

111

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

CR No. 3556 of 2022

Date of Decision: 31.08.2022

Union of India

-Petitioner

Versus

M/s Hindustan Engineering Company Pvt. Ltd. and another

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Shobit Phutela, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Perusal of impugned order Annexure P-20 would show that the same is a reasoned order and has been passed with a rider thereby protecting the claim of the petitioner in the event of acceptance of objections under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 by the Court at Jalandhar.

Faced with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this issue.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is aggrieved by the inaction on behalf of Additional District Judge, Panchkula in not deciding the objections of the petitioner under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act which are pending since 2017.

The obvious reason for not deciding the aforesaid objections is that the copy of award has not been received from the Court at Jalandhar. The record has not been made available to the Court at Panchkula, despite passing of order dated 29.10.2018.

The controversy appears to be only a procedural one and the grievance can be redressed by directing the concerned Court of Additional District Judge, Jalandhar to send original copy/certified copy of arbitration Award along with case No.169/2014 to the Court of Additional District Judge, Panchkula dealing with the objections under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act at the earliest by keeping photostat copy of the same.

In view of aforesaid, this petition is disposed of.

31.08.2022

Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No