



CR-329-2023

211

-1-

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

CR-329-2023

Date of Decision :-19.07.2024

Nohar Chand

.....Petitioner

Versus

Govt. of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr.Satbir Rathore, Advocate with
Mr.Chander Kant Rana, Advocate and
Mr.Vikram Rathore, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr.Puneet Kaur Sekhon, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr.Anil Bansal, DAG, Punjab
for respondents No.3 and 4.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present revision petition, challenge has been laid to an order dated 15.11.2022, Annexure P4, passed by the Executing Court at Bathinda whereby, an Execution application filed at the instance of petitioner-landowner has been dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction with an observation that the same be presented before Competent Court at Faridkot.

2. In the present case, certain land owned by petitioner within revenue estate of Village Goniana Khurd, District Bathinda came to be acquired vide notification dated 05.07.2013, issued under Section 3A of National Highways Act, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1956 Act”)



CR-329-2023

211

-2-

followed by award dated 07.11.2014 passed by the Competent Authority.

3. Aggrieved thereof, the petitioner invoked arbitration under Section 3G of the 1956 Act wherein, award by the statutory arbitrator was passed on 10.06.2020, Annexure P1. Based thereupon, the petitioner presented execution application before the Civil Court of Original Jurisdiction, Bathinda which came to be dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction, relying upon certain observations made by this Court in its order dated 30.09.2022, Annexure P5, passed in Civil Revision No.259-2022 titled as “National Highway Authority of India and Another Vs. Yashpreet Singh and Another”.

4. While impugning the order passed by the Executing Court and relying upon a decision passed by the Apex Court in “Sundaram Finance Limited Vs Abdul Samad and Anr. (2018) 3 SCC 622”, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an execution application pertaining to an arbitral award can be filed anywhere in the country. Para 22 of aforesaid judgment is reproduced hereunder:-

“22. We are thus, unhesitatingly of the view that the enforcement of an award through its execution can be filed anywhere in the country where such decree can be executed and there is no requirement for obtaining a transfer of the decree from the Court, which would have jurisdiction over the arbitral proceedings.”

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent has not been able to oppose the aforementioned legal position as expounded in case of “Sundaram Finance Limited” (supra).

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book as well as the judicial precedent cited at the Bar. I find merit in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

7. A perusal of judgment passed in Sundaram Finance Limited (Supra) shows that an execution application as regards an arbitral award can be filed anywhere in the country where such decree can be executed and there is no requirement for obtaining a transfer of decree from the Court which would have jurisdiction over the arbitral proceedings.

8. In view of the above, the properties of the respondents being situated at Bathinda as well, any decree against respondents was executable at Bathinda also and as such the Court at Bathinda was competent, having jurisdiction and authority to entertain the execution application filed at the instance of petitioner, seeking enforcement of arbitral award dated 10.06.2020, Annexure P1.

9. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the impugned order dated 15.11.2022, Annexure P4, passed by the Executing Court is hereby set aside with a direction that the execution application bearing No.181-2022 titled as “Nohar Chand Versus Govt. of India etc.” be entertained and disposed of as expeditiously as possible.

10. Disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

19.07.2024

Brij

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No