

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 26th April, 2023

(1)	FAO No. 4332 of 2022	
	Baljinder Kaur	
		Appellant
	Versus	
	Union of India and others	
		Respondents
(2)	FAO No. 4335 of 2022	
	Narinder Kaur since deceased through her LR	
		Appellant
	Versus	
	Union of India and others	
		Respondents
(3)	FAO No. 4362 of 2022	
	Raminder Kaur	
		Appellant
	Versus	
	Union of India and others	
		Respondents
(4)	FAO No. 4705 of 2022	
	Rinku Rupinder Kaur through GPA Mahesh Kumar Jain	
		Appellant
	Versus	
	Union of India and others	
		Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate for the appellant(s).
Mr. K. S. Kang, Advocate for the respondents.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. The instant appeals filed by land owners under Section 37 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short, 'the Act') are being disposed of by a single order as the facts are common and issue involved is similar.
2. The facts of FAO No. 4332 of 2022 are being considered.
3. The brief facts are that the land of the appellant situated in village Badbar, District Barnala was acquired for widening/ four laning of National Highway No. 64. The competent authority determined the compensation vide award dated 20.1.2014. The arbitration proceedings initiated at the instance of the land owner culminated in award dated 21.12.2020. Objections filed by the land owner under Section 34 of the Act were dismissed on 17.3.2022.
4. Learned counsel for the appellant at this stage submits that while deciding the objections the court observed that National Highway Authority of India (for short, 'NHAI') has chosen not to file the objections. However, NHAI had filed objections subsequently as the limitation was extended due to COVID-19 situation and the same are pending.
5. Notice of motion.
6. On the asking of court, Mr. K. S. Kang, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, considering that to avoid inconsistency it would be appropriate that objections of both the parties are decided together, the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remitted back to the court concerned at Patiala for deciding the objections afresh.
8. There is no doubt that considering the acquisition is of year 2012, with the co-operation of the parties, an earnest effort would be made by the court concerned to decide the objections expeditiously.
9. The appeals are disposed of.
10. Since the main appeals have been disposed of, pending application(s), if any, is rendered infructuous.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

26th April, 2023
mk

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