



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

229

CWP-15790-2022

Date of Decision: 16.09.2025

GAURAV LUTHRA

.....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanav Singla, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Advocate for respondent No.4.

Mr. Karnail Singh, Advocate for respondent No.5.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel for respondent No.4 states that the petitioner is primarily aggrieved of arbitral awards dated 16.09.2020 and 05.01.2021 (Annexures P-4 and P-5) respectively. He submits that before filing the instant petition, petitioner has filed objection under Section 34 of Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short "the Act"). Counsel asserts that the possession of vehicle in dispute was taken by respondent No.4 pursuant to an interim order passed by the arbitrator under Section 17 of the Act.

2. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Similar was the position on the last date of hearing. It seems that as petitioner has availed the alternative remedy available to him under the Act, he is not interested in pursuing the instant petition.

3. Dismissed in default for want of prosecution.

**(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE**

16.09.2025

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