in the event, an award is rendered by the Arbitrator in favour of the petitioners. All pending applications stand disposed of.

24. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith. Copy of the order be also forwarded to the learned counsel through e-mail.

MANMOHAN, J

ASHA MENON, J

JANUARY 08, 2021
KA