

ARB-71-2020

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(109)

ARB-71-2020

Date of decision:- 02.05.2024

Balveer Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

M/s C & C Constructions Limited

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Surinder Kumar Daaria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 11 (6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, petitioner has moved before this Court for appointment of an Arbitrator to adjudicate the disputes between the parties arising out of Agreement dated 23.04.2015, which was amended on 31.01.2016, 06.08.2016 and 04.05.2018, Annexure P-1 (colly), between the parties.

2. On 18.03.2024, this Court passed the following order:-

"On 25.02.2024, this court passed the following order:-

"It is noticed that the present petition has been filed under Section 11(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 for appointment of an Arbitrator.

Vide order dated 01.12.2023, this Court had noticed that the main agreement executed between the petitioner and respondents No.1 and 2 has not been filed and only the agreement, executed between the petitioner and respondent No.1 only, has been filed for the purpose of referring the dispute to the Arbitrator. The matter is pending since 2020 and is being adjourned either on the request of counsel for the petitioner or on account of his absence.

In the interest of justice, last opportunity is granted to the petitioner to comply with the order dated 01.12.2023.

Adjourned to 18.03.2024."

Yet another opportunity has been sought by counsel for the petitioner to comply with the order passed by this court.

List on 25.04.2024.

Another opportunity is granted to the petitioner to comply with the order, subject to deposit of costs of Rs.5,000/- with the Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Sector 12, Chandigarh."

3. Despite opportunities, petitioner has neither placed on record a copy of the agreement, nor has deposited the costs in compliance of the reproduced order. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he has made repeated attempts to contact the petitioner, who has not responded. It seems that petitioner is not interested in pursuing the matter.

4. Dismissed for default in pursuing the petition.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

02.05.2024

Pardeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes/No