



\$~57, 58, 59, 60, 61

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ O.M.P. (MISC.) 10/2025

SANJAY JHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smita Maan, Mr. Vishal Maan,  
Mr. Aditya Singh and Mr. Kartik  
Dabas, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC, Mr Rakesh  
Kumar, CGSC with Ms. Shreya Jetly  
and Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocates for  
R-1/UoI.  
Mr. Shivam Goel, Mr. Anil Kumar  
Goyal, Ms. Ramya S. Goel and Ms.  
Sanya Sharma, Advocates for R-  
2/NHAI.

+ O.M.P. (MISC.) 11/2025

SURENDER RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smita Maan, Mr. Vishal Maan,  
Mr. Aditya Singh and Mr. Kartik  
Dabas, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC, Mr Rakesh  
Kumar, CGSC with Ms. Shreya Jetly  
and Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocates for  
R-1/UoI.



Mr. Shivam Goel, Mr. Anil Kumar Goyal, Ms. Ramya S. Goel and Ms. Sanya Sharma, Advocates for R-2/NHAI.

+ O.M.P. (MISC.) 12/2025

RENU RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smita Maan, Mr. Vishal Maan, Mr. Aditya Singh and Mr. Kartik Dabas, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC, Mr Rakesh Kumar, CGSC with Ms. Shreya Jetly and Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocates for R-1/UoI.  
Mr. Shivam Goel, Mr. Anil Kumar Goyal, Ms. Ramya S. Goel and Ms. Sanya Sharma, Advocates for R-2/NHAI.

+ O.M.P. (MISC.) 13/2025

RENU RANA AND ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Smita Maan, Mr. Vishal Maan, Mr. Aditya Singh and Mr. Kartik Dabas, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC, Mr Rakesh Kumar, CGSC with Ms. Shreya Jetly



and Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocates for R-1/UoI.

Mr. Shivam Goel, Mr. Anil Kumar Goyal, Ms. Ramya S. Goel and Ms. Sanya Sharma, Advocates for R-2/NHAI.

+ O.M.P. (MISC.) 14/2025

SMT SAJJAN KAUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smita Maan, Mr. Vishal Maan, Mr. Aditya Singh and Mr. Kartik Dabas, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC, Mr Rakesh Kumar, CGSC with Ms. Shreya Jetly and Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocates for R-1/UoI.  
Mr. Shivam Goel, Mr. Anil Kumar Goyal, Ms. Ramya S. Goel and Ms. Sanya Sharma, Advocates for R-2/NHAI.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD**

**ORDER**

**20.03.2025**

%

**I.A. 7182/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P. (MISC.) 10/2025**

**I.A. 7183/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P. (MISC.) 11/2025**

**I.A. 7184/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P. (MISC.) 12/2025**

**I.A. 7185/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P. (MISC.) 13/2025**

**I.A. 7186/2025 (Exemption) in O.M.P. (MISC.) 14/2025**

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.



**O.M.P. (MISC.) 10/2025**

**O.M.P. (MISC.) 11/2025**

**O.M.P. (MISC.) 12/2025**

**O.M.P. (MISC.) 13/2025**

**O.M.P. (MISC.) 14/2025**

1. These Petitions under Section 29A(4) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 have been filed by the Petitioner for extending the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal in the Arbitration proceedings which are going on between the parties.
2. Material on record indicates that Special Secretary, Land and Building Department of GNCT of Delhi was authorized to act as the Arbitrator for all revenue Districts of Delhi for determination of compensation under Section 3G (5) of the National Highway Act 1956 for the acquired land. It is stated that the mandate of the Arbitrator has expired.
3. It is stated that the pleadings have been completed on August, 2022. It is stated that the arbitral proceedings and the connected arbitration petitions were listed before the statutory Arbitrator on several occasions, however for one reason or other beyond the control of the parties and the Ld. Arbitrator, the proceedings could not be concluded and same are still pending before the Ld. Sole Arbitrator. It is further stated that arbitral proceeding is in nature of statutory arbitration by the nominated officer of the Government/statutory Arbitrator under the National Highways Act and the subject proceedings herein are tagged along with other several similar petitions/applications pertaining to acquisition of other lands situated in same village acquired vide the same common Award for same public purpose. It is sated that due to several connected matters, completion of pleadings therein taking substantial time, frequent change of officer acting



as the statutory arbitrator and the officer/statutory arbitrator being also being occupied in administrative duties, the above arbitral proceedings are still pending till date and meanwhile the time period stipulated under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended) for passing of the Award by the Ld. Arbitrator stood expired.

4. Learned Counsel for the Respondents have no objection if the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal is extended.

5. The Apex Court in Rohan Builders (India) Private Limited v. Berger Paints India Limited, **2024 SCC OnLine SC 2494**, has held that an application for extension of the time period for passing an arbitral award under Section 29A(4) read with Section 29A(5) is maintainable even after the expiry of the twelve-month or the extended six-month period, as the case may be.

6. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to regularize the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal till today and extend the mandate of the Arbitral Tribunal for a further period of one year from today, i.e. till 20.03.2026, so that the award can be pronounced and no further extension of time would be required by the Tribunal.

7. The Petition are disposed of, along with the pending applications, if any.

**SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J**

**MARCH 20, 2025**

*RJ*