



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.3605/2025

M/s Hariom Projects Pvt. Ltd., through its Authorized Signatory Mr. Nadoda
Punjabhai Manabhai

Vs.

The Union of India, through its Chief Engineer, (FY), Hyderabad

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders or directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri S.S. Dewani, Advocate for petitioner
Ms Mugdha Chandurkar, DSGI for respondent

CORAM : PRAVIN S. PATIL, J.

DATE : 16.01.2026

1. The submission made before this Court is that before the learned District Judge, the respondent has challenged the Arbitration award to the extent of claim Nos.10 and 11 of granting of interest 18% per annum and further compounding the same annually from 20.05.2013 and further granting 18% on costs. As such, according to the petitioner, the entire amount was required to be deposited by the petitioner before the District Judge as per the provisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. However, instead of doing so, the application was moved vide Exhibit-8 for grant of permission to deposit the principal amount as awarded by the Arbitrator. Hence, it is stated that for not depositing the entire amount, the appeal is filed.

2. Learned Counsel for respondents stated that in the pending proceedings before the District Judge, the application for grant of stay was moved as well as the application Exhibit-8 was also filed for depositing the amount.

3. It is stated that learned Court has conducted hearing on both the applications simultaneously but while passing the order, it was wrongly recorded that order passed below Exhibit-8. Learned Counsel for petitioner also not disputed this factual position.

4. In light of the submission of both the parties, I have perused the impugned order dated 16.06.2025. The order shows that it was passed below Exhibit-8. However, at the same time, granted stay to the execution of award on condition of deposit of principal amount of the Arbitration award. The said order nowhere disclosed the reasons as to why the respondent was precluded from depositing the entire amount which was under challenge.

5. In the circumstances, both the parties sought time to place on record the copies of Rojnama to demonstrate that the learned District Judge has heard the matter on stay application as well as Exhibit-8.

6. List this matter on 23.01.2026.

(PRAVIN S. PATIL J.)